EVALUATION

OF

CENTRALLY SPONSORED SCHEME

FOR

REHABILITATION OF BONDED LABOUR

(FINAL REPORT)

PROGRAMME EVALUATION ORGANISATION

PLANNING COMMISSION
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
NEW DELHI—110001
MARCH, 1984

PREFACE

The Government of India passed the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act in 1976. Efforts were thereafter initiated for identification, release and rehabilitation of bonded labour in different States. A Centrally Sponsored Scheme for rehabilitation of the freed bonded labourers was started in 1978-79. The scheme provided for matching grant assistance from the centre to the extent of 50 per cent of the total cost which was fixed at Rs. 4000 per bonded labourer.

2. The rehabilitation of the bonded labour has been included as one of the improtant items in the 20 Point Programme. This programme for economic upliftment and rehabilitation of bonded labour needed systematically to be followed up so as to ensure that there was no relapse into bondage in due course. The Ministry of Labour, therefore, requested the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission during February, 1979 to conduct urgently an evaluation study.

3. The main objective of the study was to find out the extent to which the aims of the scheme to identify, free and rehabilitate the bonded labour have been fulfilled with particular reference to :

(a) the administrative arrangements made at various levels for the implementation of the schemes to identify, release and rehabilitate the freed bonded labour ;

(b) The detailed contents of the various schemes and the extent to which they have been implemented;

(c) the impact of the various schemes towards the rehabilitation of the bonded labourers in terms of employment and income generated to the released persons;

(d) the administrative support being given and the follow up methods adopted to prevent the lapsing back of the bonded labourers into bondage;

(e) to study the impact of the programmes in bringing about any social change in the life and living conditions of the beneficiaries and the village community, and

(f) extent of integration of the released labour in the mainstream of the village community.

4. Accordingly, the PEO initiated the evaluation study in 9 States covering 23 districts in which the rehabilitation was reported to be in operation. The field work would be initiated by middle of June, 1981 and was completed towards the end of 1981. In order to understand at first hand the problem encountered in the implementation of the scheme at various levels, evaluation teams from the PEO headquarters visited the districts of Kota (Rajasthan) in December 1980, Ranga Reddy and Medak (Andhra Pradesh) in April 1981, Nalanda (Bihar), in January 1981, Koraput (Orissa) in April 1981 and Bangalore, Kolar and Mysore (Karnataka) in Feb., 1982.

On-the-spot study reports were prepared and forwarded to the Ministries of Labour and Home and the respective State Governments for suitable action. The Minitsry of Labour have since issued further instructions incorporating most of the suggestions contained in above mentioned reports. Some of the State Governments have already taken action on the recommendations of the PEO teams.

5. Based on the field data collected, an Interim Report on the working of the scheme for rehabilitation of Bonded Labour was brought out in December 1982. The report brought out several deficiencies in the implementation of the programme. Co pies of the interim report were sent to the Ministry of Labour for necessary action.

6. The present is the Final Report on the working of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for rehabilitation of the Bonded Labour. Apart from examining issues relating to plaaning and administration of the schems, the aspects relating to estimates, origin, problems of identification, release, rehabilitation and impact on target groups have been examined in depth and suggestions and recommendations have been made touching upon not only the economic aspects of the problem but also on the structural sociological aspects, particularly of our rural society.

7. Some of the more important findings, observations, recommendations and suggestions of the Report are as follows :

7.1 The report has stressed the need for constitution of the vigilance committees wherever they have not been formed, their functioning and maintenanece of statutory registers.

7.2 The process of identification, release and rehabilitation has remained incomplete in various States and estimates from various sources are quite divergent. It is suggested that fresh identification may be attempted during the household surveys conducted for locating the population below the poverty line etc. Dovetailing of resources available from other rural development programmes such as IRDP, NREP Housing Programmes for landless rural workers, ITDP, the tribal sub plan, the special component plant for scheduled castes, etc. have also been stressed.

7.3 A high percentage of beneficiaries had come out of the clutches of bondage after 20 years and more in States like Bihar and UP leading to the conclusion that the system of bonded labour may be oldest in these States. The system may comparatively be of recent origin in the States of Orissa and Andhra Pradesh where about 90% and 46% of the selected beheficiaries respectively remained in bondage for less than 5 years in these two States. This, however, calls for further research.

7.4 About 98% of the beneficiaries were bonded due to indebtedness, while about 2% were bonded due to customary or social obligations, because of belonging to a certain caste. The social and customary bondage was found only in the States of Bihar, Karnataka, Orissa and Rajasthan leading to the conclusion that the social customs and norms are still rigid in these States where the warker sections like SC/ST suffered from such social and customary bondage disabilities.

7.5 The State/District authorities by and large have failed in providing sufficient subsistence allowance during the intervening period of release and rehabilitation thereby exposing most of the beneficiaries to the danger of relapse into bondage.

7.6 As regards rehabilitation schemes, practically in all cases no steps were taken by the concerned authorities to assess the background and choice of the beneficiaries in the matter of allotment of rehabilitation schemes.

7.7 The cooperative credit societies by and large have not been able to do much in assisting proper rehabilitation of the erstwhile bonded labourers.

7.8 The encouraging impact of the programme was related to ability of the majority of the beneficiaries to spend some money on several new items such as education of children, social functions, visits to religious places and relatives, entertainment,

medical care etc. Thus they have started a new and better life in terms of the socio cultural activities mentioned above. They had also freedom of movement and mobility in terms of domestic tourism e.g. visits to religious places etc.

7.9 About 242 beneficiaries out of 421 depended upon borrowing from some source or the other which endangered them of going back to bondage, since there was no capacity in them to repay the loans. The concerned State Governments should take prompt follow up action to see that such persons do not relapse into bondage. It is also desirable to see that sufficient income is generated to the beneficiaries who were going without meals or resorting to begging.

7.10 About 50% of the beneficiaries reported that the well off and influential villagers did not like the programme of release and rehabilitation which could be due to the setback they might have suffered in not getting easily available cheap labour from the bonded.

7.11 As majority of bonded labourers belong to SC, they besides suffering as a bonded labour also suffered from the outdated customary disabilities attached to untouchability and caste. It is, therefore, recommended that the civil right act may be enforced strictly and reputed voluntary organisations may be encouraged to undertake social movement and social reform etc.

7.12 The State Governments and the social welfare organisations in different States should seriously consider suggestions to educate people to overcome the age old social handicaps and prejudices so that there is rapid social change in the rural areas. This recommendation is relevant not only to the ex-bonded labour system but also to the whole social system/structure of our society as such as there are still rigid norms and customs and barbaric social disabilities like untouchability which inhibit not only the development of human personality social and economic growth but frustrate all our planned efforts and planning process itself in our country.

7.13 It was observed that bonded labour system exists both in backwardness and modernisation of villages. Hence there may be other factors like particular social system or the power and property structure in the villages or the mental attitude of the society in the variou s areas for perpetuating this system.

8. The study has also stressed the following aspects :

(i) Organisation of training workshop to explain the various sections of the Bonded Labour Act including correct definitions as there was some confusion in the minds of various functionaries about the proper definition of bonded labour as distinguished from attached labour, contract labour, migrant labour etc.

(ii) Continuous need to identify bonded labour from time to time alongwith other surveys so that the bonded labour becomes a thing of the past in our society.

(iii) Inducing the bonded labourers to put their children in schools by reimbursing the earnings which the children are at present getting by working to supplement the income of their parents for livelihood/survival.

(iv) Provision of protective measures against atrocities on the bonded labourers during the process of identification till time of actual release.

(v) Dissemination of the various provisions of the rehabilitation assistance both to the beneficiaries and the implementing officials since some of the bonded labourers selected only such of the benefits which were less in value thinking that the same needs to be repaid.

(vi) Possibility of rehabilitating the bonded labourers in groups on agricultural/industrial estates as in the case of Karnataka.

(vii) Desirability of providing all the necessary inputs and accompanying facilities like veterinary cover, agricultural credit including consumption loan, irrigation facilities, development of uncultivable land, marketing, transport facilities etc.

9. The field work of the study was conducted by the experienced field units of the PEO. The detailed design of the survey formulation of tools of investigation, its planning, supervision, coordination and final drafting of the report was done by the Project Director, Shri P. L. Aware under the overall supervision and guidance of Jt. Adviser Mrs. M. Krishna. He was ably assisted by Research Officers S/Shri S. S. Jain and V. L. Kantha Rao. Special mention may be made of the team of devotted investigators namely, S/Shri D. V. Biniwale, B. S. Chouchary, R. N. Bose, Chattar Singh, Balwinder Pal, Rattan Singh, Chander Bhan and Suraj Prakash for their hard work. The secretariat assistance for completion of the report was provided by Shri K. M. Sharma, P. A. The assistance of the nine State Governments, the Ministry of Labour and the members of the TAC is also gratefully acknowledged.

10. We hope that the findings of the report will be useful not only to those engaged in the planning, implementation and formulation of future policy of the programme but also to research institutes/universities, social reformers and research scholars both within and outside the Government.

NEW DELHI
MARCH, 1984

S. P. GUPTA
Adviser (PP and Evl.)

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

NTRODUCTION

The problem of bonded labour was being felt in several parts of the country even before independence. Some concerted efforts were made to prohibit the use of forced labour in the thirties in accordance with the I.L.O. Convention known as the Forced Labour Convention 1930. But a serious view was taken only after independence by making special provisions under article 23 of the Constitution to prohibit trafficking in human beings 'Begar' and other forms of forced labour.

1.2 The Government of India, in 1975, issued Bonded Labour (Abolition) Ordinance which included not only freeing of bonded labour but also their rehabilitation under special programmes. This ordinance subsequently became Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act 1976. The practice of bonded labour has been made a socio-economic offence under the Bonded Labour Act 1976. The basic ingredients of the offence are

(i) denial of freedom to participate in the labour market,

(ii) denial of freedom of movement to any part of the country, and

(iii) exploitation of the innocent labourer and his family members under customary and debt conditions.

The Act not only defines the practice of bonded labour but also provides for extinguishment of liability to pay bonded debt, formation of vigilance committees and punishment for following the system of bonded labour.

The Estimates of Bonded Labour

1.3 The estimates of total number of bonded labourers in different States of the country vary significantly. The main sources of the estimates are (i) Gandhi Peace Foundation and National Labour Institute (ii) NSSO Surveys and (iii) Identification by the State Governments under the Bonded Labour Abolition Act. The Gandhi Peace Foundation (in January, 1981) had estimated total number of bonded labourers at 26.17 lakhs in 10 States whereas NSSO surveys in 32nd round (July 1977-June 1978) had estimated the number at 4.5 lakh persons in the 15 States surveyed by them. However, only 9 States namely, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh, in March 1980, had reported existence of Bonded labourers. The total number of bonded labourers for these 9 States was estimated at 1.2 lakh only on 31st March 1980. The survey methodology adopted by each of the above sources for estimating bonded labourers and the area covered varied significantly. According to the NSSO, the following two aspects of work contract decided the existence of bonded labour : (i) whether a person is free to work for others ? (ii) whether wage salary paid for the work fully compensate the work performed? The State Governments and Gandhi Peace Foundation had adopted the definition of bonded labour as given in the Bonded Labour Act. Appendix 1.1 gives the details regarding States covered and estimates of bonded labourers as estimated by Gandhi Peace Foundation, NSSO's 32nd round and State Governments.

Need for Fresh Survey

1.4 Tre estimates of bonded labourers, as discussed above, vary due to difference in concepts, coverage and methodology which may be seen in Appendix 1.2. There is, however, no dispute that the problem of bonded labour exists in various parts of the country and the bonded labourers need to be freed and rehabilitated. As only 9 States had declared the existence of bonded labourers, the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for the Rehabilitation of Bonded Labour is currently operating in these States only. It may, however, be mentioned that some of the States who had denied existence of bonded labour, figure in the NSSO survey. In view of the findings of NSSO, there is need to have a fresh survey in other States like Gujarat, Jammu and Kashmir, Maharashtra and West Bengal who had not reported the existence of bonded labour as on 31st March, 1980.

Rehabilitation Programmes :

1.5 To deal with the problems of Bonded Labour the Government of India formulated a rehabilitation programme in 1978-79. The main objectives of the programme are to identify, release and rehabilitate the bonded labourers under the Centrally Sponsored Schemes as well as the schemes undertaken by the State Governments. Accordingly, the Government of India and State Governments have initiated various rehabilitation programmes for this class of labour.

1.6 The rehabilitation schemes under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme with matching contribution from the concerned State Governments, as per the guidelines, were to be drawn for areas where there was concentration of bonded labour and which would have been left out otherwise under various approved plan schemes or where these plan scheme were inadequate for providing rehabilitation to the released bonded labourers. The schemes approved for central assistance are

2—227 PC/ND/84

financed on a matching grant basis, i.e. 50 per cent by the State and 50 per cent by the Centre, of the total cost of the approved schemes.

1.7 The schemes taken up in the selected States were as follows :

Land Based Schemes.—Allotment of land, provision of agricultural inputs, supply of drought animals, construction of irrigation well and reclamation of land.

Non-land Based Schemes.—Supply of buffaloes, cows, piggery, goatry, sheep and poultry birds.

Skill Craft Based Schemes.—Supply of sewing machines, carpentry sets, training in dyeing, leather works and laundry.

Other Schemes.—Cart and animals, rickshows and tomtams and marriage grants.

1.8 The following rehabilitation schemes have been listed in the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Labour in May, 1978 :—

(a) **Land Based**

(i) Allotment of land out of Government land or ceiling surplus land, preferably in the village where the bonded labourer ordinarily resides or is liberated to prevent parting from the social milieu or prevent antagonism from other villages.

(ii) Identification of delivery system or inputs, credit facilities, seeds, water-supply, agricultural implements, drought animals and fertilizers.

(iii) Need, if any, of reclamation and development of the assigned land.

(b) **Non-land Based**

They include the supply of :—

(i) Milch cattle-cows and buffaloes-suitable for the area;

(ii) Pigs, goats, sheep, dependent upon the social sensibility of the bonded labourers released and the physical environment;

(iii) Ensure minimum veterinary cover from the existing/extension of veterinary services;

(iv) Institutional linking up of marketing.

(c) **Skill/Craft Based Occupations**

(i) Identification of skill/craft;

(ii) Supply of raw materials, implements, working capital and work-shed;

(iii) Linking with market through cooperatives for State aided institutions to eliminate exploitation by private middlemen;

(iv) Administrative support to prevent lapsing back into bondage again.

1.9 The most popular schemes under land based category were supply of drought animals and agricultural development schemes. The supply of milch animals was the most popular scheme amongst the non-land based schemes. The schemes under skill/craft and other category have only made a beginning. It was however noted that none of the beneficiary was interested in taking up poultry scheme. This may be due to the failure of implementing agency in providing the necessary training and background in taking up such income generating schemes. (Please also see para 8.18).

CHAPTER II

THE EVALUATION STUDY

The main objective of the Bonded Labour Scheme as stated earlier, was to identify, release and rehabilitate the bonded labour both under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme as well as under the ongoing schemes of the State Governments.

2.2 The State Governments were asked to prepare rehabilitation schemes for the bonded labour, broadly in conformity with the guidelines issued in this connection. These schemes were then scrutinised for approval by Screening Committee consisting of representatives of Ministry of Labour, Department of Rural Development and Planning Commission, set up at the Centre. For each of the Schemes, as per the guidelines of the Labour Ministry, the State Governments were required to indicate the district agency responsible for its execution.

2.3 The programmes for economic upliftment and rehabilitation of bonded labour needed systematically to be followed up so as to ensure that there was no relapse into bondage in due course. In its 5th meeting held on 9th January 1979, the Screening Committee recommended that the working of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for rehabilitation of bonded labour should be evaluated so that corrective measures, if required, could be identified and applied in the formulation of the suitable future policy for the scheme. The Ministry of Labour, therefore, requested the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission to conduct, urgently such an evaluation study.

Objectives of the Evaluation Study

2.4 The Main objective of the evaluation study was to find out the extent to which aims of the scheme to identify, free and rehabilitate the bonded labour have been fulfilled with particular reference to :

(a) the administrative arrangements made at various levels for the implementation of the schemes to identify, release and rehabilitate the freed bonded labour;

(b) the detailed contets of the various schemes and the extent to which they have been implemented;

(c) the impact of the various schemes towards the rehabilitation of the bonded labourers in terms of employment and income generated to the released persons;

(d) the administrative support being given and the follow up methods adopted to prevent the lapsing back of the bonded labourers into bondage;

(e) to study the impact of the programme in bringing about any social change in the life and living conditions of the beneficiaries and the village community; and

(f) extent of integration of the released labour in the mainstream of the village community.

Coverage and Methodology

2.5 The Ministry of Labour in the initial stages informed that the scheme was being implemented in 23 districts of 9 States. As such it was decided to take up the evaluation in all the 23 districts. When the P.E.O. field teams visited the concerned districts, it was found that there was no central scheme in operation in five districts out of 23 districts. These districts were Wynad (Kerala), Bastar and Betul (MP), Mayurbhunj (Orissa) and Nilgiris (Tamil Nadu). (Since the beneficiaries were rehabilitated on schemes other than the centrally sponsored one, no canvassing of beneficiaries could be done in Wynad district of Kerala). The administrative and other aspects were, however, studied. In the light of these observations the detailed study was restricted to only 18 districts of 8 States which are as follows :

State	District
Andhra Pradesh	Rangareddy, Mehboobnagar, Medak.
Bihar	Nalanda, Santhal Parganas, Bhagalpur, Monghyr.
Karnataka	Kolar, Chitradurga.
Madhya Pradesh	Jabalpur, Raigarh.
Orissa	Phulbani, Ganjam, Koraput, Kalahandi.
Rajasthan	Kota
Tamil Nadu	Periyar
Uttar Pradesh	Tehri Garhwal

Selection of Blocks

2.6 The selection of blocks was to be restricted to 2 blocks having maximum number of bonded labourers. In case the total number of bonded labourers in the first two blocks fell short of the required number of beneficiaries, a provision was made to select more blocks to select the required number of beneficiaries. Thus, more than two blocks were selected in the district of Bhagalpur (Bihar) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu) whereas only one block each was coverd in 4 districts, namely,

Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), Ganjam (Orissa), Kolar (Karnataka) and Tehri-Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh) as the Centrally sponsored scheme was working in only one block of these districts.

Selection of villages and Beneficiaries

2.7 All the villages in the selected blocks were arranged in descending order of the number of beneficiaries in each village. Three villages from each of the block/talukas having the miximum number of beneficiaries were selected. Keeping in view the manpower resources in the field and objectives of the programme, it was decided to select 10 beneficiaries per village. In case the number of beneficiaries in the six villages of two blocks fell short of sixty beneficiaries, two more villages, one each from the two blocks, were selected. The maximum number of villages to be covered per district was however, restricted to ten to avoid long distance movement of the field staff.

2.8 Ten beneficiaries per village were selected randomly from the list as available in the registers of the Vigilance Committees set up by the State Governments or from other available records. In case the number of beneficiaries was less than 10 in the selected villages all were selected for the detailed study and to ensure the selection of 60 beneficiaries per district, 2 more villages from each block were covered. On the basis of above methodology, following was the coverage :

States	8
Districts	18
Blocks	38
Villages	112
Beneficiaries	782

2.9 The details giving name of States, districts, blocks and villages alongwith the number of beneficiaries is given in Appendix 2.1.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

2.10 The Technical Advisory Committee was constituted on November 15, 1980 to guide the evaluation study at various stages. The composition of the Committee is given in Appendix 2.2. In the first meeting of the Committee held on Feb. 2, 1981, the instruments of observation and other problems were discussed and finalised.

2.11 An all India Training Workshop was organised at New Delhi on 2nd and 3rd February, 1981 to discuss the findings of the pretested Schedules and Questionnaires. In this Workshop, concerned Regional Evaluation Officers and Project Evaluation Ocers were present. The workshop was addressed by Dr. M. S. Swaminathan, Member of Planning Commission and Dr. Man Mohan Singh, the then Member Secretary of Planning Commission.

Instruments of Observation

2.12 Keeping in view the nature of the study, time and resources available at the Programme Evaluation Organisation headquarters and at the field level, the following instruments of observation were developed for study. The experience gained in pretesting and during the on the spot stulies was utilised in finalising these instruments viz.;

(i) State/District level guidepoints-cum questionnaire.

(ii) Village Level Schedule.

(iii) Beneficiary Schedule.

Field Work

2.13 The field work was initiated in middle of June, 1981 and completed towards the end of 1981. Scrutiny of schedules and questionnaires was done at the Regional Evaluation Offices and PEO Hqrs.

2.14 In order to understand at first hand the problem encountered in the implementation of the scheme at various levels, evaluation teams from the PEO Headquarters visited the districts of Kota (Rajasthan) in December, 1980 and Ranga Reddy and Medak (Andhra Pradesh) in the month of April, 1981. The other visits undertaken were in districts of Nalanda (Bihar) in the month of January, 1981, Koraput, (Orissa) in April, 191 and Bangalore, Kolar and Mysore (Karnataka) in February, 1982. Based on the spot studies, detailed reports were prepared and forwarded to the Ministries of Labour and Home and the respective State Governments for suitable action. The Ministry of Labour issued further instructions incorporating most of the suggestions and recommendations contained in the above mentioned reports. Some of the State Govts. have already taken action on the recommendation of the PEO teams.

Interim Report

2.15 The interim report primarily based on State level and district level field reports was issued in December, 1982.

CHAPTER III

ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANISATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME

The administrative and organisational set up at State, District and Tehsil/block level were scrutinised for assessing adequacy and suitability for planning, implementation and coordination of the process of identification, release and rehabilitation of the bonded labour.

3.2 The departments responsible for implementation of the programme in the selected nine States are as follows :

State	Name of the Department
Andhra Pradesh	Social Welfare
Bihar	Labour
Karnataka	Social Welfare
Kerala	Tribal Welfare
Madhya Pradesh	Labour
Orissa	Revenue
Rajasthan	Special Schemes Organisation
Tamil Nadu	Social Welfare
Uttar Pradesh	Labour and Hill Developmen

3.3 The Revenue Department and Social Welfare Department, by and large, appeared more effective in dealing with the problem of bonded labour. The Revenue Department was more effective for the reason that its officials at different levels were equipped with judicial and administrative powers to enforce the Bonded Labour Act directly. The Social Welfare Department also proved effective due to the fact that, by and large, the officials were well oriented towards Social Welfare Development Programmes. The programme was more effective where sense of commitment was more. It is, therefore, recommended that for effective implementation of the programme the subject of bonded labour may either be dealt with in the Revenue Department or Social Welfare Department. Wherever departments other than mentioned above are dealing with the subject at State level, the task of identification and release should be entrusted to the revenue agency at lower levels and rehabilitation aspects to the Social Welfare Department.

3.4 It was observed that district collectors were solely responsible for coordination and implementation of the scheme at the district level. As there was no special staff sanctioned for this purpose, the collectors implemented the programme through the help of some of the departments at the district headquarters . In district Medak of Andhra Pradesh, Executive Officer of the District Scheduled Caste and Backward Class Service Cooperative Society helped the collector whereas in district Mehboobnagar the collector was helped by the District Social Welfare Officer. In Rangareddy, the collector was being helped by a sub-collector. At lower levels, Tehsildars and other revenue officials were responsible for identification and release whereas Block Development Officers were responsible for the implementation of rehabilitation schemes in all the three districts of Andhra Pradesh where the evaluation was conducted. In Bihar, the collector was assisted by the staff of the labour department at the district level, block level and lower levels for identification and release whereas BDO and other extension staff were responsible for implementation of the rehabilitation schemes in all the four districts evaluated. It was observed that the staff of Labour Department was not so effective in dealing with identification and release in Bihar. In Karnataka, the Deputy Commissioner (Collector) was assisted by District Social Welfare Officer at the district level and the Block Development Officers and extension staff were responsible for the implementation of the programme at Block and lower levels in the two districts studied. In Kerala, the Revenue Divisional Officer and Block Development Officer looked after the Programme at sub-divisional and block levels respectively. In Madhya Pradesh, the revenue staff at various levels i.e. sub-Divisional Officers, Tehsildars, Naib-Tehsildars and Patwaris were responsible for the implementation of programme. In Orissa, the Collector was assisted by Additional District Magistrate at the district level. At lower levels, the Sub-Divisional Officers with the help of Assistant District Welfare Officers looked after identification and release whereas Block Development Officers and extension staff looked after the rehabilitation schemes. It is unfortunate that in Rajasthan the programme was a **non starter and nothing could be found out about the functioneries** at various levels except that there was one Project Officer and an Additional District Magistrate who helped the District Magistrate. In Tamil Nadu, the revenue staff at Magistrate. In Tamil Nadu, the revenue staff at all levels was responsible for the scheme. In Uttar Pradesh (Tehri-Garhwal) the scheme was taken care of by a Project Director of the Tribal Project Authority, Dehradun with one Project Officer, 3 Assistant Development Officers and 16 Project Workers. The district-wise position of

the functionaries dealing with Bonded Labour at various levels is given below :

State	District	Functionaries at	
		District level	Taluka/Bloc k level
Andhra Pradesh . . .	Medak	Collector	Block Development Officer
	Mehboobnagar	Collector	Tehsildars and Block Development Officers
	Rangareddy	Collector	Tehsildars and Block Development Officers
Bihar	Bhagalpur	Collector	Labour Inspector
	Monghyr	Collector	Labour Inspector and BDO
	Nalanda	Collector	Labour Inspector
	Santhal Parganas	Collector	Labour Inspector and Block Development Officers
Karnataka	Chitradurga	Deputy Commissioner	Block Development Officers
	Kolar	Deputy Commissioner	Block Development Officer
Kerala	Wynad	Collector	Revenue Divisional Officer and Block Development Officer
Madhya Pradesh . . .	Jabalpur	Collector	Sub-Divisional Officer
	Raigarh	Collector	Sub-Divisional Officer
Orissa	Ganjam	Collector	Sub-Divisional Officer and Block Development Officer
	Kalahandi	Collector	Sub-Divisional Officer and Block Development Officer
	Koraput	Collector	Sub-Divisional Officer and Block Development Officer
	Phulbani	Collector	Sub-Divisional Officer and Block Development Officer
Rajasthan	Kota	Collector	Programme is a non-starter and nothing is known at the lower levels.
Tamil Nadu	Periyar	Collector	Sub-Divisional Officer and Tehsildar
Uttar Pradesh	Tehri Garhwal	Project Director at Dehradun	Project Officer, 3 Assistant Developmen Officers and 16 Project Workers.

Vigilance Committees

3.5 As per section 13 of the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act 1976, Vigilance Committees are required to be constituted at district level or sub-divisional levels. The main functions of the Vigilance Committees are

(i) to advise the District Magistrate or any officer authorised by him as to the efforts made and action taken to ensure that provision of this Act, or of any rule made thereunder are properly implemented;

(ii) to provide for the economic and social rehabilitation of the free bonded labourers;

(iii) to coordinate the functions of rural banks and cooperative socities with a view to canalising adequate credit to the freed bonded labourers;

(iv) to keep an eye on the number of offences of which cognizance has been taken under the Act;

(v) to make a survey as to whether there is any offence of which cognizance ought to be taken under this Act;

(vi) to defend any suit instituted against a freed bonded labourer or a member of his family for the recovery of the whole or part of any bonded debt or any other debt which is claimed by such person to be a bonded debt.

3.6 These Committees were set up in the States of Bihar, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. In two other States under study viz, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala, no Vigilance Committees were formed either at the district or sub-division levels. In addition, one twenty point programme committee headed by Chief Minister, was constituted at State level in Bihar. Similarly, in Uttar Pradesh, a sub-committee of the Cabinet with Labour Minister as convenor and Ministers for Public Works Department and Harijan and Social Welfare as members was constituted in 1976 to look after rehabilitation programme but it ceased functioning since 1977. However, for

20 point programme a monthly meeting was held in which progress of bonded labour programme was reviewed. The district-wise position ragarding constitution of Vigilance Committee is indicated below :

State	District	Year of Constitution	No. of meetings held since inception
1	2	3	4
Andhra Pradesh	Medak	Nil	NR
	Rangareddy	Nil	NR
	Mehboobnagar	Nil	NR
Bihar	Bhagalpur	1976-77	1
	Monghyr	1975-76	4
	Nalanda	1978-79	3
	Santhal Parganas	Nil	NR
Karnataka	Chitradurga	Nil	NR
	Kolar	1977-78	1
Madhya Pradesh	Jabalpur	1978-79	2
	Raigarh	Nil	NR
Orissa	Ganjam	1976-77	Nil
	Kalahandi	1976-77	4
	Koraput	1976-77	8
	Phulbani	1976-77	1
Rajasthan	Kota	Details not available though reported to have been formed.	
Tamil Nadu	Periyar	Nil	NR
Uttar Pradesh	Tehri-Garhwal	1977-78	5

3.7 It may be mentioned that out of 18 districts under study, Vigilance Committees were set up only in 10 districts. For one district records were not available though reported to have been constituted while in the remaining 7 districts Vigilance Committees were not constituted at all.

3.8 The Vigilance Committees were active in holding the meetings in the districts of Koraput and Kalahandi (Orissa), Tehri-Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh), and Monghyr (Bihar) only. In their meetings, the Vigilance Committees discussed.

(i) the progress achieved and problems faced in the implementation of the programme at various levels.

(ii) detection of new cases.

(iii) fixing up of targets and

(iv) review of progress of rehabilitation and maintenance of records etc.

3.9 It was also observed that in recent times most of the Committees were defunct and were not as effective as required. Regular meetings were not held by these committees since their inception. Adequate guidance was not provided. Effective steps were not taken to ensure the implementation of the decisions taken. In one district (Koraput—Orissa) the non-official members did not take any interest in the work. It is, therefore, recommended that attempts should be made to nominate active and committed persons to serve on the committees as non-official members.

3.10 It has been observed that there is a need to constitute Vigilance Committees in all the districts for successful planning, implementation and coordination of the programme.

Statutory registers and their maintenance

3.11 As required under the Act, 4 statutory registers were to be maintained. These related to.

(a) a register containing the names and addresses of the freed bonded labourers.

(b) a register containing statistics relating to the occupation and income of every freed bonded labourer.

(c) a register containing details of the benefits and.

(d) a register containing details of cases under different sections of the Act.

In the 2 districts of Andhra Pradesh and one district of Madhya Pradesh, it was reported that in the absence of Vigilance Committees, these details were not maintained at tehsil office and block office. In case of Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka it was observed that all the registers, except one containing the details of cases under different sections, were maintained by the district level and block level authorities involved in the programme. In Tamil Nadu, all the four statutory registers were maintained by the Revenue Divisional Officers. In case of Rajasthan, a vigilance committee was reported to have been constituted but no details were available with the State or District authorities. As such the registers were not available at district or subdivisional levels in Rajasthan.

3.12 As far as maintenace of statutory registers were concerned, it was observed that in most of the States these were not maintained properly. Names of the beneficiaries, type of assistance given and number benefitted were not recorded properly. Inconsistencies were also found in the

records. District-wise position regarding maintenance of various registers is as follows :

State	District	Whether registers maintained *(Yes/No)			
		a*	b*	c*	d*
Andhra Pradesh.	Medak	No	No	No	No
	Rangareddy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Mehboobnagar	No	No	No	No
Bihar	Bhagalpur	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Monghyr	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Nalanda	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Santhal Parganas	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Karnataka	Chitradurga	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Kolar	Yes	No	Yes	No
Madhya Pradesh	Jabalpur	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Raigarh	No	No	No	No
Orissa	Ganjam	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Kalahandi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Koraput	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
	Phulbani	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rajasthan	Kota	No	No	No	No
Tamil Nadu	Periyar	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Uttar Pradesh	Tehri Garhwal	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

*(a) Register containing the names and addresses of free bonded labourers.
(b) Register containing statistics relating to the occupation and income of freed bonded labourers.
(c) Registers containing the details of benefits given to the freed bonded labourers.
(d) Register containing details of cases under different sections of the Act.

3.13 It is clear from the above table that in case of 4 districts viz.. Medak, Mehboobnagar, Raigarh and Kota these registers were not maintained at all.

3.14 It may be observed that, by and large, the administrative arrangements in various States were not satisfactory for the enforcement of the Bonded Labour Act and consequently for the implementation of the rehabilitation programme for the released bonded labourers. Under the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act 1976, the setting up of Vigilance Committees at district and sub-Division levels is a statutory requirement. Out of 18 districts taken up for the study. seven districts had not set up the Vigilance Committees. In the remaining eleven districts where these committees were set up they were reported to have not been functioning effectively. Similar was the position in regard to the statutory registers and their maintenance. It is, therefore, suggested that necessary steps may be initiated to improve and strengthen the administrative arrangements for the effective enforcement of the Act as well as for implementation of the rehabilitation programme.

CHAPTER IV

BONDAGE

The bonded labour in India forms the lowest class of the agriculutral labourers who even after 35 years of independence are still being exploited under the traditional agricultural and other customary bondage. The masters, who generally control the power and property structure deprived the bonded labourers of their freedom to seek other employment and right to appropriate or sell at market value any of their property. It is diffcult to trace the origin of bonded labour as the system is continuing from generations in India. However, on the basis of available information, its origin and perpetuation could be traced to mainly :

(i) economic compulsions coupled with social customs and traditions

(ii) customary and traditional bondage due to being bonded in a particular caste/community and

(iii) contractual bondage.

4.2 The social customs and obligations like births, marriages, deaths in the families and drinking habits also played an important role in compelling the poor cultivators to resort to borrowings. The money-lenders took full advantage of the deteriorating economic conditions and social obligations of poor peasants and advanced small loans from time to time in lieu of binding them to work as agricultural labourers till the final repayment of loans. As these labourers could never free themselves from the vicious circle of poverty, they had to continue in bondage. The indebtedness became an economic inevitability and bondage a way of life to majority of them.

4.3 The origin of customary and traditional bondage could be traced to the need generated for ensuring landless labourers near to centres of industrialisation. It became necessary for the money lenders to bind the agricultural labourers by offering better terms of loan and better living conditions with meals, clothes, place to stay and land to cultivate so as to avoid the shortage of agricultural labour during harvesting season. As the landlords provided basic security of life to this category of agricultural labourers, they developed family ties. The landlords in these cases took all cares for him and his children and hence the agricultural labourers never wanted to break away from their masters resulting into customary and traditional bondage.

4.4 In the contractual bondage, the agricultural labourers and the landlords entered into a contract for one year to provide labour in lieu of wages/basic necessities of life and/or loan paid for social purposes. The terms of agreement varied from place to place according to the bargaining power of the labourers. According to the contract, labourers were free not to renew the contract at the end of the year but in actual practice it was found that they could never do so due to their extreme poverty and security offered by the landlords. This class of labourers was reported to have renewed the contract because of their inability to pay back petty loans offered to them by landlords for social customs.

4.5 The root cause of bonded labour problem, thus, was the poverty of rural landless agricultural workers which forced them to take loans for consumption and their inability to pay the interest as well as the loan. The majority of this bonded labour class belonged to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The profiles of the released selected 782 bonded labourers and the conditions during bondage have been analysed and presented in the paragraphs that follow.

Profile of Selected Beneficiaries

4.6 During the course of evaluation study, efforts were made to find out the age, sex, caste, educational qualifications and the principal occupation of the beneficiaries. The analysis based on the above items may be seen in the paragraphs that follow.

3—227 PC/ND/84

Age-wise Distribution

4.7 The statewise distribution, of selected beneficiaries in different age groups may be seen in the table given below :

TABLE 4.1

Distribution of Selected Beneficiaries in Different Age-groups

State	Age-Groups						
	10—15	15—25	25—35	35—45	45—55	Above 55	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Andhra Pradesh	1	60	63	35	12	9	180
Bihar	—	9	48	59	52	24	192
Karnataka	2	62	35	14	5	2	120
Madhya Pradesh	—	4	11	10	6	—	31
Orissa	9	29	22	14	3	2	79
Rajasthan	—	10	26	12	8	4	60
Tamil Nadu	—	8	22	14	10	6	60
Uttar Pradesh	—	3	10	22	18	7	60
Total	12	185	237	180	114	54	782
Percentage	1·5	23·7	30·3	23·0	14·6	6·9	100·0

4.8 For finding out whether there was appreciable number of child labour amongst the rehabilitated bonded labourers, the age group upto 10 years and 10-15 years was included for analysis. It may be mentioned that in the sample there was no selected beneficiary who was 10 years old or below. Even in the age group 10-15 years there were only 12 beneficiaries forming a very meagre percentage of 1.5 out of a total number of 782 selected. If we see the total number of beneficiaries selected from all the States the maximum number of 237 (30.3 percent) rehabilitated bonded labourers has fallen in the age group of 25-35 years. From the figures given in above table, it may be seen that 77 percent of the selected beneficiaries had fallen in the range of 15 years to 45 years, which age could also be considered as youthful and energetic for putting in hard physical labour in which the master was always interested. On the other extreme, it may not be out of place to mention that about 7 percent of the selected beneficiaries had fallen in the age group of above 55 years, the majority coming from Bihar State.

4.9 On the basis of grouping of States, it could be seen that 4 States out of 8 studied, namely, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu the age-group pattern of the maximum number of bonded labourers was similar to the all India pattern i. e. the maximum number had fallen in age group of 25-35 years. These States have 63, 11, 26 and 22 beneficiaries with percentages as 35.00, 35.50, 43.30 and 36.70 respectively. In the States of Karnataka and Orissa the maximum number of beneficiaries lies in the age group 15-25, the numbers and their percentage being 62 (51.7%) and 29 (36.7%) respectively. On the other hand in the States of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, the maximum number lies in the age group 35-45, the respective numbers and percentages being 59 (30.7) and 22 (36.7). Thus these two age groups in the above mentioned four States are different from the All India picture.

4.10 There is still another striking exception in the case of Bihar State where in the age group 45-55, the number of beneficiaries is 52 (27.1%) which is nearest to the maximum in the State and is more than the figure 48 (25%) obtaining in the maximum age group (25-35) at all India level.

4.11 The child labour seems to be not much in vogue except in Orissa where the total number of beneficiaries in the age group 10-15 is 9 amounting to a percentage of 11.4. In the States of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, it was negligible where the number of beneficiaries was 1 and 2 respectively.

4.12 In these 8 States, the study was conducted in 18 districts. The position with regard to the number of beneficiaries in the various age group varied in these districts as given in Table 4.2. It will be seen that in the age group 25-35 years there were 5 districts namely, Rangareddy, Monghyr, Koraput, Kota and Periar which had the maximum number of beneficiaries. These districts had the number beneficiaries as 32 (53.3%), 15 (26.3%), 21 (43.8%), 26 (43.3%) and 22 (36.7%) respectively. The age group 15-25 had the maximum number of beneficiaries in Medak 17 (28.3%), Mehboobnagar 28 (46.7%), Chitradurga 27 (45%), Kolar 35 (58.3%), and Kalahandi 13 (59.1%). Districts Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Nalanda, Jabalpur and Tehri Garhwal had the maximum number of beneficiaries in the age group 35-45, their numbers and percentage being 16 (32%), 15 (26.3%), 13 (50%), 10 (34.5%) and 22 (36.7%) respectively. District Monghyr had equal number of beneficiaries i.e. 15 in the age groups 25-35 and 35-45. Santhal Parganas was the only district where the maximum number of beneficiaries 24 (40.7%) was in the age group 45-55. On the whole the number of

beneficiaries in the age group 45-55 and above 55 is much less as compared to the groups falling within the range 15-45 years which testifies the position at All India level. Child Labour is conspicuously present in one district i.e. Kalahandi in Orissa State, the number and percentage being 8 (36.4%), Districts Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh), Chitradurga (Karnataka) and Phulbani (Orissa) have negligible child labour with one child labourer each.

TATBE 4.2

Distribution of Beneficiaries in Selected Districts according to age groups

Name of the District	Age Groups							
	Below 10	10—15	15—25	25—35	35—45	45—55	Above 55	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Medak	—	—	17 (28·3)	12 (20·0)	16 (26·7)	8 (13·3)	7 (11·7)	60 (100·0)
Mehboobnagar	—	1 (1·7)	28 (46·7)	19 (31·7)	8 (13·3)	2 (3·3)	2 (3·3)	60 (100·0)
Rangareddy	—	—	15 (25·0)	32 (53·3)	11 (18·3)	2 (3·3)	— —	60 (100·0)
Bhagalpur	—	—	5 (10·0)	12 (24·0)	16 (32·0)	12 (24·0)	5 (10·0)	50 (100·0)
Monghyr	—	—	3 (5·3)	15 (26·3)	15 (26·3)	13 (22·8)	11 (19·3)	57 (100·0)
Nalanda	—	—	1 (3·8)	8 (30·8)	13 (50·0)	3 (11·5)	1 (3·8)	26 (100·0)
Santhal Parganas	—	—	—	13 (22·0)	15 (25·4)	24 (40·7)	7 (11·9)	59 (100·0)
Chitradurga	—	1 (1·7)	27 (45·0)	15 (25·0)	11 (18·3)	4 (6·7)	2 (3·3)	60 (100·0)
Kolar	—	1 (1·7)	35 (58·3)	20 (33·3)	3 (5·0)	1 (1·7)	— —	60 (100·0)
Jabalpur	—	—	4 (13·8)	9 (31·0)	10 (34·5)	6 (20·7)	— —	29 (100·0)
Raigarh	—	—	—	2 (100·0)	—	—	—	2 (100·0)
Ganjam	—	—	—	1 (50·0)	—	1 (50·0)	—	2 (100·0)
Kalahandi	—	8 (36·4)	13 (59·1)	—	1 (4·5)	—	—	22 (100·0)
Korapur	—	—	10 (20·8)	21 (43·8)	13 (27·1)	2 (4·2)	2 (4·2)	48 (100·0)
Phulbani	—	1 (14·3)	6 (85·7)	—	—	—	—	7 (100·0)
Kota	—	—	10 (16·7)	26 (43·3)	12 (20·0)	8 (13·3)	4 (6·7)	60 (100·0)
Periyar	—	—	8 (13·3)	22 (36·7)	14 (23·3)	10 (16·7)	6 (10·0)	60 (100·0)
Tehrigarhwal	—	—	3 (5·0)	10 (16·7)	22 (36·7)	18 (30·0)	7 (11·7)	60 (100·0)

Caste and Sex

4.13 The proportion of various social groups and the preponderance of sex in the various social groups who had undergone the painful experience under bondage, is reflected in the list given below :—

TABLE 4.3

Distribution of selected beneficiaries in various social groups according to sex

Social Groups	Male		Females		Total	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Scheduled Castes	472	63·0	9	27·3	481	61·5
		98·0		2·0		100·0
Scheduled Tribes	163	21.8	7	21.2	170	21.7
		95.9		4.1		100.0
Backward Classes	88	11·8	1	3·0	89	11·4
		98·9		1·1		100·0
Other Classes	26	3·4	16	48·5	42	5·4
		61·9		38·1		100·0
Total	749	100·0	33	100·0	782	100·0
		95·8		4·2		100·0

4.14 It may be seen from the above table that Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes together formed 83.2 percent of the total selected beneficiaries. The rest belonged to Backward Classes and other classes. The percentage of female selected beneficiaries out of a total of 782 was a meagre 4.2, indicating that females were bonded rarely. On the contrary, amongst the other classes, female percentage was as high as 38 which perhaps shows that the females from other classes were bonded not only due to custom or tradition but also out of economic necessity. The Statewise position of various social groups is shown in the table below :

TABLE 4.4

Statewise distribution of selected Beneficiaries according to Social groups:

State	Social Groups									
	S.C.	%	S.T.	%	B.C.	%	Others	%	Total	%
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Andhra Pradesh	145	80·5	3	1·7	32	17·8	..	0·0	180	100·0
Bihar	136	70·8	5	2·6	51	26·6	..	0·0	192	100·0
Karnataka	103	85·8	9	7·5	—	0·0	8	6·7	120	100·0
Madhya Pradesh	8	25·8	22	71·0	..	0·0	1	3·2	31	100·0
Orissa	9	11·4	52	65·8	..	0·0	18	22·8	79	100·0
Rajasthan	7	11·7	52	86·7	..	0·0	1	1·7	60	100·0
Tamil Nadu	18	30·0	27	45·0	5	8·3	10	16·7	60	100·0
Uttar Pradesh	55	91·7	..	0·0	1	1·7	4	6·7	60	100·0
Total	481	61·5	170	21·7	89	11·4	42	5·4	782	100·0

4.15 As could be seen from the above table, the State of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh had the majority of Scheduled Castes, their numbers along with percentages in these States were 145 (80.5%), 136 (70.8%), 103 (85.8%) and 55 (91.7%) respectively. On the other hand, the Scheduled Tribes beneficiaries were in majority in the remaining 4 States i.e. Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. Their numbers and percentages in these individual states were 22 (71.0%), 52 (65.8%), 52 (86.7%) and 27 (45%) respectively.

4.16 Bonded Labour belonging to Backward Classes were significantly present in the states of Andhra Pradesh and Bihar. Their numbers and percentages being 32 (17.8%) and 51 (26.6%). There were no backward class beneficiaries in the state of Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Rajasthan and in the remaining two states i.e. Tamil Nadu and U. P., their percentages were 8.3 and 1.7 respectively.

4.17 There were no beneficiaries from other classes in Andhra Pradesh and Bihar. Their

numbers and percentages in Karnataka, Orissa, Tamil Nadu and U. P. were 8 (6.7%), 18 (22,8%), 10 (16.7%) and 4 (6.7%) respectively. In the remaining two States of Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan, their presence was negligible as each of these two States had one beneficiary from other classes.

4.18 Coming to the District-wise figures, it was observed that all the districts covered in Andhra Pradesh, i.e. Medak, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy, the districts of Monghyr, Nalanda and Santhal Parganas of Bihar, Chitradurga and Kolar in Karnataka and Tehri Garhwal in Uttar Pradesh had the maximum percentage of selected beneficiaries belonging to Scheduled Castes. The percentage of Scheduled Castes beneficiaries in these districts ranged between 70.7 per cent to 96.4 percent. In districts of Monghyr and Kolar, it was maximum being 94.6 and 96.4 respectively.

4.19 The percentage of Scheduled Tribes was maximum in the selected districts of Bhagalpur (Bihar), Jabalpur and Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), Ganjam and Koraput (Orissa), Kota (Rajasthan) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu). Their percentage in these districts ranged between 45 in Periyar to 100 in Ganjam. The number of selected beneficiaries in Ganjam was 2 only and both of them were from Scheduled Tribes. There was only one beneficiary from backward classes in District Tehri-Garhwal (U. P.).

4.20 The beneficiaries from other classes were found mostly in districts Chitradurga (Karnataka), Kalahandi (Orissa), Periyar (Tamil Nadu), and Tehri Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh), their percentages being 10.0, 81.8, 16.7 and 6.7 in the respective districts.

4.21 Most of the female beneficiaries were from district Kalahandi (Orissa) and belonged to other classes. Out of an All India total of 33 female beneficiaries 17—more than 50% were from this district. In this district, total number of beneficiaries were 22 out of which 17 (77.3%) were females, 3 belonging to Scheduled Tribes and 14 to other classes. Other worth mentioning districts where the female beneficiaries were present were Kolar (Karnataka) and Tehri-Garhwal (U. P.) with 4 beneficiaries each. Some other districts where the female beneficiaries were negligibly present were Monghyr (Bihar), Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu) with 1, 2, 2 and 3 female beneficiaries respectively.

Distribution of beneficiaries according to primary occupation prior to Bondage

4.22 Out of 782 selected beneficiaries, 644 beneficiaries were having different type of occupations and the rest 138 beneficiaries were having no occupation. The reason for this was that they were minors and hence they were not having gainful employment anywhere. Prior to bondage 68.79 percent of the beneficiaries were working as labourers, 11.65 perecent of the beneficiaries were cultivators, 4.19 percent of the beneficiaries were working in animal husbandry, 1.86 percent of the beneficiaries were working as artisans and 13.35 percent of the benefiiciaries were earning their livelihood by grazing cattle and hiring of bullocks.

4.23 During bondage 90.92 percent of the beneficiaries were working as labourers followed by 1.66 percent of the beneficiaries working in animal husbandry and 7.03 percent of the beneficiaries employed in other occupations such as hiring of bullocks and grazing of cattle.

4.24 Presently 67.39 percent of the beneficiaries were working as labourers followed by 16.24% in cultivation, 5.24 percent in animal husbandry, 2.43 percent in traditional village service like Barber, Washerman, Sweeper etc. and 7.93 percent of the beneficiaries were employed in other occupations such as hiring of bullocks and grazing of cattle.

4.25 There is a shift in occupational structure. Prior to bondage 11.65 perecent of the beneficiaries were cultivators but presently 16.24 percent are cultivators. Similarly, at present 5.24 percent of the beneficiaries are employed in animal husbandry whereas prior to bondage 4.19 percent of the beneficiaries were having this occupation. There were only 0.16 percent of the beneficiaries in traditional village service prior to bondage but presently 2.43 percent of the beneficiaries are employed in this occupation.

4.26 There is a negative shift in labour, artisan and others. Prior to bondage 68.79 percent were employed as labourers but presently 67.39 percent were employed in this class. Similarly prior to bondage 1.86 percent of the beneficiaries were artisans but presently only 0.77 percent are working as artisans. In other services such as grazing of cattle and hiring of bullocks, there is a negative shift of 5.42 percent.

4.27 It is clear that during bondage there was shift from all non-labour occupation like cultivation, animal husbandry and artisan to labour as occupation and the percentage of such persons which was 68.79 percent prior to bondage increased to 90.92 percent during bondage. The situation has, however, improved after rehabilitation and the percentage of such labour has increased in all other occupation marginally and decrease in labour as occupation by about 23.53 percent after rehabilitation.

4.28 **Principal Occupation (Present).**—The selected beneficiaries were asked to give their principal occupations on the basis of the maximum income earned from various occupations

that they have adopted. The position that emerged may be seen in following table :—

TABLE 4.5

Distribution of beneficiaries according to principal occupations

Occupation	No. of beneficiaries	Percentage to total
1	2	3
Cultivation	127	16·2
Labour	543	69·4
Dairying	37	4·8
Sheep rearing	4	0·5
Artisans	6	0·9
Traditional village services	1	8·2
Others	64	..
Total	782	100·0

4.29 It could be seen that the maximum number of rehabilitated bonded labourers i.e. 69.4 percent were still having their primary occupation i.e. the main source of income as labourer. Out of this 441 earned their livelihood through agricultural labour, 86 through non-agricultural labour and 16 through pulling of cart. In other words, the rehabilitation programmes have not been able to give sufficient assets to earn their living from sources other than labour. Cultivation was the main source of income for 127 or 16.2 percent beneficiaries out of which 102 were owner cultivators and 25 were tenant cultivators. Other occupations were dairying, sheep rearing, artisans and others which in all accounted for 14.4 percent beneficiaries.

Conditions under Bondage

4.30 **Age at which bonded.**—The exploitation of helpless poor could be realised from the fact about 43 percent of the selected beneficiaries were bonded when they were less than 15 years of age so much so that more than 8 percent of the selected beneficiaries were those who were even less than 10 years. More than 38 percent beneficiaries were those who were bonded between 15 and 25 years of age. The remaining about 19 percent of selected beneficiaries were bonded between ages of 25 and 55 years. The age wise number of selected beneficiaries and their percentage to total is shown below :

TABLE 4.6

Selected beneficiaries by age group

Age Group	No. of selected beneficiaries	Percentage to total selected
1	2	3
Below 10 years	64	8·18
10—15 years	272	34·78
15—25 years	301	38·49
25—35 years	96	12·28
35—45 years	38	4·86
45—55 years	9	1·15
Above 55 years	2	0·26
Total	782	100·0

4.31 On a close examination of the data of beneficiaries it was observed that the bondage 'at the age of less than 15 years' was predominet in Bihar, Karnataka and Rajasthan where the percentage of such beneficiaries to total selected was 59, 73 and 43 respectively. Amongst the districts, the maximum percentage of beneficiaries in the age groups was reflected in the district of Kalahandi—Orissa (100 percent) followed by Phulbani—Orissa (86 percent), Nalanda—Bihar (85 percent), Monghyr—Bihar (79 percent), Kolar—Karnataka (75 percent), Chitradurga—Karnataka (70 percent) and Kota—Rajasthan (43 percent).

4.32 **Duration of Bondage.**—The longevity of the period under bondage could be indicative of the depth to which the system of bondage was rooted. It was observed that about 72 percent of the selected beneficiaries had remained under bondage for 5 years and above while about 25 percent remained in bondage for 20 years and above. The detailed position of the selected beneficiaries falling under different periods of bondage could be seen in the following table :

TABLE NO. 4.7

Distribution of selected beneficiaries according to period under bondage

No. of years spent under bondage	No. of selectde beneficiaries	Percentage to total selected
1	2	3
Less than 1 year	17	2·17
1— 2 years	46	5·88
2— 5 years	158	20·20
5—10 years	205	26.21
10—20 years	178	22·77
20 years and above	178	22·77
Total	782	100·00

4.33 An analysis of beneficiaries from different states revealed that quite a high percentage of beneficiaries had come out of the clutches of bondage after 20 years and more in the states of Bihar (55 percent) and Uttar Pradesh (40 percent). This may also be indicative of the fact that the system of bonded labour was the oldest in these two states. If judged from the above hypothetical criteria, the states of Orissa and Andhra Pradesh could be considered as states where the system of bondage may not be very old as about 90 percent and 46 percent of selected beneficiaries respectively remained under bondage for less than 5 years. The remaining 4 states could be placed in the middle. Amongst the districts the maximum percentage of beneficiaries who had undergone the torture of bondage for 20 years and more was in the district of Monghyr (Bihar) and Tehri Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh). The shortest period of bondage of less than 5 years was undergone by the selected beneficiaries of Phulbani, Koraput and Kalahandi (Orissa) and Mehboobnagar of Andhra Pradesh.

4.34 The details of selected beneficiaries in different districts under different period of bondage may be seen in Appendix Table No. 4.1.

Causes of Bondage

4.35 The main cause of bondage as brought out by the study related to the loans taken by self, by parents and by other relatives of the beneficiary. This cause was reported by 766 beneficiaries out of a total number of 782 selected beneficiaries, forming a percentage of about 98. The remaining 16 beneficiaries forming about 2.04 percent reported the cause as customary/social obligations. They were bonded because they were born in a particular caste/community. The beneficiaries reporting having bonded on account of customary/social obligations were from Bihar, Karnataka, Orissa and Rajasthan. The other 4 States did not have any selected beneficiary in this category.

4.36 The overall picture is as follows :—

Cause of bondedness	No. of beneficiaries	Percentage to total
1	2	3
Advances by self . . .	444	56·78
Advances by parents . .	245	31·33
Advances by other relatives .	77	9·85
Customary/Social obligation .	16	2·04
Total .	782	100·00

4.37 The district-wise breakup of the figures reveal that in 15 of the 18 districts labourers informed that they were bonded on account of taking loans/advances. In both the districts of Madhya Pradesh namely, Jabalpur and Raigarh all the labourers in the sample went into bondage on account of taking loans or advances. In 9 districts studied the percentage of labourers who went into bondage for taking loans and advances ranged from 52 to 89. These districts are Medak and Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Bhagalpur, Monghyr and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Koraput (Orissa), Kota (Rajasthan), Periyar (Tamil Nadu) and Tehri-Garhwal (U.P.). In the remaining 4 districts the position of bondedness due to taking loan and advances was as follows:

Kolar (Karnataka) 31.67 percent,
Mehboobnager (Andhra Pradesh), 40 percent,
Nalanda (Bihar), 11.54 percent and
Chittaradurga (Karnataka) 8.33 percent.

4.38 In 15 districts the labourers reported that they have gone into bondage due to loan or advance taken by their predecessors. More than 80 percent of the labourers were in bondage due to this reason in the districts of Nalanda (Bihar), Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa). In the district of Kolar (Karnataka) two beneficiaries reported that they were kept in bondage in lieu of interest of loan taken by them.

4.39 The human bondage due to social and customary obligations was found in the districts of Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Koraput (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan). The number of bonded labourers in bondage due to such customs in these districts was 3 each in Santhal Parganas and Kota, 7 in Kolar and 2 in Koraput.

4.40 The details of the bonded labourers kept in bondage due to various reasons in different districts may be seen in Appendix 4.2.

Work for which bonded and actually done

4.41 Just to find out the extent of exploitation after bondage efforts were made to find out the type of work for which the beneficiary was bonded and the type of work which he actually had to do after the agreement to get bonded was reached. The categorisation was done only for 4 types of works and the other beneciaries falling outside these categories were clubbed under others. The shift in the category of work after being bonded may be seen as follows :

Table No. 4.8

Nature of work for which bonded and actually done

Type of work	Number reporting work for which actually bonded	Number teporting work actually done	Number increase (+) or decrease (—)
1	2	3	4
All Types . . .	99	140	(+) 41
Agriculture Labour .	617	572	(—) 45
Non-agricultural labour	23	22	(—) 1
Domestic work . .	93	101	(+) 8
Others . . .	44	46	(+) 2
Total responses . .	876	880	
Total No. of selected beneficiaries . .	782	782	

4.42 It could be seen from above that the major shift after bondage was from 'agricultural labour to all types of works'. When a bonded labour is engaged only for agricultural labour he is expected to work only on the agriculture farm from dawn to dusk. But when 41 of these agricultural labourers who were bonded for agricultural work were faced to undertake all types of works, it implied that he had to work on the farm as usual but attend to other types of work like domestic work, attending to the animals etc. before the start of agricultural operations in the morning and after the agricultural operations were over in the evening till late in the night. Amongst the States the beneficiaries from Bihar and Madhya Pradesh were the most affected ones for such exploitation. Amongst the districts Bhagalpur and Monghyr (Bihar) and Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh) reported the highest incidence of such exploitation.

Agreement under bondage

4.43 For finding out the process of bondage the beneficiaries were asked whether the agreement about bondage was written or verbal and whether agreement so reached was followed by the masters. Out of a total number of 782 selected beneficiaries, 310 (39.64 percent) reported that the agreement was signed but no copy of the agreement was given to them. 469 beneficiaries or about 60 percent beneficiaries reported that the agreement was not signed and every thing was verbal. The remaining 3 selected beneficiaries could not say anything about the agreement. The highest percentage of selected beneficiaries (98.33 percent) were from the States of Tamil Nadu who reported that the agreement was signed. The next place was taken by Rajasthan where 93.3 percent selected beneficiaries reported having signed the agreement. The percentage of such beneficiaries was 58.3 in Andhra Pradesh, 38.0 in Bihar and 20 percent in Uttar Pradesh. Only 3 beneficiaries from Karnataka, none from Madhya Pradesh and 2 from Orissa were reported to have signed the agreement. Amongst the 18 selected districts of 8 States, Periyar (Tamil Nadu) showed the highest percentage of 98.3 beneficiaries who had signed the agreement. The next in order was Kota (Rajasthan) with 93.3 percent, Santhal Parganas (Bihar) with 81.3 percent and Medak (Andhra Pradesh) with 81.7 percent. There was no beneficiary who reported having signed the agreement from Nalanda (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur and Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh) and Ganjam and Koraput (Orissa). In the remaining districts the percentage of such beneficiaries ranged between 2 to 68 vide details in Appendix No. 4.3.

4.44 Regarding the question of honouring the agreement, only about 10 percent (78 beneficiaries) of beneficiaries reported that the agreement was not honoured by the master. The maximum number of 54 out of 78 (forming about 70 per cent) belonged to the State of Bihar. The other States were Madhya Pradesh with 39 percent of selected beneficiaries and Rajasthan with about 17 percent of selected beneficiaries reporting agreement not honoured by their masters. None of the selected beneficiaries from the States of Orissa, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh reported any breach of agreement by their ex-masters. However, there was one beneficiary each from Andhra Pradesh (District Rangareddy) and Karnataka (District Kolar) who reported breach of agreement. The question of breach of agreement was further probed to find out the aspect of life of a bonded labourer in respect of which the agreement was breached. Majority of the beneficiaries (51) out of 78 who reported breach of agreement reported that they were also given work for which they were not bonded and had to work for longer hours. Five beneficiaries from Santhal Paraganas (Bihar) reported that more work was extracted but no matching remuneration were given to them. 15 beneficiaries from the same district reported breach of agreement because they were harshly treated. 8 beneficiaries from district Kota (Rajasthan) reported other reasons as can be seen in Appendix Table No. 4.4.

Working conditions of the bonded labourers during bondage and the behaviour of master

4.45 **Off-days.**—In order to ascertain the working conditions and facilities, if any to the bonded labourers during bondage the selected beneficiaries were asked to react on their working condition 'Off Days'. It was found that there were 11 beneficiaries who reported that they were given weekly off. 160 beneficiaries forming 20.46 percent of the total reported that they were given off-days in a month which renged from 1 day to 4 days. Likewise, 50 beneficiaries reported that they were given off days in a year ranging from 7 to 20 days. It was found that no off day was given to bonded labourers in all the districts of Andhra Pradesh and there was only one labourer who reported that he was given off day in a month in the State of Madhya Pradesh. In the remaining States, it was found that the bonded labourers were given off days weekly, monthly as well as yearly. The details of the days given off weekly, monthly and yearly in the district studied may be seen in the Appendix Table 4.5.

Distribution of beneficiaries reporting special treatment during festivals and other occasions

4.46 The analysis of the replies given by the beneficiaries revealed that out of the 782 beneficiaries selected for the study, 485 or 62 percent reported that they and their families were given special treatment during festivals and other occasions like marriages. During such occasions the beneficiaries were given new clothes and good food for them and their families. They were also given a day off on the day of the festival as well as after the festival. No special treatment was given to the bonded labourers on other occasions in the States of Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh. It was only in Uttar Pradesh that no special treatment was given on any occasions excepting marriages.

4.47 As a result of the above analysis the following broad issues could emerge :

(i) The study of the age structure of the bonded labour during bondage revealed that there were about 43% of them below the age of 15 years and as many as 8% below the age of 10 years. It was also noted that there were also bonded labourers above the age of 55 years. Thus due to extreme poverty bonded labourers of a very young age as well as of a very old age were forced to work under bondage. However, the preference of the landlords was for the young ones as they can work longer and harder.

(ii) Looking at the figures of the period of bondage it was revealed that in two States, namely, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh there

were 55% and 40% of labourers respectively who were under bondage for about 20 years. This may indicate that the system of bonded labour was comparatively the oldest in these two States. On the other hand the system of bonded labour could be considered as of recent origin in the States of Orissa and Andhra Pradesh because about 90% and 64% respectively of the selected beneficiaries remained under bondage in these States for less than 5 years.

(iii) As regards the cause of bondage it was revealed that about 98% of the beneficiaries were bonded due to indebtedness while there were about 2% who were bonded due to customary or social obligations, because of belonging to a certain caste. The social and customary bondage was found only in the States of Bihar, Karnataka, Orissa and Rajasthan. This may lead to the conclusion that the social customs and norms are sitll rigid in these States and the weaker sections like SC/ST suffered from social and customary bondage. The Directorates of Social Welfare and Tribal Development should undertake further indepth studies of these aspects to facilitate social reforms and social development of these sections.

CHAPTER V

IDENTIFICATION

The first and the most important requisite for the successful implementation of the Rehabilitation of Bonded Labour Scheme relates to complete and proper identification of bonded labour. And hence, during the course of evaluation study, efforts were made to ascertain

(a) the criterion and methods of identification
(b) agencies involved and
(c) need for continuance of identification process.

For this purpose a questionnaire for functionaries was canvassed at the State level and district level. Through the beneficiary schedule, the time lag between first contact and final identification agencies responsible for identification, reactions of ex-master and suggestions of the beneficiaries were collected. The data collected through these schedules/questionnaire are analysed in the following paragraphs.

Criterion and procedure

5.2 The study was conducted in nine States out of which only 3 States namely, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar and Orissa reported that some guidelines/questionnaire were prepared and issued to the lower level functionaries for identifying the bonded labourers, whereas four States namely, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu reported that no criterion was circulated for adoption by the functionaries at various levels. Personal knowledge of the officials regarding bonded labourers was depended upon for identification. The remaining 2 States namely, Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh reported to have taken necessary action for identifying the bonded labourers in accordance with the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976.

5.3 The procedure adopted for identification varied from State to State. In Andhra Pradesh, the officials were required to visit Harijanwadas without prior intimation and talked to all the inhabitants about their working conditions, indebtedness etc., and in accordance with the guidelines provided to them they were required to identify the bonded labourers Those who escaped identification could also contact the concerned Tehsildar for their identification.

5.4 In Bihar, records were prepared for prosecution of the employers of bonded labourers after the investigations were completed. The notices were issued to employers and the bonded labourers. After hearing, necessary orders were issued by the Sub-divisional Officers and District Magistrates.

5.5 In Karnataka, the identification drive was taken up by the Block Development Officers through Social Welfare Inspectors with the help of other officials at block level. People's Committees were also formed to help the process of identification in this State.

5.6 In Kerala, the identification was resorted to through personal enquiries made by Tehsildars, Welfare Officers and Block Development Officers and all the Paniyans, Adiyans and Kattumaickans were identified as bonded labourers. Here, no steps or measures for identification were deemed necessary because all the castes mentioned above were deemed to be bonded labourers.

5.7 In the State of Madhya Pradesh, patwari, the lowest village level functionary of the Revenue Department, was entrusted with the responsibility of identification as he was considered to be the most knowledgeable person. The patwari reported the identified cases to higher authorities for further necessary action for release etc. In the initial years i.e. after 1976, the bonded labourers could contact the concerned patwaris and ask for release. It was only in the beginning of 1980 that a proforma was devised and a survey was taken up for identifying the remaining bonded labourers in all the 45 districts of the State.

5.8 In Orissa the main role was played by the District Welfare Officers, Assistant District Welfare Officers and Welfare Extension Officers who were supposed to be equipped with the type of knowledge required for the purpose of identification. The cases were referred to the Sub-Divisional Officers who as the Trying Magistrates held open camp courts to decide the cases for release.

5.9 In Rajasthan, the process of identification was restricted to Kota district only. The collector/ADM asked the Revenue Officials at the lowest rung of the Revenue machinery i.e., patwari, to detect the 'Halis' under their jurisdiction. As the Halis were accepted as the bonded labourers, there was no need to lay down any guidelines for the identification.

5.10 In the State of Tamil Nadu, the district officials with the assistance of knowledgeable persons have taken up the task of identification. The process involved Revenue officials (Tehsildars) going from door to door enquiry, gathering information from village officials and representations form the bonded labourers themselves.

5.11 In Uttar Pradesh, a detailed survey was taken up by labour department during 1976-77 to identify the bonded labourers. The survey party, moving from village to village for group contacts, included the Village Level Worker, Labour Inspector, Assistant Development Officer and Village Pradhan. The work was transferred to Hill Development Department on 1-4-1977 but actually the implementation was taken up by Tribal Development Authority which started functioning since October, 1978. The project workers of the Tribal Development Authority prepared the list of bonded labourers by utilising all knowledgeable sources. After this, the identification was done by a party consisting of a Revenue Official, one official from Development Department, one Assistant Development Officer, project officer and a Social Worker. This party moved from village to village and interviewed all the bonded labourers. After identification, bonded labourers were required to fill in a form with witness of a social worker of the area which was later attested by Assistant Development Officer or Block Development Officer. These forms were placed before the District Vigilance Committee for approval.

Problems Faced in Identification

5.12 Out of the nine States studied, five States viz., Karnataka, Kerala, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh, reported that no problems were faced by them in the identification process. In the States of Andhra Pradesh and Bihar, some of the bonded labourers did not come forward due to the fear of the landlord and as such their cases could not be identified. The bonded labourers did not come forward for identification in Bihar because of the lack of alternative employment and delay in the proceedings. In Madhya Pradesh, the process of identification was understood to thave started only in 1980 though a survey based on the knowledge of patwaris, the results of which were not available. Prior to 1980, only those bonded labourers were identified who came forward and approached the patwaris. In Orissa, difficulty was faced due to lack of proper understanding of the definition of bonded labourer which is reported to have been simplified as late as in January, 1981.

Preparatory work and publicity

5.13 It was found in all the states surveyed that no preparatory work was done before launching the process of identification. Instructions were, however, issued to the district collectors to take the necessary steps for identification according to the provisions of the Act. They, in turn, issued necessary instructions to other officials in the district. These instructions could be of routine nature. Only in the State of Karnataka, wide publicity was done about the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 alongwith the nature of assistance available under the rehabilitation programme.

Role of Voluntary Agencies

5.14 Only in Bihar, the Agricultural Trade Unions were reported to be involved in the welfare and identification of the bonded labourers, to some extent. On account of the conflicting views of different trade unions, the role played by them was very limited. In another State, namely, Tamil Nadu, Nilgiris Adivasis' Welfare Association was doing some work in Nilgiris District only. No details, however, of their activities were available. In Andhra Pradesh, some social workers individually were reported to have brought some cases of bonded labourers to the notice of authorities for necessary identification. In the remaining six States, no social workers or any organised social welfare associations were reported for helping the process of identification. It could, therefore, be concluded that no voluntary agencies as such were fully involved in the identification of the bonded labour.

Number of Bonded Labourers Identified

5.15 In all the States, identification was taken up immediately after the proclamation of ordinance on the Abolition of Bonded Labour. In Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh the process continued for about two years whereas in Orissa it continued upto 1979-80 and in Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh the identification continued upto 1980-81. In Rajasthan, identification was done in a couple of places in district Kota during 1976-77 only. In 3 States i.e., Bihar Karnataka and Kerala, it was difficult to establish the year upto which the identification was continued. It was planned to collect yearwise and castewise number of bonded labourers identified in different States but the yearwise figures were available only in respect of two States viz., Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh. The castewise figures were available in respect of 4 States out of 9 States evaluated. The States were Karnataka, Kerala, Madrya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. The total number of bonded labourers identified as reported upto June, 1981 in different States may be seen in the table below :

Table 5.1

Statewise number of bonded labourers identified

S. No.	State	No. of Bonded Labourers identified on the date of enquiry (as on 30th June 1981)
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pracesh . . .	13,071
2.	Bihar	6,547
3.	Karnataka	62,689
4.	Kerala	1,162
5.	Madhya Pradesh . . .	1,531
6.	Orissa	1,123
7.	Rajasthan	2,974
8.	Tamil Nadu	2,927
9.	Uttar Pradesh . . .	5,668
	(Total all 9 States) . . .	97,692

5.16 In 3 States viz., Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka anl Tamil Nadu, out of nine evaluated, no work on identification was being done as the identification was reported to have been completed. Out of these 3 States, Andhra Pradesh is reported to be in favour of initiating the process of identification again as the bonded labour is likely to be in existence in some form or the other. The States of Karnataka and Tamil Nadu do not feel the need for further identification as all the bonded labourers were expected to have been identified. In four States namely, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh, the process of identification was reported to be in progress. In the remaining two States namely, Kerala and Rajasthan not much work on identification has been done. It is felt that there is a great need to take up identification in all the States as there is a possibility of some new labourers getting bonded and earlier ones getting into bondage again for want of timely and suitable rehabilitation.

5.17 The primary requirement of bonded labour scheme relates to complete identification. This task has not been taken up seriously by undertaking systematic household surveys in all the States. In view of the estimates of bonded labourers varying between 1.33 lakhs (estimates of 9 states of the study) to 4.5 lakh (NSSO), there is a need to take required measures for complete identification. Some of the States who had declared non-existence of bonded labourers in their States are also reported to have the bonded labour as per the NSSO Survey. It is, therefore, felt that in all the States, fresh household surveys to locate the bonded labourers should be undertaken. In many States the State Governments are required to undertake household surveys for the use of beneficiary oriented programmes like Integrated Rural Development Programme, Integrated Tribal Development Programme, Special Component Plans etc. These surveys should also identify the bonded labour. The Government of Orissa under Economic Rehabilitation of Rural Poor (ERRP) on the basis of PEO recommendations of on-the-spot study in April 1981, have identified about 28,000 bonded labourers as against the original estimate of 1123 bonded labourers. It was also observed that the Revenue Agency which possessed executive and judicial powers was more effective in dealing with the identification in some of the States and hence this agency should be made to coordinate the work relating to identification of bonded labour.

Time Lag between first contact and actual identification

5.18 For judging the effectiveness of the administrative arrangements the beneficiaries were asked to indicate the date of the first contact and the actual date of identification for finding out the time-lag between the two points of time. Out of the 782 beneficiaries canvassed, it was found in the case of 561 (71.74%) beneficiaries that practically there was no time lag as the identification was completed within one month of the first contact by the agencies responsible for identification. All the selected beneficiaries from the States of Karnataka, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu reported no time-lag. The percentage of such beneficiaries was 94 from Madhya Pradesh and 88 percent from Andhra Pradesh. In Orissa, the percentage of such beneficiaries was 58 and in Bihar it was 43 percent. The lowest percentage of 8.3 was reported from Uttar Pradesh. The all India picture of the selected beneficiaries could be seen from the following table.

Table 5.2

Distribution of beneficiaries according to time lag between the date of first contact and actual date of identification

Time lag	No. of beneficiaries	Percentage to total
No time lag	561	71·74
Upto one month	45	5·75
One to 3 months	88	11·25
3 to 6 months	31	3·96
6 to 9 months	19	2·43
9 to 12 months	2	0·26
1 to 2 years	34	4·35
Above 2 years	2	0·26
Total	782	100·00

5.19 It will be seen from the above table that majority of the selected beneficiaries (over 70 per cent) were identified with little or no time lag and as many as 88 per cent or so within three months of the first contact. The only State which reported 34 beneficiaries having been identified between 1 to 2 years of the first contact was Bihar (Bhagalpur and Santhan Parganas districts). The State-wise and District-wise position of the selected beneficiaries may be seen in Appendix Table No. 5.1.

Agency responsible for identification

5.20 The selected beneficiaries were asked to indicate the agency who contacted them and were ultimately responsible for their identification. This was necessary to find out whether the main task of identification was performed by the various governmental agencies or some other voluntary organisations and research workers etc. The following table gives the picture for all the selected beneficiaries :

Table 5.3

Number of selected beneficiaries giving agencies responsible for their identification

Agency reponsible for identification	No. of beneficiaries reported	Percentage to total
1	2	3
Another bonded labour	61	7·80
Someone from the village	10	1·28
His own caste leader	7	0·90
Some social worker	3	0·38
Some Govt. official	656	83·89
Some research worker	24	3·07
Others	21	2·68
Total	782	100·00

5.21 It may be seen from the above table that the single largest agency responsible for identifying 84 percent of the selected beneficiaries was the government agency. The next important agency responsible for identifying the beneficiaries was "Another bonded labour" who were instrumental in getting 61 or 7.8 percent of the selected beneficiaries identified. These 61 bonded labourers belonged to Bhagalpur (9) and Monghyr (1) districts of Bihar, Chitradurga (17) district of Karnataka and Periyar (34) district of Tamil Nadu. A research worker who had gone to study the problems of agricultural labourers in district Nalanda of Bihar had identified 24 selected beneficiaries in their identification. The other agencies namely someone from the village, his own caste leader and some social worker played a very marginal role.

Reactions of the Masters

5.22 It was learnt that many landlords/masters on learning that some one was trying to snatch away the cheap and easily available labour in the form of bonded labour became violent. Only to ascertain the behaviour of the ex-masters from the released bonded labourers themselves questions were canvassed whether the contacts for identification were made within the knowledge of ex-masters or without the knowledge of ex-masters. If without the knowledge of the ex-masters, then how was it managed. The reactions of ex-masters on beneficiaries and also on the persons who contacted them were also studied separately.

5.23 Out of the 782 selectel beneficiaries, 660 i.e. 84.4 percent reported that the contacts for identification were established by different agencies within the knowledge of ex-masters and the remaining 115 i.e. 14.71 percent reported that the contacts were established without the knowledge of their ex-masters. Seven beneficiaries could not respond to this question. The selected beneficiaries reporting contacts without the knowledge of their ex-masters belonged to districts Bhagalpur (70 percent), Monghyr (35 percent) and Santhal Parganas (15 percent) of Bihar State, Koraput (100 percent) of Orissa and stray cases from Chitradurga of Karnataka, Tehri Garhwal of Uttar Pradesh.

5.24 As 84.4 percent of the beneficiaries reported that the agencies established contact with them for identification with the knowledge of the ex-masters. It was felt necessary to know the reactions of the ex-masters on the beneficiaries and on the person who contacted the beneficiaries. The following table gives the total picture of 657 beneficiaries out of the relevant 660 beneficiaries as 3 could not say anything :

Table No. 5.4

Reactions of ex-master at the time of contacts for identification of bonded labour

Type of Reactions	No. of selected beneficiaries repoting reactions of ex-masters			
	On beneficiary		On persons who contacted	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5
No reaction/indifferent . .	201	30.60	411	62·56
Violent . . .	37	5·63	8	1·22
Very Angry .	71	10·81	16	2·44
Angry . .	258	39.27	75	11.42
Mildly Angry .	72	10·96	116	17·66
Happy . . .	15	2·28	10	1·52
Scared . . .	—	..	21	3·20
Others . . .	3	0·46	..	..
Total . .	657	100·00	657	100·00

5.25 It could be seen from the above table that percentage of beneficiaries reporting Violent, Very Angry and Angry was higher in respect of the reactions of ex-masters towards beneficiaries themselves and it was lower for reactions towards persons who contacted. The ex-masters were indifferent to a greater extent for persons contacting the beneficiaries than towards the beneficiaries. The above table clearly indicates that ex-masters were quite harsh towards the beneficiaries when the bonded labourers were contacted by different agencies for identification. It may be seen that the 21 ex-masters were even reported scared of the official agencies and all these 21 reporting beneficiaries/ belonged to district Kalahandi of the State of Orissa. It was interesting to note that 15 ex-masters were happy towards the beneficiaries and 10 towards the person who contacted the beneficiaries which was just opposite to the general views and observations alround.

5.26 115 beneficiaries i.e. 14.71 percent of the total selected reported that the contacts for identification was established without the knowledge of ex-masters. This naturally would rouse the curiosity to find out how it was managed when a bonded labour is supposed to be at the

back of and call of the masters. The following responses were obtained to our querries :—

Table No. 5.5

Number of beneficiaries reporting contact of identifying agencies without the knowledge of ex-masters

Manner in which contacted	No.of beneficiaries reported	Percentage to total reporting
1	2	3
1. Meeting arranged when master was out	31	26·96
2. Meeting arranged late in the night when master was asleep	28	24·35
3. Outside the village while working in the field	43	37·39
4. In the market place	5	4·35
5. Others	8	6·95
Total	115	100·00

5.27 It could be seen that 37.4 percent of the beneficiaries (reporting contact without the knowledge of the ex-masters) reported that the contacts were established by different agencies outside the village while working in the field. Meeting was arranged in 27 percent of cases when the master was out and 24 percent could meet the agencies responsible for identification late in the night when the ex-masters were asleep. Five beneficiaries i.e. 4.4 percent reported that the contacts were maintained at the market place. The remaining 8 i.e. 7 per cent reported that secrecy was maintained but could not make it more specific as to how it was maintained.

Suggestions for improving the process of identification

5.28 At the end of discussions on the process of identifications, efforts were made to get some suggestions from the beneficiaries for improving the process of identification. Out of the 782 selected beneficiaries, only 244 i.e. 31.2 percent could offer some suggestions. The suggestions are as follows :—

Table No. 5.6

No. of beneficiaries offering suggestions for improving the process of identification

Type of suggestions	No.	Percentage to total offering any suggetions
1	2	3
Caste leader should come forward	74	30·33
People should be enlightened	73	29·92
Social Welfare organisations should be more active	53	21·72
Bonded labour should come forward voluntarily	17	6·99
Panchayat leaders should come forward	4	1·64
Surprise raids	14	5·74
Others	11	41·51

5.29 It could be seen from above table that about 30 percent each of the beneficiaries suggested that caste leaders should come forward and people should be enlightened. Another 22 percent suggested that social welfare organisations should be more active. The other suggestions were bonded labour should come forward voluntarily, panchayat leaders should come forward and surprise raids by magistrates and officials responsible for identifications.

5.30 There were 7 districts namely, Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Nalanda (Bihar), Jabalpur & Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), Ganjam and Koraput (Orissa) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu) where more than 50 percent of the beneficiaries gave one suggestions or the other. On the contrary there were 4 districts where no beneficiary gave out any suggestions. They were Monghyr (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa). The remaining 7 districts had fallen in between these two ranges.

Need for continuous identification

5.31 As the process of identification is incomplete and all the bonded labourers have not been identified it is desirable to continue the process of identification till such time as the bonded labour becomes a thing of the past.

Voluntary Agencies

5.32 The analysis of agencies responsible for identification revealed that voluntary agencies had hardly any role in the process. The State Government should encourage voluntary agencies of repute as also youth organisations of SC/ST in this work.

CHAPTER VI

PROCEDURE FOR RELEASE

The Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 stipulates two basic requirements viz., (i) identification of the bonded labourers by the concerned agencies, and (ii) preparation of the list of released bonded labourers and its maintenance. A special statutory register is prescribed for the purpose. Action for release is taken thereafter and the identified labourers are either released immediately or wherever necessary after taking recourse to legal procedure. Action on both the counts are required to be taken by concerned officers i.e. Tehsildars and other revenue officers at district and lower levels. Information on (a) procedure followed; (b) time lag between identification and release; and (c) difficulties faced in releasing the bonded labourers was, therefore, collected for the present evaluation study through discussions with the State and/or district level officers.

The information/data collected on the above issues from the **eight States** studied is analysed in the present chapter.

Release procedure

6.2 It was observed that the lists of identified bonded labourers were generally reported to have been sent to the officers responsible for final disposal of cases in all the nine States. After necessary verifications, through personal visits or through hearings where the concerned bonded labourer and his master appeared, the release was affected. In majority of the districts of the eight selected States, the landlords released the bonded labourers voluntarily without making any hue and cry for fear of legal proceedings. Except in Orissa, all the States reported that, by and large, no legal proceedings had to be instituted. In Orissa, out of 1123 identified bonded labourers (up to June, 1981), only 329 were reported to be released whereas in other 7 States almost all the identified bonded labourers had been released. This was mainly because in Orissa prosecution was regarded as inevitable in each and every case where landlords were found keeping the bonded labourers. This fear of inevitable prosecution compelled the landlords to produce evidences against the complaint of keeping a bonded labourer and in the absence of proper witnesses in favour of bonded labourers, about 700 cases were required to be dropped. Recently, some flexible approach has been adopted in Orissa under which the master have been persuaded to release the bonded labour voluntarily. Only in cases where the master refused to release the bonded labour working with him, court cases have been instituted. The cases were prolonged in Bihar because many a times landlords managed to get adjournments or forced labourers to leave station for avoiding prosecution.

Time lag between identification and release :

6.3 The gap between the estimates of executive machinery and the actual implementation was sought to be worked out for the process of identification and release. For this purpose the executive officers i.e. Collectors at the district level were required to give their opinions about the normal time expected to be taken between identification and release of the bonded labourers. Thereafter, during the course of visits to the blocks and villages, this aspect was discussed with Tehsildars/Block Development Officers and other lower level functionaries and actual time taken between identification and release was noted. This aspect was also canvassed to the actual beneficiaries. The expected time lag and actual time lag between identification and release is shown in the following table :

TABLE 6.1

Statement showing expected and actual time lag between identification and release

State	District	Expected time lag	Actual time lag
1	2	3	4
Andhra Pradesh . . .	Medak . . .	Two to four weeks	Two to four weeks
	Mehboobnagar .	One to two weeks	One to two weeks
	Rangareddy	Less than a week (in some cases upto three moths)	Less than a week

TABLE 6.1—*Contd.*

1	2	3	4
Bihar	Bhagalpur	N.A.	N.A.
	Monghyr	Less than a week	6 months to 2 years
	Nalanda	Less than a week	Less than a week
	Santhal Parganas	Less than a week	Less than a week
Karnataka	Chitradurga	About 4 weeks	1 week to 4 weeks
	Kolar	About a week	About a week
Madhya Pradesh	Jabalpur	Two weeks	Two weeks
	Raigarh.	2 days	2 days
Orissa	Ganjam	Less than a week	Less than a week
	Kalahandi	Less than a week	Less than a week
	Koraput	Less than a week	6 months to two years
	Phulbani	2 to 4 weeks	3 to 4 years (Court cases delayed)
Rajasthan	Kota	No time lag	No time lag
Tamil Nadu	Periyar	5 days	5 days
Uttar Pradesh	Tehri Garhwal	No time lag	No time lag

Source : District Level Notes

6.4 It was repoted by the State authorities that there was no significant variation in the expected and actual time lag between identification and release except in the States of Bihar and Orissa.

Difficultes faced

6.5 Out of the 8 States evaluated, only the States of Bihar and Orissa reported some problems created by the landlords. In these two States it was reported that landlords forcibly prevented the bonded labourers from appearing in the courts. Some landlords from these two States forced the bonded labourers to leave the States and even went to the extent of implicating them in criminal cases. As such they could not appear in courts to give statements against the landlords, thereby delaying the process of release.

6.6 The information about the various reasons for time lag between identification and release may be seen below :

Type of reasons	No. of Beneficiaries	Percentage
1	2	3
Procedural delay	144	67·29
Prolonged court proceedings	5	2·34
Officials not taking interest	1	0·47
Master was influential	..	..
Any other	10	4·67
Total	160	74·77

6.7 Out of 782 selected beneficiaries 214 (27.37) beneficiaries had reported time lag between identification and release. Thus the remaining beneficiaries had not reported any time lag. In other words identification and release took place without any delay or simultaneously.

6.8 Out of 214 beneficiaries, only 160 beneficiaries had given the reasons for time lag. There were 144 beneficiaries or 67.29 percent who had indicated the reason procedural delay for release after identification. Prolonged court proceedings was reported by five beneficiaries the percentage being 2.34 which is negligible. Lone beneficiary had reported the reason that officials were not taking interest. Ten beneficiaries had reported other reasons than stated above the percentage being 4.67. More than 25% with number of beneficiaries as 54 were not able to comment on the reasons for time lag. It is worth to mention that none of the beneficiaries had reported that Master was influential. This reason has been included to find out the role of the Master in release of the bonded labour.

6.9 It could be seen that in the districts of Rangareddy (A.P.), Bhagalpur (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka) and Jabalpur (M.P.) the percentage was more in respect of the reason procedural delay. The number of beneficiaries being 27.48, 10 and 25 with percentage as 93.10, 96.00 100.00 and 86.21 respectively in the districts concerned. The number of such beneficiaries was 10 in the districts of Medak (A.P.), 6 in Monghyr (Bihar) and 18 in the district of Koraput (Orissa).

6.10 There were two beneficiaries from Bhagalpur district (Bihar) and three beneficiaries from Jabalpur district (M.P.) who had reported the reason prolonged court proceedings which established the fact there was some delay in release from bondage. Lone beneficiary from Jabalpur district (M.P.) had reported that officials were not taking interest.

Distribution of beneficiaries reporting the issue of certificate of release, whether really released or continue with the same master.

6.11 In order to ascertain whether the beneficiaries were really released and issued necessary certificate, the selected beneficiaries were contacted and the following position emerged.

6.12 It was found that out of the 782 selected beneficiaries, 274 replied that they were issued certificates of release but only 194 reported that they were in the possession of such certificates. Districtwise it was found that all the selected beneficiaries in the district of Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka), Ganjam, Koraput, and Phulbani (Orissa) were issued the certificate of release. The number of such beneficiaries was 60, 60, 2, 48 and 7 respectively in the above districts. Except the beneficiaries in the district of Kolar (Karnataka) and Ganjam (Orissa) the beneficiaries from the above districts were in possession of released certificates. In the district of Kolar, there was only one beneficiary who was in the possession of release certificate out of 60 who were reported to have been issued release certificate. **There was however, not a single beneficiary in possession of release certificate in the district of Ganjam (Orissa).** Even though it was reported that two beneficiareis in this district were issued release certificates. In Periyar district Tamil Nadu, it was seen that all the 58 beneficiaries were in possession of release certificate. While in Kalahandi (Orissa), only 5 beneficiaries out of 22 were in possession of release certificate. In Bhagalpur (Bihar) both the beneficiaries were in possession of release certificate whereas in Santhal Pargana 12 beneficiaries out of 14 were in possession of the same. There was only 1 beneficiary from Jabalpur district of Madhya Pradesh who was issued the certificate of release and he was in possession of the same.

6.13 Efforts were made to further find out whether bonded labour were really released or not and the position is discussed below :—

There were 739 beneficiaries out of 782 who reported that they were really released while 7 reported that they are only partly released and 36 reported that they were not at all released. the State-wise and district-wise position is as follows:—

6.14 It has been reported that all the selected beneficiaries in Medak, Mehboobnagar and Ranga Reddy districts of Andhra Pradesh, Bhagalpur and Santhal Parganas of Bihar, Chitradurga and Kolar of Karnataka, Jabalpur and Raigarh of Madhya Pradesh, Ganjam, Kalahandi, Phulbani and Koraput of Orissa, Periyar of Tamil Nadu and Tehri Garhwal of U.P. were really released.

6.15 Six beneficiaries in the district of Monghyr (Bihar) and one beneficiary of Kota (Rajasthan) reported that they were only partly released. It was, however, shocking to note that about 17 beneficiaries in Monghyr district of Bihar and 19 beneficiaries of Nalanda district of the same State, reported that they were not released at all and continue to work with the same master. This shows not only lack of physical monitoring on the part of the State authorities who did not verify whether all the bonded labourers were really released, but also lack of administrative will and non-concern to this important item of 20 point programme.

Distribution of beneficiaries according to conditions of work after release

6.16. The beneficiaries were also contacted to react about the condition of work after release from the bondage. It was found that about 9.4% of the beneficiaries reported that the condition of work was same as during bondage, majority of them (90%) reported that the condition has improved after release. However, there were two beneficiaries who reported that their condition of work had become worst after release. The details may be seen below :

Condition of work	Number of Beneficiaries	Percentage
Same	74	9·46
Better	706	90·28
Worse	2	0·26
Total	782	100·00

6.17 State-wise it was seen that all the beneficiaries from the 12 districts of Medak, Mehboobnagar and Ranga Reddy (Andhra Pradesh), Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka), Raigarh (M.P.), Ganjam, Kalahandi, Koraput, Phulbani (Orissa), Kota (Rajasthan) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu), reported that the condition of work was better after release. One beneficiary from Santhal Paraganas district of Bihar reported that the condition of work was same even after release. The beneficiaries from Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Nalanda (Bihar) and Jabalpur (M.P.) reported that the condition of work was better after release. However, some of the beneficiaries from the district of Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Nalanda, Santhal Parganas in Bihar and Jabalpur in M. P. had reported that the condition of work was same. There was one beneficiary each from Monghyr of Bihar and Tehri Garwal of U. P. who reported that the condition of work was worst.

Distribution of beneficiaries reporting the reaction of ex-master on release and reasons for the same.

6.18 The information pertaining to the reaction of ex-master towards their bonded labour at the time of release may be seen below :

Type of reaction	Number of beneficiaries	Percentage
Violent	58	8·39
Very Angry	61	8·83
Angry	280	40·52
Mildly Angry	127	18·38
Indifferent	122	17·66
Happy	15	2·17
Others	28	4·05
Total	691	100·00

6.19 It will be seen from the above table that out of 782 selected beneliearies about 691 or 88.36 percent be beneliearies have reported the various types of reaction of their ex-master on

release. Of this 468 (67%) beneficiaries have reported that their masters were angry in varying degrees. It will also be seen that about 58 beneficiaries consisting of 8.39% had reported that their masters were voilent at the time of their release. However, there were at least 15 (2.17%) beneficiaries who had reported that their masters were very happy at the time of their release. It will also be seen that about 122 (17.66%) beneficiaries reported that their masters were indifferent at the time of their release.

Districtwise position

It was noted that the beneficiaries from the districts of Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Santhal Parganas (Bihar) had reported that their master's attitude was violent at the time of their release. The number of such beneficiaries was 19, 26 and 3 respectively in the above districts. The number of such beneficiaries was slightly lower in the districts of Nalanda (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka) and Kota (Rajasthan) where their number was 2, 3 and 2 respectively. There was one beneficiary each from the districts of Medak and Ranga Reddy in Andhra Pradesh and Periyar in Tamil Nadu who had reported violent reaction of their masters.

6.20 The districts of Mehboobnagar, Ranga Reddy (A.P.), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Jabalpur (M.P.), Periyar (Tamil Nadu) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.) had higher percentage of beneficiaries reporting that their masters were very angry, slightly angry or angry at the time of their release. The number of such beneficiaries from the above districts was 53, 37, 54, 26, 46 and 49 respectively. The number of such beneficiaries was somewhat lower in the districts of Medak, Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Nalanda, Santhal Parganas, Kolar, Kalahandi, Koraput, Phulbani and Kota. It is, however, interesting to note that there was a lone beneficiary from the district of Kota who had reported happy reaction of master at the time of release.

6.21 Efforts were also made to collect the information about the reasons for such adverse reactions on the part of the ex-masters and the same has been analysed and the details of the beneficiaries reporting various reasons are given below :

Type of Reasons	Number of Beneficiaries	Percentage
Will lose a source of cheap labour	344	65·40
May face problem of labour at peak season	61	11·60
May not get person who could be at his back and call	31	5·89
Loan of bonded labour was written off	220	41·83
Any other reason	4	0·76
Cannot say	3	0·57
Total any reason (No. of beneficiaries reporting)	523	99·43
No. of reasons reported by these beneficiaries	663	126·05

6.22 It will be seen that there were about 344 beneficiaries constituting the percentage of over 65% that there were such landlords or ex-masters in our society who thought that they will lose a source of cheap labour and hence they were either violent or angry at the time of the release of their cheap labour namely, bonded labour. There are about 220 beneficiaries who reported that the masters were angry because the loan taken by the bonded labour will be written off.

6.23 The beneficiaries who reported that their landlords will lose their source of cheap labour came from the districts of Mehboobnagar, Monghyr, Chitradurga, Kolar, Kalahandi, Phulbani and Kota. The number of such beneficiaries in the above districts was 48, 29, 53, 8, 4 and 28 respectively. The number of such beneficiaries is comparatively high in these districts as compared to other districts. The number of beneficiaries reporting that the master was unhappy because the loan of the bonded labour will be written off was higher in the districts of Ranga Reddy (A.P.), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Koraput, Phulbani (Orissa) and Tehri-Garhwal (U.P.). The percentage of such beneficiaries was 54.72 90.74, 52.00, 100.00 and 85.71 respectively in the above districts.

Distribution of beneficiaries according to the reactions at the time of release and reasons for the same.

6.24 In the earlier section we dealt with the reactions of the ex-master and the reasons for such reactions as reported by the selected beneficiaries. In this section the reactions of the beneficiaries at the time of their release are described. Information regarding the reactions of the beneficiaries at the time of release is given below :

Type of reaction	Number of Beneficiaries	Percentage
Slightly happy	35	4·68
Happy	370	49·47
Very happy	334	44·65
Indifferent	3	0·40
Not happy	4	0·53
Any other	2	0·27
	748	100.00

It will be seen from the above table that out of 782 beneficiaries 720 had reported favourable reactions which consisted of the beneficiaries being slightly happy or very happy at the time of release. While unfavourable reaction consisted of indifferent and not happy at the time of release etc.

6.25 It will, however, be seen that as could be expected majority of the beneficiaries had reported that they were happy at the time of their release. The number being 370 or 49.47% of the beneficiaries, reporting this reaction, very

happy reaction was reported by about 334 beneficiaries forming a percentage of 44.65. Under categories slightly happy there were 35 beneficiaries forming a percentage of 4.68.

State-wise position

It was found that the percentage of beneficiaries was more in the category 'very happy' reaction at the time of release in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh. The position was not so good in the case of Tamil Nadu, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh where the number of such beneficiaries was comparatively lower.

6.26 Among the selected districts it was found that in 7 districts of Medak, Nalanda, Raigarh, Ganjam, Kalahandi, Phulbani and Periyar all the selected beneficiaries had reported reaction as happy and very happy at the time of release. The number of such beneficiaries was also comparatively very high in the districts of Ranga Reddy, Santhal Parganas, Kolar and Tehri Garhwal. The position was not so good in the districts of Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Chitradurga, Jabalpur, Koraput and Kota. Beneficiaries from 11 districts had reported reaction as slightly happy. As mentioned earlier the beneficiaries had expressed the reaction as favourable or unfavourable and also the reasons for such reactions which are analysed as below :

Reasons	Number of Beneficiaries	Percentage
Will be free from bondage	438	59·26
Will be able to get more for his labour	248	33·56
Harsh treatment will end	63	8·53
Will be able to have some leisure	44	5·95
Free from the loan of the master	150	20·30
Will be able to lead an honourable life	48	6·50
Any other	5	0·68
Total reporting reasons	996	134·78
No. of beneficiaries offering reasons	739	100·00

6.27 It will be seen from the above table that some of the beneficiaries had expressed more than one reason and hence the number of reasons are 996. There were about 739 beneficiaries out of 748 who had at least one reason for being happy after release from bondage. About 60% of the beneficiaries expressed the opinion that they will be free from bondage and hence they were happy. The second reason for being happy related to their hope of getting more for their own labour which they were not able to get under bondage. There were about 248 beneficiaries who expressed this reason. 150 beneficiaries felt that they will be free from the loan which they have taken from their masters. It is interesting to note that there were only 48 beneficiaries forming a percentage of 6.50 who felt that they will be able to lead an honourable life.

6.28 There were more beneficiaries in the States of Karnataka, Orissa, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh who had expressed their happiness after release while number of such beneficiaries was comparatively low in other States like Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan.

6.29 **The district-wise position is discussed below.**—It will be seen that the beneficiaries from the districts of Medak, Monghyr, Critradurga, Kolar, Kalahandi, Phulbani, Periyar and Tehri Garhwal had higher percentage of beneficiaries who felt that they will be free from bondage. This was not the position in the districts of Mehboobnagar, Ranga Reddy, Bhagalpur, Nalanda, Santhal Parganas, Jabalpur, Ganjam, Koraput and Kota where the percentage of such beneficiaries was found to be lower. It is interesting to note that excepting the districts of Nalanda, Chitradurga and Phulbani beneficiaries from all the remaining 15 districts felt that they will be able to get more for their labour after bondage. It means that their labour was being exploited by the masters to their advantage during the periol of bondage.

6.30 Beneficiaries from 11 districts had felt that they will be able to lead an honourable life after release. It may be noted that beneficiaries from these districts had some idea of human rights and good life. Such beneficiaries were found in the districts of Ranga Redly, Nalanda, Santhal Parganas, Kolar, Kota, Periyar, Tehri Garhwal, Medak, Mehboob Nagar, Bhagalpur and Ganjam.

6.31 As stated earlier there were favourable as well as unfavourable reactions of the beneficiaries after release. The unfavourable or adverse reactions of the beneficiaries are given below :

State	District	Will lose a permanent source of employment	Will have to search for job	Even after release there was fear from exmaster	Total (reporting unfavourable reactions)
Bihar	Bhagalpur	..	1	..	1
Bihar	Monghyr	1	..	2	3
Madhya Pradesh	Jabalpur	1	..	..	1
Karnataka	Kolar	1	1	..	1
Uttar Pradesh	Tehri Garhwal	..	..	1	1
Total	..	3	2	3	7
Percentage		(42·86)	(28·57)	(42·86)	

6.32 It will be seen that there were only 7 beneficiaries who had expressed unfavourable reaction. Out of these 7, 3 beneficiaries from Monghyr, Jabalpur and Kolar had felt that they will lose a permanent source of employment after release. This fear may be in their mind due to the fact that they may not be able to get any alternative employment on long term basis. Two beneficiaries had categorically stated that they will have to search for job due to difficult employment situation. Three of the beneficiaries from Monghyr (2) and Tehri Garhwal (1) had also mentioned that they had fear from the ex-master even after release. This indicates the cruelty of the master as expressed by the beneficiaries. The State/district-wise position may be seen in above table.

6.33 The information pertaining to procedure of release after indentification of bonded labour may be seen as given below :

Distribution of Beneficiaries according to suggestions for improving the procedure of release

Suggestions	Number of Beneficiaries	Percentage
1	2	3
The release should be with the consent of the Master . .	45	27·78
Court cases should be quickly decided	35	21·60
Official procedure should be simplified	27	16·67
Committed officials should handle the cases	30	18·52
Any other	29	17·90
No. of suggestions offered . .	166	102·47
No. of Beneficiaries offering suggestions	162	100·00

6.34 It could be seen from the above that 162 beneficiaries or 21 percent out of 782 selected had given the suggestions for improving the procedure of release. The remaining 620 beneficiaries had no suggestions to offer or were unable to comment on the procedure of release. There were 45 (27.78%) beneficiaries who had suggested that the release should be with the consent of the Master. This gave the impression that the beneficiaries still had fear from the ex-master. (This feeling was also confirmed from the study of the reaction of the beneficiaries at the time of release and reasons for the same vide table of unfavourable reaction). 35 or 21.60 percent of the beneficiaries had suggested that court cases should be decided quickly to avoid further delay in release. The other suggestions made related to simplification of official procedure and appointment of committed officers to handle the cases. The number of beneficiaries offering these suggestions was 27 and 30 with percentage as 16.67 and 18.52 respectively. Besides this, there were other suggestions other than mentioned above. The number being 29 with percentage as 17.90.

6.35 It could be seen that the beneficiaries from 8 districts out of 18 viz., Mehboobnagar (A.P.), Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Nalanda (Bihar State), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (M.P.), Ganjam (Orissa) and Tehri-Garhwal (U.P.) had suggested that their release should be with the consent of the master. Further, it was observed that there was one beneficiary each from the districts of Bhagalpur, Monghyr (Bihar) and Ganjam (Orissa) offering their suggestions. In the remaining districts viz., Mehboobnagr (A.P.), Nalanda (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (M.P.) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.), the number of beneficiaries making this suggestion was 16, 9, 5, 3 and 9 respectively.

6.36 35 beneficiaries from the four districts namely, Bhagalpur, Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Jabalpur (M.P.) and Koraput (Orissa) had suggested that the court cases should be quickly decided to avoid further delay in release. Koraput (Orissa) district had the miximum number (24) while the lowest number (1) was found in Bhagalpur district (Bihar). This may partly explain the long delay in the release of bonded labour in Orissa. In the remaining two districts viz., Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Jabalpur (M.P.) the number of beneficiaries was 4 and 6 respectively. Some of the beneficiaries had offered suggestions that official procedure should be simplified. In other words, it should not be time consuming. The names of the districts in which the beneficiaries made above suggestions were Mehboobnagar (A.P.), Bhagalpur, Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (M.P.), Koraput (Orissa) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu). These districts had the beneficiaries as 1,3,1,1,10,9 and 2 respectively.

6.37 In conclusion, it is stated that the suggestions given above may kindly be looked into by the concerned State Governments with a view to improve the procedure of release so that there should not be much time lag between identification and release. It is desirable to cut short or avoid court proceedings to expedite release and where necessary voluntary agencies should be involved in this process.

CHAPTER VII

REHABILITATION PROGRAMME

Rehabilitation of the bonded labour is the most important and crucial aspect of the bonded labour problem. The present chapter deals with the analysis of various issues relating to the rehabilitation of identified and released bonded labour. The PEO officers discussed with the State and district level officers questions relating to (a) number and types of scheme identified for rehabilitation of the bonded labour (b) criterion adopted for selection of beneficiaries for the identified schemes (c) the extent of utilisation of funds (d) coordination for rehabilitation schemes between different agencies and departments in the State Government etc. The information collected at the State/district levels on various issues is analysed and discussed below.

7.2 The Ministry of Labour had advised the State Governments to formulate rehabilitation schemes for the released bonded labour out of a list of schemes mentioned in their guidelines to States under the four main categories, namely

(i) land based,

(ii) non-land based,

(iii) skill/craft based, and

(iv) others.

The Ministry issued revised guidelines subsequently as given in Appendix 7.1.

Land Based Schemes :

7.3 This group of rehabilitation schemes include (a) allotment of land out of Government land or ceiling surplus land (b) identification of delivery system of inputs-credit facilities, seeds, water-supply, agricultural implements, drought animals and fertilisers and (c) reclamation and development of the assigned land. Amongst these schemes, supply of bullocks was the most popular scheme which was implemented in 13 out of the 18 districts selected for the study. The next important scheme was the allotment of land which was implemented in 7 districts. The facilities for reclamation of land, agricultural implements and fertilisers were given to the released bonded labourers in 5 districts each. The other schemes which were operating in land based group were, (i) supply of seeds (4 districts), (ii) share capital for becoming member of the cooperative society (4 districts), (iii) cart with bullocks (3 districts) and (iv) irrigation wells with oil engine or electric motors (2 districts).

Non-land based schemes

7.4 This group of schemes included mainly the supply of (i) milch cattle-cows, buffaloes; (ii) pigs, goats, sheep (iii) minimum veterinary cover from the existing/extension of veterinary services and (iv) institutional linking of marketing etc. Information collected at State/district level indicated that the supply of milch cattle was most common item under this group which was implemented by 14 out of 18 districts studied. The next most popular scheme with the Government was the supply of goat and sheep units implemented by 8 and 6 districts respectively. The other scheme were piggery (3 districts), cattle shed (2 districts), supply of fodder (2 districts), supply of poultry (1 district), and supply of mule (1 district).

Skill/Craft based scheme

7.5 The recommended assistance under this group included (i) identification of skill craft; (ii)) supply of raw materials. implements, working capital and workshed; (iii) market linkage through cooperatives or State aided institutions and (iv) administrative support to prevent lapsing back into bondage.

Other Schemes

7.6 At the State/district level not much ground was covered in this category. Only two districts (Monghyr and Tehri Garhwal) availed some schemes under leather work and one district each gave assistance for providing carpentary (Tehri Garhwal) and blacksmithy tools for manufacturing (Tehri Garhwal). In Kota district of Rajasthan, Bonded Labour Industrial Cooperative Society was set up in year 1978 by investing Rs. 28 lakhs for rehabilitation of 700 honded labourers for manufacturing of Bone meal. The beneficiaries were given share certificates worth Rs. 4000 each. The scheme, however, could not start and the money was reported lying in a bank at the time of the evaluation study. It transpired that no concrete scheme in the form of a project report was either evolved or given assistance by the Bonded Labour Industrial Cooperative Society. The schemes included under 'others' category were laundry, tongas, house-sites for homeless and house construction grants etc. The importance of having a house of ones own was realised by the State of Orissa where a provision of alloting 0.04 acres of housesite was made for all the released bonded labourers having no house-sites of their own. In addition, a grant of Rs. 2000 per bonded labour was given for constructing a hutment. This scheme was adopted in three districts (Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani) of Orissa. In these districts, (Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani) financial assistance in the form of marriage grant was also given to female bonded labourers.

TABLE 7·1

Names of District showing the various categories of Schemes adopted in each State

State	Category of Schemes			
	Land Based	Non-land baseed	Skill/craft based	Others
1	2	3	4	5
Andhra Pradesh	1. Medak 2. Mehboobnagar 3. Rangareddy	1. Medak 2. Mehboobnagar 3. Rangareddy	..	1. Medak
Bihar	1. Bhagalpur 2. Monghyr 3. Santhal Parganas	1. Bhalgalpur 2. Monghyr 3. Nalanda 4. Santhal Parganas	1. Monghyr	1. Monghyr 2. Santhal Parganas
Karnataka	1. Chitradurga 2. Kolar	1. Chitradurga 2. Kolar	..	..
Madhya Pradesh	..	1. Jabalpur	..	..
Orissa	1. Ganjam 2. Kalahandi 3. Koraput 4. Phulbani	1. Ganjam 2. Kalahandi 3. Koraput 4. Phulbani	..	1. Kalahandi 2. Koraput 3. Phulbani
Rajasthan	..	..	1. Kota	..
Tamil Nadu	..	1. Periyar	..	..
Uttar Pradesh	1. Tehri Garhwal	1. Tehri Garhwal	1. Tehri Garhwal	..
All States	13	16	3	6

7.7 It may be seen from the above analysis that the rehabilitation of released bonded labourers depended on the proper identification of viable schemes to match the skill of the bonded labourer. The same schemes which were implemented under Integrated Rural Development Programme and other beneficiary oriented programmes were reported being implemented under the rehabilitation programme of the bonded labour also. Unless proper schemes are identified to suit the existing qualifications and skills of the released bonded labourers, it will not be possible even with the proposed financial assistance to rehabilitate them in such a manner so as to generate sufficient income to support them. This in turn may lead them to laps into bondage as the released bonded labourer may prefer to have regular meals even under bondage than to go hungry due to insufficient income generating activities.

Norms for Rehabilitation Schemes

7.8 By and large, it was found that no fixed norms, as such, were prescribed by the Government of India or the State Governments for allotment of various items of rehabilitation to each bonded labour. However, the available information has been analysed and the scheme-wise position is discussed below :

(i) **Land Based Schemes :**

(a) **Allotment of Land.**—No norms were fixed in the selected districts (Medak, Mehboobnagar, Rangareddy) of Andhra Pradesh. In Bhagalpur district (Bihar), land allotted to the bonded labourers varied between 0.4 to 0.56 acres. In district Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), the land allotted to bonded labourers was 2.5 acres. In the selected districts of Ganjam, Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa), 2.5 acres of land was allotted to each bonded labourer. For remaining districts, no information is available on this item.

(b) **Supply of inputs.**—For supply of inputs for land based Schemes, a sum of Rs. 200 was provided in the district of Ganjam and Rs. 170 each in the districts of Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani of Orissa. In the district of Tehri-Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh), the required inputs were provided free of cost. No norms have been prescribed in the remaining selected districts in respect of supply of inputs.

(c) **Assistance for land development and reclamation.**—A sum of Rs. 750 was prescribed for the above purpose in the district of Ganjam and Rs. 600 in the districts of Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa). In Tehri Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh) cash grant upto Rs. 2000/- was allotted for the above scheme. No norms had been fixed in the remaining districts for this programme.

(ii) **Non-land based scheme**

(a) **Supply of milch cattle.**—In the districts of Mehboobnagar and Ranga Reddy (Andhra Pradesh) one milch cattle was given per bonded labourer. Similarly, in the district of Nalanda (Bihar), one milch cattle was given to each bonded labourer while two milch cattle were allotted to a bonded labourer in the district of Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh). In the districts of Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa), two milch cattle costing a total of Rs. 2000 were allotted per bonded labourer. In Periyar (Tamilnadu) district two milch cattle worth Rs. 1500 were given to each bonded labourer.

(b) **Sheep.**—In the district of Ranga Reedy (Andhra Pradesh) 3 to 4 sheep were allotted to each bonded labourer while a unit of 10 sheep was allotted per bonded labourer in the district of Tehri Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh). For the remaining districts, no information was available.

(c) **Goats.**—3 to 4 goats were supplied to each bonded labourer in the district of Ranga Reddy in Andhra Pradesh. In district Ganjam (Orissa), 4 goats worth Rs. 400 were provided while a unit of 5 goats worth Rs. 2000/- was provided to each bonded labourer in the districts of Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani in Orissa.

(d) **Pigs.**—A unit of 5 pigs was supplied to each of the bonded labourer in the district of Nalanda (Bihar). In the district of Ganjam (Orissa), a unit of 4 pigs worth Rs. 600 was supplied to a bonded labourer. In the remaining districts no pigs had been provided.

(e) **Poultry.**—In only one district namely, Tehri Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh), a unit of 11 birds worth Rs. 200 was supplied to the bonded labourers.

(f) **Bullocks.**—2 bullocks worth Rs. 2000/- were supplied to bonded labourers in the district of Ranga Reddy (Andhra Pradesh). In Ganjam (Orissa), the worth was Rs. 600/-, in Kalahandi it was Rs. 1000/- and in Koraput the worth was Rs. 1000.

Choice of schemes

7.9 As regards choice of schemes to the beneficiaries, it was enquired whether the beneficiaries were given any choice while giving assistance. Out of 18 districts, 8 reported that some sort of selection was made on the basis of aptitude and experience of beneficiaries while giving schemes to them. The remaining 10 districts reported that, generally, schemes were chosen by the implementing agencies for the beneficiaries and no choice was either allowed or there was no scope of choice because the programme was limited. In 5 districts, namely, Ranga Reddy (Andhra Pradesh), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Kota (Rajasthan), Ganjam (Orissa) and Tehri Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh), beneficiaries were offered options to choose their scheme out of a number of available schemes for rehabilitation.

Financial Assistance

7.10 The main source of financial assistance for the rehabilitation programme was the 100% rehabilitation assistance available from the Centre and the State Governments. It may be mentioned that the centre provided 50 per cent matching grant for the implementation of this programme by the State Governments. In the district of Periyar (Tamil Nadu), in addition to the normal programmes under 100 per cent assistance, the State Bank of India and the Indian Overseas Bank also gave assistance to the bonded labourers for purchase of bullocks, buffaloes and iron ploughs. Some beneficiaries were also given consumption loans and agricultural loans by these banks. It is heartening to note that majority of the districts did not find any difficulty in utilising the financial assistance. Out of 18 districts, only 6 districts reported some difficulties in providing benefits to the released bonded labourers. This was mainly, due to (i) delay in identifying the schemes and obtaining the sanction at Block and district levels, (ii) non-availability of required staff at district levels and (iii) non-acceptance of schemes by the beneficiaries etc.

Coordination

7.11 There was only one administrative machinery handling the rehabilitation programme and hence no problem as such was reported. In most of the districts, it was District Collector at the district level and Block Development Officers/Tehsildars at the block levels who were responsible for coordinating the activities at various levels.

Arrangements for technical know how

7.12 As discussed in the earlier paragraphs, most of the schemes for rehabilitation implemented so far did not required any technical know-how and hence the question of providing and/or making arrangements for technical knowhow hardly arose. It was reported that, whenever required, efforts were made to give some carft-based technical knowledge wherever such occupations were chosen for rehabilitating the bonded labourers. In Monghyr (Bihar) and Tehri Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh), some arrangements were made by Industrial Training Institutes to give training. The beneficiaries, however, did not take advantage of these facilities.

Arrangements of raw material and marketing

7.13 In majority of cases no raw material was required to be provided as schemes were other

than skills/craft based. In two districts, Mehboobnagar and Ranga Reddy (Andhra Pradesh), some arrangements for supply of fodder were made. Such arrangements were not reported in other districts. As regards marketing facilities, there was no arrangement for marketing of milk and other products in 17 out of 18 district studied. Only in Kolar district of Karnataka, marketing arrangements were reported to have been made through Milk Producers Cooperative Society and Sheep Producers Association for marketing of milk and livestock respectively.

Suggestions for improving the programme

7.14 A specific question was enquired about suggestions for the effective implementation of the programme. The officers in 14 out of 18 districts covered for detailed evaluation, suggested that educational facilities for released bonded labourers should be provided. The other important suggestions were as follows :

Suggestions	No. of districts offering suggestion
Bonded Labour Rehabilitation programme should be integrated with other similar programme like IRDP, NREP etc. . . .	12
Sufficient staff need be posted at avarious levels for follow up action	11
Arrangements for providing technical knowledge for various schemes be made . . .	11
Some arrangements for maintaining the dry animals be made	9
Periodical medical check up of animals supplied under the scheme need be made to avoid casualtics and deterioration in health . . .	—

7.15 It may be seen from the above that at implementation level three main suggestions related to (i) integration of the programme with other beneficiary oriented programmes namely, Intensive Rural Development programme (IRDP), National Rural Employment Programme (NREP); (ii) provision of adequate staff and (iii) arrangements for providing technical know-how.

Progress of Rehabilitation

7.16 Out of 18 districts, 5 districts reported inability to provide information regarding the number of bonded labourers rehabilitated under different schemes. In other three districts, the number of beneficiaries under different categories could not be earmarked since one beneficiary was covered under more than one type of schemes. The information was available in respect of only 10 districts. The district-wise details regarding number of beneficiaries covered under each group of scheme is given below :

TABLE NO. 7.2

Distribution of Beneficiaries according to various categories of Rehabilitation Schemes

Name of District	Schemes				
	Land Based	Non-land Based	Skill/ Craft Based	Others	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6
Medak . .	911	611	..	1510	3032
Mehboobnagar .	184	774	24	..	982
Rangareddy .	630	500	..	91	1221
Bhagalpur .	..	51	..	..	51
Monghyr . .	3	607	10	79	699
Nalanda . .	..	26	..	..	26
Jabalpur . .	..	58	..	..	58
Raigarh . .	2	..	..	..	2
Kota . .	..	..	700	..	700
Periyar .	..	218	..	..	218
Total .	1730	2845	734	1680	6989

7.17 It will be seen from the above that the total beneficiaries in 10 districts were 6989. In addition, there were 2504 number of bonded labourers covered in various rehabilitation schemes of the remaining 8 districts. In all, 9493 bonded labourers were covered under various schemes in all the 18 districts studied as against the released number of 22458. This indicates that more than 50 per cent of the released bonded labourers yet remain to be rehabilitated. The plight of 57.7 per cent of the released bonded labourers was reported to be very pathetic. Some of the important reasons which could be attributed to such a state of affairs related to lack of urgency on the part of the officials at various levels in dealing with the problem of the bonded labourers. In several States, it was observed that the schemes were not drawn up according to the time schedule and as par guidelines of the Ministry of Labour. As a result there were frequent references between the State Governments and the Labour Ministry for clarifications. It was also observed that the utilisation certificates were not furnished by a number of destrict magistrates in absence of which further releases of central assistance were held up. In some cases, the allotment of funds was often late leading to the lapsing of the funds. In the case of district Phulbani of Orissa, it was observed that funds were allotted on 31st March 1981 for the year 1980-81. It is obvious that no expenditure could be incurred in such a situation. In some districts like Koraput and Mehoobnagar, the rehabilitation could not take place of some bonded labourers for want of sufficient funds. In case of Koraput, there were also cases of bonded labourers pending in the court and they could not be rehabilitated before the cases could be settled.

7.18 The table below gives the year-wise coverage under various schemes in the 12 districts out of 18 studied :

TABLE 7·3

Year-wise coverage under various Schemes in the Selected Districts

Name of District	Year						
	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Mehboob-nagar	..	132	835	15	..	..	982
Rangareddy	..	177	490	416	138	..	1221
Bhagalpur	..	..	51	..	..	..	51
Nalanda .	..	..	..	26	..	..	26
Santhal Parganas	..	..	520	..	..	155	675
Chitradurga	..	..	..	441	..	..	441
Jabalpur	..	..	..	58	..	..	58
Raigarh .	..	..	..	..	2	..	2
Ganjam .	..	..	..	..	..	2	2
Koraput .	202	14	2	22	10	3	253
Phulbani .	25	..	..	..	..	..	25
Periyar .	..	..	..	..	215	3	218
Total .	227	323	1898	978	365	163	3954

7.19 The above table indicates that after 1978-79, the rehabilitation programme seems to have petered down. The reasons for this need to be investigated. However, some of the reasons which could be attributed for non-implementation or slow progress of rehabilitation scheme are discussed below :

(i) In certain districts like Periyar (Tamil Nadu), Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa), it was reported that the funds for rehabilitation were received late and generally at the fag end of the year.

(ii) In the districts of Nalanda (Bihar), Raigarh (Madhy Pradesh) and Ganjam (Orissa), there were unspent balances which were either surrendered or even lying in banks. In the case of Ganjam (Orissa), the sub-divisional officer surrendered the funds as he was not fully satisfied with the bona-fides of the bonded labourers. In the case of Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh), it was reported that the funds could not be utilised due to non-receipt of proposals in time from the concerned officials and partly due to lack of proper planning. In the case of districts Monghyr (Bihar), it was found that funds were repeatedly being carried forward from year to year since 1978-79 and hence there was not much progress in rehabilitation. In the district of Chaitradurga (Karnataka), it was reported that/there was **shortfall of funds due to decamping of funds by the Social Welfare Inspector.**

(iii) In Kota (Rajsthan), the authorities were not in a position to formulate any rehabilitation programme and as a result they only deposited the funds meant for rehabilitation in a bank as share certificate money of the bonded labourers and showed this amount as spent. It is clear that the bonded labourers were not actually rehabilitated. Likewise, in Nalanda (Bihar) also, the funds were kept in the Punjab National Bank without spending them for rehabilitation of the bonded Labourers for which no reasons are available. The above discussed position regarding fund untilisation indicates that State Government was not able to formulate rehabilitation scheme in time and hence funds are required to be surrendered. This has resulted into slow progress of implementation of rehabilitatio programme. In some districts like Rang Reddy (Andhra Pradesh), all the released bonded labourers could not be covered due to shortage of funds. The above state of affairs shows that there was lack of sense of urgency, on the part of the implementing authorities at various levels, in rehabilitating the bonded labour.

Caste-wise Distribution

7.20 It has been reported that the maximum number of bonded labourers belonged to the scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The caste-wise number of bonded labourers rehabilitated in the 13 out of 18 districts studied is given below (upto June, 1981) :

TABLE 7·4

Caste-wise distribution of beneficiaries in the selected districts

Name of District	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Backward Classes		Others		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Medak . . .	2555	84·27	33	1·09	444	14·64	..	..	3032
Mahboobnagar .	752	76·58	13	1·32	216	22·00	1	0·10	982
Rangareddy . .	953	78·05	26	2·13	220	18·02	22	1·80	1221
Bhagalpur . .	9	17·65	1	1·96	..	..	41	80·39	51
Monghyr . .	641	91·70	38	5·44	20	2·86	..	..	699
Nalanda . .	21	80·77	..	..	5	19·23		..	26
Chitradurga . .	327	74·15	36	8·16	1	0·23	77	17·46	441

TABLE 7.4—*Contd.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Kolar . . .	392	86·54	3	0·66	..	..	58	12·80	453
Jabalpur . . .	10	17·24	48	82·76	..	..	..	..	58
Kalahandi . .	2	3·45	16	27·59	..	..	40	68·96	58
Koraput . . .	17	6·72	175	69·17	..	..	61	24·11	253
Phulbani . . .	20	80·00	5	20·00	..	..	..	..	25
Periyar . . .	106	48·62	38	17·43	..	..	74	33·95	218
Total . .	5805	77·22	432	5·75	906	12·05	374	4·98	7517

7.21 It may be seen from the above table that more than 77 percent of the rehabilitated bonded labourers belonged to Scheduled Castes, 6 per cent belonged to Scheduled Tribes and 12 per cent to backward classes.

Need for Integrated Approach for Rehabilitation

7.22 The above analysis indicates that step should be taken to integrate the rehabilitation programme with the schemes relating to special component plan for Scheduled Castes and tribes sub plan for Scheduled Tribes because of (83%) predominance of bonded labourers belonging to these sections.

Utilisation of funds

7.23 Out of the 18 districts of the study, in 3 districts no money was spent for the welfare and rehabilitation of bonded labourers. In district Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh) the available funds remained un-utilised because there was no bonded labour on whom the money could be spent as the only 2 bonded labourers were settled on land. Similar was the situtation in districts Ganjam of Orissa where only 5.7 percent of the funds could be utilised on the released bonded labourers. In Kota district of Rajasthan, 700 bonded labourers were issued share certificates of Rs. 4000 each in the name of Bonded Labour Industrial Cooperative Society as soon as the funds were made available to the district authorities. The whole of the amount of Rs. 28 lakhs was reported to have been deposited in the bank with the hope of starting an industrial cooperative society which till the date of visit of PEO field team had not started functioning. Consequently, these 700 bonded labourers have only with them a share certificate paper of Rs. 4000 which is of very little use to them in generating income for their livelihood and maintenance. The utilisation position of the funds for the remaining 15 districts is given below :

TABLE 7·5

Distribution of Districts according to percentage of Utilisation of Funds

Range of percentage utilisation	Name of Districts	Actual percentage utlisation	State
1	2	3	4
Upto 25 percent	Monghyr	21·8	Bihar
	Phulbani	24·2	Orissa
25 to 50 percent	Mehboobnagar	43·9	Andhra Pradesh
50 to 75 percent	Jabalpur	61·9	Madhya Pradesh
	Koraput	57·3	Orissa
	Tehri Garhwal	70·9	Uttar Pradesh
75 to 100 percent	Medak	81·5	Andhra Pradesh
	Rangareddy	93·2	Andhra Pradesh
	Bhagalpur	97·9	Bihar
	Nalanda	84·2	Bihar
	Santhal Parganas	98·8	Bihar
	Chitradurga	96·9	Karnataka
	Kota	89·5	Rajasthan
	Kalahandi	98·7	Orissa
	Periyar	92·7	Tamil Nadu

7.24 It may be seen from the above table that 6 districts showed substantially high percentage of under-utilisation. The main reasons for under-utilisation were reported to be (i) administrative reasons; (ii) late receipt of funds due to which money could not be spent; (iii) administrative confusion, slackness and shortage of staff.

Integration with other schemes :

7.25 Out of 18 districts 17 indicated that no efforts were made to integrate the rehabilitation of bonded labour scheme with the other on-going beneficiary oriented schemes like Food for Work Programme, Integrated Rural Development Programme, PWD Works etc. Only in one district namely. Kolar (Karnataka), some efforts were made to give benefits to the released bonded labourers under the Food for Work Programme, Janata Housing Scheme and Employment under the P W D works. The released bonded labourers were also provided elucational facilities under the adult education programme run by the State Government.

Uncovered gap :

7.26 An attempt was made to assess the extent of implementation of rehabilitation programme in comparison with the number of released bonded labourers in each of the State covered under the study. The following statement gives the Statewise information about the bonded labourers released, rehabilitated and uncovered gap in terms of numbers as well as percentages (upto 30th June 1981) :

TABLE 7·6

Statewise number of Bonded Labourers Released, Rehabilitated and yet to be Rehabilitated (upto June 30, 1981)

State	No. of bonded labourers released	No. of bonded labourers rehabilitated	Percentage	No. of bonded labourer yet to be rehabilitated
1	2	3	4	5
Andhra Pradesh	13071	7196	5·1	5875
Bihar . .	6547	3179	48·6	3368
Karnataka .	62699	24892	39·7	37807
Kerala .	817	260	31·8	557
Madhya Pradesh	1531	99	6·5	1432
Orissa .	342	342	100·0	..
Rajasthan .	2974	..	0·0	2974
Tamil Nadu .	2927	1534	52·4	1393
Uttar Pradesh	5668	2286	40·4	3382
Total .	96576	39788	41·2	56788

7.27 The above table indicates that in Orissa, the implementation in terms of rehabilitation was 100 per cent. In other words, all the released bonded labourers were rehabilitated in one or the other progarmme whereas in Rajasthan even though 2974 bonded labourers were released, none of them was rehabilitated. This was mainly because of the scheme adopted by the Government to give share certificate to a large number of released bonded labourers.

7.28 A total of 41.2 per cent of the released bonded labourers were rehabilitated in the 9 States of the study. This is not a satisfactory and desirable progress specially in the case of the bonded labour scheme. Once a bonded labourer has been released, he is without any source of livelihood and hence any delay in the rehabilitation is bound to result in either the exploitation of the situation by the ex-masters or others. The released bonded labour, therefore, needs immediate help and assistance for survival before he is rehabilitated under a particular scheme. The State Governments, therefore, should provide such immediate assistance to avoid them relapsing into bondage.

7.29 The immediate rehabilitation of a released bonded labour is of critical importance otherwise he is likely to fall back into bondage for survival if there is big gap between release and rehabilitation. Efforts were, therefore, made during the course of investigation to find out this time-lag in the different districts studied. The overall position of the selected 782 beneficiaries is as follows :—

TABLE 7·7

Distribution of selected beneficiaries according to time-lag between release and rehabilitation

Time lag	Number of beneficiaries	Percentage to total
1	2	3
No time lag	57	7·3
Less than 6 months . . .	49	6·3
6 months to one year . . .	100	12·8
One year to 2 years . . .	99	12·7
2 to 3 years	219	28·0
3 to 4 years	175	22·4
4 to 5 years	83	10·6
Above five years . . .	Nil	..
Total . . .	782	100·0

7.30 The most ideal situation would have been to rehabilitate a person as soon as one was released but even rehabilitation within six months of release would have been understood because of formalities etc. and during which subsistence allowance to maintain himself was expected to be provided. But rehabilitation after six months of release has no justification. Disappointingly as many as over 61 percent of the selected beneficiaries were rehabilitated any where between 2 and 5 years. In the later part of the chapter, the conditions under which the released bonded labourers existed during the intervening period have been discussed (Para 7.46).

7.31 It may be mentioned that 100 per cent of the identified beneficiaries were rehabilitated in Koraput and Phulbani districts af Orissa immediately after release. This, however, excludes the cases of labourers pending in courts. On the other extreme 100 per cent beneficiaries were rehabilitated after 3 to 4 years in Kolar (Karnataka) and Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh) after 2 to

3 years in district Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), and Ganjam (Orissa) and after 1 to 2 years in district Nalanda of Bihar. Over 75 per cent of selected beneficiaries from Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Kalahandi (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan) were rehabilitated after 2 to 3 years of their release. In district Periyar (Tamil Nadu) 88 per cent of the beneficiaries were rehabilitated after 4 to 5 years of release. The details may be seen in the following table :—

TABLE 7·8

Districts with percentage of beneficiaries in different ranges of time-lag between release and rehabilitation

Time lag between release and rehabilitation	Name of districts with percentage of beneficiaries in brackets
Less than six months	Koraput (100·0), Phulbani (100·0)
6 months to 1 year .	Medak (50·0), Mehboobnagar (70·0)
1 to 2 years .	Medak (50·0), Bhagalpur (42·0), Nalanda (100·0)
2 to 3 years .	Rangareddy (78·3), Raigarh (100·0) Ganjam (100·0), Kalahandi (90·9), Kota (91·7)
3 to 4 years .	Santhal Parganas (52·5), Chitradurga (50·0), Kolar (100·0), Jabalpur (100·0)
4 to 5 years .	Monghyr (42·1), Periyar (88·3)

Reasons for time-lag between release and rehabilitation

7.32 The main reason for the time lag as put forth by 358 (49.4%) beneficiaries was 'Procedural delays'. A small number of beneficiaries—55 (7.6%) attributed this time lag to slackness on the part of officials whereas another 19 (2.6%) of them gave other miscellaneous reasons for this delay in rehabilitation. The remaining 297 (41%) beneficiaries could not give any reason and were unable to say anything in this regard.

District-wise Position

7.33 On study of the district-wise figures we find that in 15 out of the 18 selected districts 100 per cent beneficiaries reported time lag between release and rehabilitation. The names of these districts are Medak, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Nalanda and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur and Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), Ganjam and Kalahandi (Orissa), Kota (Rajasthan) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu). In one of the districts—Tehri Garhwal (UP), the percentage of beneficiaries reporting this fact was 96.7 whereas in the remaining two districts i.e. Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa) no time lag was reported by the selected befienciaries. In 13 of the districts on the whole about 50 per cent of the beneficiaries reported that this time lag was due to procedural delays. In seven of these districts i.e. Medak, Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh), Bhagalpur (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), Kalahandi (Orissa) and Tehri Garhwal (UP), the percentage of beneficiaries reporting this reason ranged from 65 to 100. In another 4 districts namely, Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Monghyr and Nalanda (Bihar) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu) the percentage of beneficiaries reporting this fact ranged from 26 to 57 whereas in the remaining two districts Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Kota (Rajasthan), this percentage was 3.4 and 11.7 respectively. Next important reason put forth for this time lag by the beneficiaries in 10 of the districts was 'slackness of officials'. In two districts, namely, Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh) and Ganjam (Orissa) 50 per cent and 100 per cent beneficiaries respectively, reported this reason for the time lag.

7.34 In four of the districts i.e. Nalanda (Bihar), Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), Periyar (Tamil Nadu) and Tehri Garhwal (UP) the percentage of beneficiaries reporting this fact ranged from 13 to 39. In the remaining 4 districts, namely Bhagalpur and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka) and Kota (Rajasthan) the percentage of beneficiaries reporting the time lag due to slackness of officials, varying between 1 and 7. A small number of beneficiaries in 5 districts gave other miscellaneous reasons for the time lag between their release and rehabilitation. These related to delay in release of budget/funds non-availability of funds and shortage of field staff. Whereas in one of these districts—Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), this percentage was 18.3, the percentage in the remaining four districts was between 1 and 7. The names of these 4 districts were Medak and Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh), Kolar (Karnataka) and Tehri Garhwal (UP).

7.35 It may be further observed that a good percentage of beneficiaries from 10 of the selected districts could not give any reason or say anything regarding the time lag between their release and rehabilitation.

7.36 In seven out of these i.e. Medak, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Monghyr (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu), the percentage of such beneficiaries ranged from 23 to 55. In another two districts, namely, Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Kota (Rajasthan) the percentage of these beneficiaries was 94.9 and 81.6 respectively. The percentage of such beneficiaries was quite low—11.5 in district Nalanda of Bihar.

7.37 Thus we find from the above paragraphs that whereas more than 92 per cent of beneficiaries from most of the districts had reported time lag between their release and rehabilitation, only about 60 per cent of them could give reasons for the same. It is further observed that about 57 per cent of the beneficiaries reporting time lag had given 'procedural delays' and 'slackness of officials' as the main reasons for the time lag between release and rehabilitation.

Subsistence Allowance :

7.38 There was a provision with the State Governments to provide subsistence allowance to the released bonded labourer to tide over the difficult period of unemployment between release and rehabilitation. It was expected that after a lapse of short period all those released would be rehabilitated under the various schemes under the rehabilitation programme. The table given below indicates the overall position of the extent of benefit availed of by the selected beneficiaries.

TABLE 7·9

Number of beneficiaries and the manner of receipt of subsistence allowances

Manner of receipt	Number of beneficiaries	Percentage to total beneficiaries
1	2	3
Lumpsum . . .	197	62·2
Periodically . . .	56	17·6
Both Lumpsum & Periodically	64	20·2
Total . . .	317	100·0

7.39 It may be seen that only 317 (41%) beneficiaries out of a total of 782 selected were provided the benefit of subsistence allowance. Out of the 8 States evaluated only 3 States namely, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Rajasthan had given subsistence allowance to all the released bonded labourers. In addition, 3 beneficiary out of 57 in district Monghyr of Bihar also reported to have received the subsistence allowance. In the selected districts of Andhra Pradesh the allowance was given in lumpsum whereas in Kota district of Rajasthan it was given periodically. In selected districts of Orissa this benefit was provided in lumpsum as well as periodically. The three beneficiaries from Monghyr (Bihar) received the benefit in lumpsum only.

7.40 The amount of subsistence allowance received by the beneficiaries is shown in the following table :—

TABLE 7·10

Distribution of Beneficiaries according to the amount of subsistance allowance received

Amount	Number of beneficiaries	Percentages
1	2	3
Upto Rs. 100 . . .	19	6·0
Rs. 100 to 200 . . .	177	55·8
Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 . .	57	18·0
Rs. 300 to Rs. 400 . .	51	16·1
Rs. 400 to Rs. 500 . .	9	2·8
Rs. 500 to Rs. 600 . .	Nil	..
Above Rs. 600 . . .	4	1·3
Total . . .	317	100·0

7.41 It may be seen that 55.8 percent beneficiaries had received subsistence allowance in the range of Rs. 100 to Rs. 200. About 34 per cent beneficiaries had received subsistence allowance ranging from Rs. 200 to Rs. 400. There were only 6 percent beneficiaries who received subsistence allowance of Rs. 100 and below and only about 13 beneficiaries (4 per cent) who received more than Rs. 400. Out of these 4 beneficiaries or 1.3 percent received subsistence allowance above Rs. 600. Out of these 4, one belong to Medak (Andhra Pradesh), two to Kalahandi (Orissa) and one to Kota (Rajasthan). It was found that in 3 districts namely, Medak Mehboobnagar, Rangareddy in Andhra Pradesh, all the beneficiaries received subsistence allowance between Rs. 100 to Rs. 200. The majority of beneficiaries from the district Kota of Rajasthan had received subsistence allowance between Rs. 200 to Rs. 300. In this category there was only 1 beneficiary from Koraput (Orissa) and 3 in Monghyr (Bihar). It was also observed that in 4 districts of Ganjam, Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani of Orissa the majority of beneficiaries had received subsistence allowance between Rs. 300 to 400. Excepting these eight districts there was no other district in which the beneficiaries had received this amount. It may also be pointed out that there were about 59 per cent beneficiaries who had not received any subsistence allowance. It could only be imagined as to how these released bonded labourers would have survived in absence of any immediate relief.

7.42 During the course of evaluation efforts were made to find out average monthly ncome of the beneficiary family from all sources during the intervening period. This would reflect how these families financially managed during this crucial period. Following table gives the average monthly family income of the selected beneficiaries reporting some time-lag between release and rehabilitation.

TABLE 7·11

Distribution of beneficiaries showing average family monthly income from all sources

Average income per month	Number of beneficiaries	Percentage
1	2	3
Upto Rs. 100 . . .	98	13·5
Rs. 101 to Rs. 150 . .	175	24·1
Rs. 151 to Rs. 200 . .	164	22·6
Rs. 201 to Rs. 300 . .	162	22·3
Rs. 301 to Rs. 500 . .	105	14·5
Rs. 501 to Rs. 750 . .	11	1·5
Rs. 751 to Rs. 1000 .	8	1·1
Above Rs. 1001 . .	2	0·3
Total . . .	725	100·0

7.43 It could be seen from the above table that about 70 per cent of the beneficiaries reporting time lag between release and rehabilitation had a family income of ranging from Rs. 101 to Rs. 300 per month. Taking the average size of the family to be 5, it meant an income of Rs. 20 to Rs. 60 per head per month. About 14 per cent of the beneficiaries had an income upto Rs. 100 and about the same number had an income from Rs. 301 to Rs. 500. There were only 21 beneficiaries forming a meagre percentage of 2.9 who had an average income above Rs. 500 per month.

7.44 In between the 16 districts where beneficiaries had reported some time lag between release and rehabilitation, there were 3 districts namely, Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), Ganjam and Kalahandi (Orissa) where maximum number of beneficiaries had an average monthly income upto Rs. 100 only. On the other extreme there were two districts namely, Monghyr and Santhal Parganas of Bihar where maximum number of beneficiaries had an average income ranging between Rs. 301 and Rs. 500. There was only one district namely, Tehri Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh) where mfaximum number of beneficiaries had fallen in the income range of Rs. 201 to 300. The maximum number of beneficiaries in the remaining 10 districts had an income ranging between Rs. 101 and Rs. 200.

Measures adopted for survival

7.45 In an effort of probing into the real hardships, a direct question was put to the released and rehabilitated beneficiaries whether the income during the intervening period between release and rehabilitation was sufficient for maintaining the family and if it was insufficient what were the reasons and how the shortfall was made up. The paragraphs that follow give the insight into these aspects.

7.46 Out of the 782 beneficiaries selected for the study, 725 (92.71%) had reported a time lag between release and rehabilitation. Out of these 725 beneficiaries 381 (52.55%) had stated that their income during the intervening period i.e. period between release and rehabilitation, was not sufficient to support their families. They gave various reasons in support of their statement. Most of them i.e. 255 (66.93%) reported that work was not available to them to earn their livelihood. A small number of 9 (2.28%) said that no one was prepared to give them work. 79 (20%) beneficiaries stated that they were given no subsistance allowance during this period, whereas another 92 (24.15%) beneficiaries gave many other reasons for insufficient income during the period. As a result of insufficiency of income they had to resort to different ways and means for maintaining themselves and their families. Most of them 139 (36.48%) resorted to missing a meal whereas another 74 (18.73%) of them were just starving to cope with the situation. A good number of them 132 (33.98%) had been borrowing from friends and relatives to tide over this difficult period. Another 54 (14.17%) adopted other miscellaneous ways to maintain themselves during this period of hardship and struggle. Of the 54 Bonded Labourer 24 were S.C., 18 were S.T., 11 Backward Class and 1 other—2 of them actually resorted to begging to make the two ends meet. Both of them belong to the Scheduled Caste community and were found in Kolar Distric (Karnataka).

7.47 On going through the district-wise figures it was observed that in 15 of the selected 18 districts, 100 per cent beneficiaries reported a time lag between release and rehabilitation. In one of the districts, Tehri-Garhwal, this percentage was 96.67 and in the remaining two i.e. Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa), none of the selected beneficiaries reported a time lag. It may be noted that in 15 of these 16 districts reporting time lag, the beneficiaries had insufficient income during the intervening period between release and rehabilitation. In 5 of these districts, 93—100 percent beneficiaries has stated that they did not have sufficient income during the intervening period. The names of these districts are Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Kolar (Karnataka), Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), Ganjam (Orissa) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu). In another six dis - tricts, namely, Medak and Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh), Bhagalpur (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh) and Kota (Rajasthan), the percentage of such beneficiries ranged from 50 to 72. In three more districts i.e. Monghyr, Nalanda and Santhal Paraganas (Bihar), the percentage of beneficiaries reporting this fact varied between 10 and 23. In district Tehri-Garhwal (U.P.) there was only one beneficiary (1.72%) reporting this fact.

Reasons for insufficiency of Income

7.48 Two main reasons (i) "Work not available", (ii) "No subsistence allowance given" were put forth by most of the benelciaries for insufficient income during the intervening period. In 12 of the districts about 67 per cent beneficiaries had reported non-availability of work as the reason for insufficient income during the period. In 5 out of these i.e. Medak and Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Monghyr (Bihar), Raigarh (Madhya Pralesh) and Ganjam (Orissa), the percentage of beneficiaries reporting this reason ranged from 90 to 100. In six other districts, namely, Mehboobnagar, (Andhra Pradesh), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), Kota (Rajasthan) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu), the percentage of benefi)iaries reporting this fact varied between 46 and 79. In the remaining district of Chitradurga (Karnataka) this percentage was only 17.14 In three of the districts i.e. Kolar (Karnataka), Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), and Periyar (Tamil Nadu), it was reported by 1.79 percent, 42.86 percent and 3.33 per cent beneficiaries that no one was prepared to give them any work.

7.49 It was reported by some beneficiaries in 9 of the selected districts that they were given no subsistence allowance which added to their hardships during the intervening period. In four of

these, i.e. Monghyr and Nalanda (Bihar), Ganjam (Orissa) and Tehri-Garhwal (U.P.), 100 per cent beneficiaries and in Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Kolar (Karnataka) 53.85 per cent and 73.21 per cent beneficiaries respectively, reported this fact. In the remaining 3 districts namely, Chitradurga (Karnataka), Kota (Rajasthan) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu), the percentage of such beenficiaries was 17.14, 6.06 and 18.33 respectively.

Missing meals for survival

7.50 The most common practice followed by majority of the beneficiaries in 14 selected districts was to miss a meal a day to keep their lives going during this hard time. About 21 to 55 per cent beneficiaries in 9 of these districts practised this method to keep themselves alive. The names of these districts are Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Bhagalpur and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur and Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh), Ganjam (Orissa), Kota (Rajasthan) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu). In another 3 districts, i.e. Monghyr and Nalanda (Bihar) and Kolar (Karnataka), 67 to 100 per cent beneficiaries were reported to be practising this method. In the remaining two districts, namely, Medak (Andhra Pradesh) and Chitradurga (Karnataka), a low percentage of beneficiaries—4 and 11 respectively, had resorted to this measure.

Starving for survival

7.51 It was further observed that 74 (19 per cent) beneficiaries in 8 districts out of 381 reporting time lag between release and rehabilitation were just starving and struggling very hard for existence during the period. Of these 51 were Scheduled Caste, 13 Scheduled Tribes, 9 Backward Class and 1 other. Among these 88.57 per cent and 100 per cent beneficiaries belonged to Chitradurga (Karnataka) and Ganjam (Orissa) respeceively. In another 4 districts i.e., Bhagalpur and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), and Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh) the percentage of such beneficiaries ranged from 21 to 41. In the remaining two districts—Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh) and Kota (Rajasthan), the percentage of these beneficiaries was 10.71 and 12.12 respectively.

7.52 One very important way of supplementing this insufficient income during the intervening period was 'Borrowing from friends and relatives' as reported by 34 per cent of the selected beneficiaies in 9 of the selected districts. In districts Medak and Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradsh) 88.37 per cent and 60 per cent beneficiaries respectively reported to have resorted to borrowing from friends and relatives, whereas in another 6 districts i.e., Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Bhagalpur (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur and Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu), the percentage of such beneficiaries ranged from 21 to 50. In the remaining district of Kota (Rajasthan), the percentage of beneficiaries resorting to borrowing was only 12.12. There were 3 beneficiaries, one from Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh) and 2 from Kolar (Karnataka) who actually had started begging for maintaining themselves and their families.

7.53 There were 54 (14.17%) beneficiaries from 10 districts who adopted different miscellaneous ways to pull on during this intervening period. In 4 out of these i.e. Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Kota (Rajasthan), the percentage of beneficiaries, adopting these miscellaneous ways ranged from 21 to 49. In three more districts Medak and Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh) and Bhagalpur (Bihar), the percentage of such beneficiaries was between 6 and 14. In the remaining 3 districts, namely, Tehri-Garhwal (U.P.), Kolar (Karnataka), and Periyar (Tamil Nadu), one beneficiary each had resorted to these miscellaneous ways to maintain themselves during this period. For details please see appendix table No.7.2.

CHAPTER VIII

REHABILITATION SCHEME—THEIR SUITABILITY

The selected beneficiaries were also canvassed for giving their reactions and suggestions on various aspects of the rehabilitation programmes and schemes. These are analysed in the subsequent paragraphs.

Beneficiaries reporting rehabilitation scheme thrust upon them and the suitability or otherwise of the scheme under which covered

8.2 Out of 782 beneficiaries selected for the study of rehabilitation of bonded labour in India, 326 (42%) beneficiaries reported that the schemes were thrust upon them and 426 (58%) beneficiaries reported that they had a choice of the schemes (Details in Table 8.1 & 8.2).

8.3 59 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported that the schemes were suitable to their background and needs. 19 percent of the selected beneficiaries, however, reported that the schemes were neither suitable to their background nor to their needs. 21 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported that, although the schemes were suitable to their background yet those were not suitable to their needs. Only 1 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported that the schemes were not suitable to their background but were suitable to their needs.

8.4 From table 8.1 it was observed that 100 percent of the selected beneficiaries in Tamil Nadu had no choice of the scheme and therefore, the schemes were thrust upon them. In Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan more than 95 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported that the schemes were thrust upon them. In Andhra Pradesh 26 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported the same thing. However, in Karnataka 98 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported that the schemes were of their choice. In Uttar Pradesh, 82 percent followed by Bihar 79 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported that they had a choice of the various schemes.

8.5 98 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Uttar Pradesh reported that the schemes were suitable to their background as well as to their needs. This was followed by Karnataka, 75

TABLE 8·1

Statewise percentage distribution of beneficiaries reporting Rehabilitation Scheme, thurst upon them and the suitability or otherwise of the scheme under which covered

Sl. No.	State	Code	No. reporting Scheme (Block 8·15)		No. reporting Scheme (Block 8·16)		Suitable to background but not suitable to needs	Not suitable to background but suitable to need	Total no of selected beneficiaries
			Thurst upon	There was a choice	Suitable to background and need	Not suitable to background and need			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1	47	133	74	18	88	0	180
			(26·11)	(73·89)	(41·11)	(10·00)	(48·89)	(0·00)	(100·0)
2.	Bihar	2	41	151	130	28	34	0	192
			(21·35)	(78·65)	(67·71)	(14·58)	(17·71)	(0·00)	(100·0)
3.	Karnataka	3	2	118	90	0	29	1	120
			(1·67)	(98·33)	(75·00)	(0·00)	(24·17)	(0·83)	(100·0)
4.	Madhya Pradesh	5	30	1	2	17	9	3	31
			(96·77)	(3·23)	(6·45)	(54·84)	(29·03)	(9·68)	(100·0)
5.	Orissa	6	78	1	46	25	6	2	79
			(98·73)	(1·27)	(58·23)	(31·65)	(7·59)	(2·53)	(100·0)
6.	Rajasthan	7	57	3	2	58	0	0	60
			(95·00)	(5·00)	(3·33)	(96·67)	(0·00)	(0·00)	(100·0)
7.	Tamil Nadu	8	60	0	60	0	0	0	60
			(100·00)	(0·00)	(100·0)	(0·00)	(0·00)	(0·00)	(100·0)
8.	Uttar Pradesh	9	11	49	59	1	0	0	60
			(18·33)	(81·67)	(98·33)	(1·67)	(0·00)	(0·00)	(100·0)
	TOTAL		326	456	463	147	166	6	782
			(41·69)	(58·31)	(59·21)	(18·80)	(21·23)	(0·77)	(100·0)

percent, Bihar 68 percent, and Orissa 58 percent where the selected beneficiaries reported that the schemes were suitable to their background and needs. In Rajasthan, 97 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported that the schemes were neither suitable to their background nor to their needs. This was followed by Madhya Pradesh where 55 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported the same thing. 49 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Andhra Pradesh reported that the schemes were only suitable to their backgroud but not to their needs.

8.6 From table 8.2 it was observed that 100 percent of the selected benevciaries of five districts, viz., Periyar of Tamil Nadu, Phulbani, Kalahandi, Ganjam of Orissa and Jabalpur of Madhya Pradesh reported that the rehabilitation schemes were thrust upon them. More than 90 percent of the selected beneficiaries of two districts of Koraput and Kota also reported the same thing. 70 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Bhagalpur district of Bihar, 53 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Rangareddy district of Andhra Pradesh and 50 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Raigarh district of Madhya Pradesh also reported that the rehabilitation schemes were thrust upon them.

8.7 It is evident that no steps were taken to assess the choice of the beneficiaries in the above districts, in the matter of rehabilitation scheme.

TABLE 8·2

Districtwise percentage distribution of beneficiaries reporting rehabilitation scheme thurst-upon them and the suitability or otherwise of the scheme under which covered

Sl. No.	State	District	No. reporting Scheme		No. reporting Scheme		Suitable to background but not suitable to need	Not suitable to background but suitable to need
			Thurst upon	There was a choice	Suitable to background and need	Not Suitable to background and need		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Medak	20·00	80·00	65·00	6·67	28·33	0·00
		Mehboobnagar	5·00	95·00	41·67	3·33	55·00	0·00
		Rangareddy	53·33	46·67	16·67	20·00	63·33	0·00
2.	Bihar	Bhagalpur	70·00	30·00	74·00	26·00	0·00	0·00
		Monghyr	0·00	100·00	63·16	7·02	29·82	0·00
		Nalanda	0·00	100·00	46·15	11·54	42·31	0·00
		Santhal Parganas	10·17	89·83	76·27	13·56	10·17	0·00
3.	Karnataka	Chitradurga	0·00	100·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
		Kolar	3·33	96·67	50·00	0·00	48·33	1·67
4.	Madhya Pradesh	Jabalpur	100·00	0·00	6·90	58·62	24·14	10·34
		Raigarh	50·00	50·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00
5.	Orissa	Ganjam	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00
		Kalahandi	100·00	0·00	13·64	77·27	0·00	9·09
		Koraput	97·92	2·08	85·42	14·58	0·00	0·00
		Phulbani	100·00	0·00	28·57	14·29	57·14	0·00
6.	Rajasthan	Kota	95·00	5·00	3·33	96·67	0·00	0·00
7.	Tamil Nadu	Periyar	100·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
8.	Uttar Pradesh	Tehri Garhwal	18·33	81·67	98·33	1·67	0·00	0·00

8.8 100 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Monghyr, Nalanda and Chitradurga reported that the rehabilitation schemes were upto their choice. More than 90 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Kolar and Mehboobnagar and more than 80 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Santhal Parganas, Tehri Garhwal and Medak also expressed the same views.

8.9 It was encouraging to note that 100 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Periyar and Chitraduraga reported that the rehabilitation schemes were both suitable to their background and needs. 98 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Tehri Garhwal, 85 percent of the selected beneficiaris of Koraput and more than 60 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Santhal Parganas, Bhagalpur, Medak and Monghyr expressed the same views. 50 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Kolar and 42 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Mehoboobnagar reported that the rehabilitation schemes were both suitable to their background and needs. 97 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Kota district, 77 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Kalahandi district and 59 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Jabalpur district reported that the schemes were neither suitable to their background nor to their needs. 100 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Ganjam and Raigarh expressed that the

rehabilitation schemes were suitable to their background but not suitable to their needs. 63 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Rangareddy, 57 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Phulbani and 55 percent of the selected beneficiaries of Mehboobnagar also reported the same thing. Very few selected beneficiaries of Jabalpur (10%), Kalahandi (9%) and Kolar (2%) reported that the rehabilitation schemes were not suitable to their background but suitable to their needs.

8.10 The failure of the rehabilitation efforts could, therefore, be attributed to the routine manner in which the schemes were implemented in majority of districts without taking into account the choice, background and felt needs of the beneficiaries.

Distribution of beneficiaries reporting schemes suitable according to their choice of the scheme

8.11 From table No. 8.3 it appeared that out of 782 beneficiaries selected in eight States for the study of rehabilitation of Bonded Labour, 319 beneficiaries (41%) reported that the schemes meant for rehabilitation were not suitable. 155 beneficiaries (49%) reported that the land based schemes were suitable, 85 selected beneficiaries (27%) reported that the non-land based schemes were suitable. Only 10 selected beneficiaries (3%) were of the opinion that skill/craft based schemes were suitable to them and 93 beneficiaries reported that other schemes such as supply of hand cart, cart with bullocks, cart with camel etc. were suitable to them in eight selected States.

8.12 District-wise figures revealed that the maximum number of selected beneficiaries reported the suitability of land based schemes. One selected beneficiary in Tehri Garhwal and two selected beneficiaries in Raigarh reported that the land based schemes were suitable. Similarly 75 percent to 80 percent selected beneficiaries in Medak, Kolar and Kota reported the land based schemes as suitable. 40 percent to 50 percent selected beneficiaries in Monghyr, Jabalpur, Kalahandi and Koraput reported that the land based schemes were suitable to them. 37 percent selected beneficiaries in Mehboobnagar and 10 to 20 percent selected beneficiaries in Rangareddy, Bhagalpur and Nalanda also reported land based scheme as suitable to them.

8.13 Two selected beneficiaries (100%) in Ganjam reported that the non-land based scheme as suitable. 70 percent to 80 percent selected beneficiaries in Nalanda and Jabalpur and 60 percent selected beneficiaries in Phulbani reported that the non-land based schemes were suitable to them. 20 percent to 40 percent selected beneficiaries in Bhagalpur, Santhal Parganas and Kalahandi also suggested that the non-land based scheme as suitable to them. Only 10 percent to 20 percent selected beneficiaries in Medak, Mehboobnagar, Rangareddy and Kolar suggested the suitability of non-land based scheme.

8.14 One of the selected beneficiaries in Tehri Garhwal suggested skill/craft based scheme as suitable to them. Similarly 6 selected beneficiaries (22%) in Jabalpur district suggested the above mentioned scheme as suitable. Out of 18 districts selected for the study of rehabilitation of bonded labour, the selected beneficiaries in only 14 districts suggested skill/craft based scheme as suitable.

8.15 74 percent of the selected beneficiaries in Rangareddy, 55 percent to 65 percent of the selected beneficiries in Santhal Parganas, Bhagalpur and Koraput suggested that the other schemes such as supply of hand cart, cart with bullocks etc. were suitable to them. 46 percent selected beneficiaries in Mehboobnagar and only 24 percent selected beneficiaries in Kota also suggested the above mentioned scheme as suitable.

Land based scheme

8.16 out of 18 districts selected for the study of Rehabilitation of Bonded Labour in 9 districts viz., Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Nalanda, Jabalpur, Kalahandi, Koraput, Phulbani, Kota and Tehri Garhwal 90 percent to 100 percent selected beneficiaries suggested that allotment of agricultural land under land based scheme was suitable to them. 25 percent to 45 percent of the selected beneficiaries in Medak, Rangareddy and Kolar also suggested that allotment of agricultural land under land based scheme was suitable. Three selected beneficiaries in Koraput suggested that the provision of seeds was suitable. Similarly two selected beneficiaries in Koraput suggested supply of fertilizer as suitable. Provision of agricultural implements under land based scheme was suitable to each one of the beneficiaries in Kolar and Raigarh District. One selected beneficiary in Santhal Parganas, 6 selected beneficiaries (60%) in Rangareddy, 8 selected beneficiaries (50%) in Jabalpur, 17 selected beneficiaries (37%) in Kota, 5 selected beneficiaries (38%) in Mehboobnagar suggsted that supply of drought animal under land based scheme was suitable to them. Financial assistance for construction of irrigation wells under land based scheme was suitable to 13 selected beneficiaries (57%) in Kolar and 3 selected beneficiaries (30%) in Rangareddy district, 2 selected beneficiaries (100%) in Raigarh, 12 selected beneficiaries (75%) in Medak, 6 selected beneficiaries (46%) in Mehboobnagar and one selected beneficiary (33%) in Koraput district suggested any other scheme other than the scheme mentioned under land based scheme.

Non-land based Scheme

8.17 Under non-land based scheme, supply of cows was considered suitable as suggested by 36 percent of the beneficiaries in eight selected States. 28 percent of the selected beneficiaries in these States preferred for supply of goats, 20 percent of the selected beneficiaries preferred supply of Buffaoes, 11 percent of the selected beneficiaries preferred supply of sheep and only 6 percent of the selected beneficiaries preferred supply of pigs under non-land based scheme.

8.18 It would appear from the district-wise data that all the three selected beneficiaries in Medak,

ee selected beneficiaries in Mehboobnagar, ee selected beneficiaries in Santhal Parganas d one selected beneficiary in Ganjam suggested : supply of buffaloes as suitable. All selected neficiaries in Monghyr, Ganjam and Kalahandi d 45 percent selected beneficiaries of Nalanda trict suggested the supply of cows under non- id based scheme as suitable. The supply of gs under non-land based scheme was suitable 33 percent of the selected beneficiaries in agalpur, 27 percent of the selected beneficia- s in Nalanda and 25 percent of the selected neficiaries in Mehboobnagar. 90 percent of : selected beneficiaries in Jabalpur, 50 percent the selected beneficiaries in Ganjam and Kota ggested the supply of goats as suitable. 60 per- nt of the selected beneficiaries in Kolar and percent of the selected beneficiaries in Ranga- ldy district suggested the supply of sheep under on-land based scheme as suitable. **None of the neficiaries were in favour of setting up poultry any district.**

Skill/Craft

8.19 Out of 10 beneficiaries in eight States, 6 selected beneficiaries were in favour of leather works under skill/craft based scheme. 100 percent of the selected beneficiaries in Mehboobnagar and Nalanda and 50 percent of the selected beneficiaries in Jabalpur districts suggested leather works under skill/craft based scheme as suitable.

Other Schemes

8.20 Eighty selected beneficiaries out of ninety-three selected beneficiaries in eight States selected for the study of Rehabilitation of Bonded Labour, suggested the supply of cart with bullocks as suitable. Only 13 selected beneficiaries (14%) in eight States suggested other schemes. District-wise figures revealed that 90 percent to 100 percent of the selected beneficiaries in Medak, Mehboobnagar, Rangareddy, Kolar and Koraput and 70 percent to 80 percent of the selected

TABLE 8·3

State	District	Total No. of selected beneficiaries	No. Reporting scheme not suitable	Schemes Suggested Suitable				Total
				Land based	Non-land based	Skill/ craft based	Others	
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Andhra Pradesh	Medak	60	21 (35·00)	16 (76·19)	3 (14·29)	0 (0·00)	2 (9·52)	21 (100·00)
	Mehboobnagar	60	35 (58·33)	13 (37·14)	4 (11·43)	2 (5·71)	16 (45·71)	35 (100·00)
	Rangareddy	60	50 (83·33)	10 (20·00)	7 (14·00)	0 (0·00)	37 (74·00)	50 (100·00)
Bihar	Bhagalpur	50	13 (26·00)	2 (15·38)	3 (23·08)	0 (0·00)	8 (61·54)	13 (100·00)
	Monghyr	57	21 (36·84)	9 (42·86)	12 (57·14)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	21 (100·00)
	Nalanda	26	14 (53·85)	2 (14·29)	11 (78·57)	1 (7·14)	0 (0·00)	14 (100·00)
	Santhal Parganas	59	14 (23·73)	1 (7·14)	4 (28·57)	0 (0·00)	9 (64·29)	14 (100·00)
Karnataka	Chitradurga	60	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
	Kolar	60	30 (50·00)	23 (76·67)	5 (16·67)	0 (0·00)	2 (6·67)	30 (100·00)
Madhya Pradesh	Jabalpur	29	27 (93·10)	16 (59·26)	20 (74·07)	6 (22·22)	0 (0·00)	27 (100·00)
	Raigarh	2	27 (100·00)	2 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	2 (100·00)
Orissa	Ganjam	2	2 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	2 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	2 (100·00)
	Kalahandi	22	19 (86·36)	10 (52·63)	7 (36·84)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	17 (89·47)
	Koraput	48	7 (14·58)	3 (42·86)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	4 (57·14)	7 (100·00)
	Phulbani	7	5 (71·43)	1 (20·00)	3 (60·00)	0 (0·00)	1 (20·00)	5 (100·00)
Rajasthan	Kota	60	58 (96·67)	46 (79·31)	4 (6·90)	0 (0·00)	14 (24·14)	59 (101·72)
Tamil Nadu	Periyar	60	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
Uttar Pradesh	Tehri Garhwal	60	1 (1·67)	1 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	1 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	1 (100·00)
All States		782	319 (40·79)	155 (48·59)	85 (26·65)	10 (3·13)	93 (29·15)	318 (99·69)

beneficiaries in Bhagalpur and Kota suggested the supply of cart with bullocks, under other schemes as suitable. Please see table No. 8.3.

8.21 The above analysis should be useful to the respective State/District authorities to consider the selection of background of the beneficiaries schemes in future according to the needs and if more bonded labour is detected and requires rehabilitation.

Distribution of Beneficiaries according to reasons for distribution of suitability of the scheme

8.22 From the table it is observed that out of the 782 beneficiaries 318 (40.66%) had come out with suggestions of suitable schemes. These beneficiaries had given a number of reasons justifying the suitability of various schemes suggested by them.

8.23 Majority of the beneficiaries — 137 (43.22%) had stated that the schemes suggested by them would provide regular source of income for them. Another 83 (26.18%) had reported that the schemes suggested by them would provide sufficient income, whereas 50 (15.77%) of the beneficiaries gave their earlier experience in support of the suitability of the schemes. Whereas about 6 percent of the beneficiaries had reported that the schemes suggested by them would provide employment to the whole of the family and another 6 percent stated that the schemes would be more beneficial being in accordance with their traditional occupations. 30 (9.46%) of the beneficiaries gave other miscellaneous reasons in support of the schemes suggested by them.

8.24 On studying the districtwise figures it will be observed that about 40 percent of the beneficiaries from 16 of the selected 18 districts had come out with suggestions of suitable schemes. The beneficiaries suggesting suitable schemes, gave a number of reasons justifying their suggestions. The most common reason given by about 43 percent of the these beneficiaries in 13 of the districts was that the schemes suggested by them 'would provide a regular source of income'. Another important reason 'income will be sufficient' was put forth by 26 percent of the beneficiaries in 14 districts. Next to this, there was another reason i.e. 'had earlier experience' given by 50 (15.77%) beneficiaries in nine of the selected districts. Eighteen beneficiaries from 8 districts had given "Traditional Occupation" in support of their suggestions for suitable schemes. In four of these districts i.e. Nalanda and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka) and Phulbani (Orissa) one beneficiary each had put forth the above reason, whereas in the districts Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh) two beneficiaries each in district Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), three beneficiaries had given this reason. In the remaining district of Kalahandi (Orissa) seven of the beneficiaries had stated the above noted reason in support of their suggestions. Nineteen of the beneficiaries (5.99%) from six districts had stated that their suggestions 'would provide employment to the whole of the family.'

8.25 In five of the districts, namely, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Nalanda and Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Kota (Rajasthan), 4 to 22 percent beneficiaries had given these miscellaneous reasons. In the remaining two districts—Medak (Andhra Pradesh) and Raigarh (Madhya Pradesh) 57.14 percent & 50% beneficiaries respectively had put forth such reasons in support of their suggestions for suitable schemes. Thus it is observed that majority of the beneficiaries (85%) in most of these districts had given three main reasons in support of their suggestions, i.e. (i) will provide regular source of income, (ii) income will be sufficient and (iii) had an earlier experience. For details please see Appendix Table No. 8.1.

Beneficiaries reporting benefits from rehabilitation schemes inadequate and putting forth suggestion for imporvement

8.26 It may be seen from the table that out of a total no. of 782 selected beneficiaries 205 (26.21%) said that the benefits were adequate and 262 (33.50%) said that these were partially adequate whereas the remaining 315 (40.28%) reported that the benefits were not adequate and gave suggestions for improvement. It means that majority of the beneficiaries amounting to about 73.78 percent reported the inadequacy of the rehabilitation assistance. Most of these beneficiaries put forth more than one suggestion. Maximum No. of these beneficiaries i.e. 224 (38.82%) wanted that the size of the schemes be increased. 138 (23.92%) of the beneficiaries said that the schemes should be viable. Another 60 (10.40%) suggested that the subsistence allowance should be paid regularly till rehabilitation and 2 (0.35%) of them wanted the rate of subsistence allowance to be raised. A few of the beneficiaries i.e. 22 (3.81%) wanted that there should be provision for urgent cash needs. 96 (16.64%) beneficiaries wanted allotment of more land. It was expressed by them that land of good quality should be given to them. Some of the beneficiaries — 23 (3.99%) suggested that they should be given financial assistance for the purchase of Agricultural inputs whereas another 11 (1.91%) desired that there should be provision for Irrigation facilities. Still there were many others — 45 (7.80%) suggesting numerous other requirements and facilities.

8.27 On studying the districtwise figures we find that on the whole 205 (26.21%) beneficiaries from 12 of the selected districts had reported the benefits to be 'adequate'. In seven of these districts i.e. Medak (A.P.), Bhagalpur, Monghyr and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kalahandi and Koraput (Orissa) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.), the percentage of beneficiaries reporting the benefits as **'Adequate'** ranged from 31 to 65. In the remaining 5 districts, namely, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (A.P.), Chitradurga (Karnataka),

Phulbani (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan), Percentage of such beneficiaries varied between 5 and 17.

8.28 A good number i.e. 262 (33.50%) of beneficiaries from 15 of the selected districts reported that the benefits provided to them were partially adequate. In 5 of these districts the percentage of beneficiaries reporting this fact was quite high and ranged from 54 to 85. The names of these districts are mehboobnagar (A.P.), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Jabalpur (M.P.), and Phulbani (Orissa). In seven of the districts the percentage of such beneficiaries ranged between 18 and 41, the names of these districts being Medak (A.P.), Bhagalpur, Monghyr and Nalanda (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Kalahandi and Koraput (Orissa). In the remaining 3 districts this percentage was not significant.

8.29 Maximum no. of beneficiaries i.e. 315 (40.28%) from almost all the selected districts reported that the benefits provided were inadequate. Beneficiaries ranging between 60 and 100% reportng the benents as 'Inadequate' were from 7 districts, namely, Rangareddy (A.P.), Nalanda (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Raigarh (M.P.), Ganjam (Orissa), Kota (Rajasthan) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu). In six of these districts i.e. Bhagalpur and Monghyr (Bihar), Jabalpur (M.P.), Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.), the percentage of such beneficiaries varied between 23 and 44. In the remaining 5 districts, the percentage of such beneficiaries ranged between 1 and 15, their names being Madak and Mehboobnagar (A.P.), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka) and Koraput (Orissa).

8.30 The beneficiaries reporting the benefits as 'Partially Adequate' and 'Not Adequate' from various districts advanced many suggestions for improvement in this regard. Largest number of beneficiaries i.e. 224 (38.82%) from 15 of the selected districts were for "increase in the size of schemes" offered to them. Beneficiaris from 4 districts — Rangarddy (A.P.), Bhagalpur and Nalanda (Bihar) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.) suggesting increase in the size of the schemes ranged between 66 and 94 percent. In eight of the selected districts, the percentage of beneficiaries putting forth this suggestion varied between 25 & 47. The names of these districts are Madak and Mehboobnagar (A.P.), Monghyr and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka), Kalahndi (Orissa) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu). The remaining 3 districts i.e. Phulbani (Orissa), Jabalpur (M.P.) and Kota (Rajasthan) had 16, 10 and 1.75 percent of such beneficiaries. For details please see Appendix Table No. 8.2.

8.31 138 (23.93%) beneficiaries from 11 of the selected districts had suggested that the schemes offered to them should be viable. In three of the districts — Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Ganjam (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan), the percentage of beneficiaries giving this suggestion varied between 50 and 85. Beneficiaries ranging from 15 to 45 percent in five of the selected districts i.e., Bhagalpur, Monghyr and Nalanda (Bihar), Jabalpur (M.P.) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu) also came out with the same suggestion. In the remaining 3 districts — Mehboobnagar (A.P.), Kolar (Karnataka) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.), the percentage of such beneficiaries varied between 4 and 10.

8.32 In 14 of the selected districts, 96 (16.64%) beneficiaries wanted allotment of more land, some of them asking for good quality land. In 4 of these districts, beneficiaries ranging from 50 to 85 percent had put forth this suggestion. The names of these districts are Chitradurga (Karnataka), Raigarh (M.P.), Ganjam and Kalahandi (Orissa). In 5 more districts i.e. Medak, Menboobnagar (A.P.), Monghyr (Bihar), Jabalpur (M.P.) and Phulbani (Orissa), the percentage of beneficiaries giving this suggestion varied between 10 and 27. In remaining 5 districts, the percentage of such beneficiaries was insignificant—5 and below.

8.33 In six of the selected districts 60 (10.40%) beneficiaries wanted that the subsistence allowance be paid regularly. Out of these 30 were from Kolar (Karnataka), 10 from Koraput (Orissa) and 15 from Periyar (Tamil Nadu). In the remaining 3 districts, the No. of beneficiaries varied between 1 and 3. The names of these districts are Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Ganjam (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan). One beneficiary each from Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh) and Koraput (Orissa) wanted the subsistence allowance to be raised.

8.34 Fortyfive beneficiaries from 11 districts gave miscellaneous suggestion for improvement in providing these benefits. 16 of these beneficiaries belonged to Jabalpur. In the remaining 10 districts, the no. of these beneficiaries giving these miscellaneous suggestions varied between 1 and 6. The suggestions offered by them were as follows :—

1. Provision of grazing land.
2. Provision of feed and fodder.
3. Provision of regular wage employment.
4. Provision of house/house-site.
5. Supply of sewing machines.

These suggestions bring out the need for dovetailing and intergrating the rehabilitation efforts with other schemes like NREP, IRDP, House-sites etc., Tribal and special employment plan. There were 22 beneficiaries from 8 districts who suggested that there should be provision for urgent cash needs. The number of beneficiaries putting forth this suggestion in these districts varied between one and six. These districts were Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh), Nalanda and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), Koraput (Orissa), Periyar (Tamil Nadu) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.). Again in 8 of the districts i.e. Medak and Mehboobnagar (A.P.), Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka), Raigarh (M.P.), Ganjam, Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa), there were 23 beneficiaries suggesting "Financial

Assistance for Agricultural Inputs". The number of these beneficiaries varied between 1 and 6 in these districts (numbering 11). A few beneficiaries from three districts wanted Irrigation facilities. These beneficiaries were 6 from Medak and 3 from Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh) and 2 from Tehri Garhwal (Uttar Pradesh). For details please see Appendix Table No. 8.3.

Distribution of beneficiaries according to the size of cultivation holding

8.35 It may be further noticed that out of the 301 cultivator beneficiaries, 105 (34.88%) had a cultivation holding of upto 0.4 hect. These beneficiaries belonged to 11 districts. In seven of these districts, i.e. Medak, Mehbooonagar and Rangareddy (A.P.), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Kalahandi (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan) the percentage of beneficiaries having this cultivation holding ranged from 23 to 50. In two of the districts — Monghyr (Bihar) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.), this percentage was 100 and 76.36 respectively. In the remaining two districts the percentage of such beneficiaries was quite low and was 13.33 in Chitradurga (Karnataka) and 2.56 in Koraput (Orissa). In the group 0.4—0.8 hect., there were ten districts having 98 beneficiaries. In three of these districts, i.e. Kalahandi, Koraput, and Phulbani (Orissa), the percentage of beneficiaries having a cultivation holding of 0.4—0.8 hects. varied between 74 and 100. In the remaining seven districts, namely, Medak, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (A.P.), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Kota (Rajasthan) and Tehri Garhwal (UP), the percentage of beneficiaries falling in this cultivation holding group ranged from 14 to 37.

8.36 On studying the figures we find that out of 782 selected beneficiaries 38 (73.08%) were allotted 0.4—0.8 hectares of land. There were 5 beneficiaries who were allotted upto 0.4 hect. of land. Four beneficiaries each were allotted land 0.8 — 1.0 and 1-2 hectares. There was only one beneficiary who was allotted above 2 hect. of land. Of the selected 782 beneficiaries maximum No. 105 (34.88%) had a cultivation holding of upto 0.4 hect. followed by 98 (32.56%) beneficiaries with a holding 0.4—0.8 hect. There were 73 (24.25%) beneficiaries with a cultivation holding of 1-2 hectares whereas in the group 2—4 and above 4 hects. there were only 11 and 1 beneficiaries respectively. In the group 0.8—1 hect. also there were just 13 beneficiaries.

8.37 Districtwise figures show that maximum No. of beneficiaries 38 (73.08%) from 4 selected districts were allotted 0.4—0.8 hect. of land. Most of the beneficiaries—28 (90.32%) belonged to Koraput (Orissa). Two of the remaining three districts were also from Orissa i.e., Phulbani with five and Kalahandi with three beneficiaries. The third district i.e. Santhal Parganas (Bihar) had two beneficiaries who were allotted 0.4—0.8 hects. of land. There were five beneficiaries from three districts who were allotted land upto 0.4 hects., names of these districts being Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kalahandi (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan), 0.8 to 1 hects. of land was allotted to 4 beneficiaries in three districts, namely, Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Raigarh (MP) and Ganjam (Orissa), another 4 beneficiaries from 2 districts Koraput (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan) were allotted 1-2 hectares of land. One beneficiary from Raigarh (MP) was allotted land above 2 hectares.

8.38 There were only 13 beneficiaries from six of the selected districts with a cultivation holding from 0.8—1 hect. These beneficiaries were six from Rangareddy and three from Medak (AP). The remaining four districts — Mehboobnagar (AP), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Raigarh (MP) and Koraput (Orissa) had one such beneficiary each. In the group 1-2 hects. there were 10 districts with a total of 73 beneficiaries. In one of these districts—Ganjam (Orissa) 100% beneficiaries had this holding. Beneficiaries ranging from 25 to 54% from six districts also had their cultivation holding from 1-2 hects. The names of these districts are, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (AP), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka) and Kota (Rajasthan). In the remaining three districts the percentage of such beneficiaries varied between 1 and 16, the names of these districts being Medak (AP), Koraput (Orissa) and Tehri Garhwal (UP).

8.39 In six of the selected districts, 11 beneficiaries had their holdings between 2 and 4 hects. The number of these beneficiaries varied between 1 and 4 in these districts. The names of these districts were Mehboobnagar, Rangareddy (AP), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Raigarh (MP) and Koraput (Orissa). Only one beneficiary from Koraput (Orissa) had a cultivation holding of more that 4 hectares. For details please see Appendix Table No. 8.4.

8.40 It is recommended that the concerned State/District authorities should carry out studies about the economic benefits for the exbonded labourer according to size of land holding allotted to them.

Distribution of beneficiaries reporting allotted land not brought under cultivation and reasons thereof

8.41 From the figures it may be noted that out of the 52 beneficiaries who were allotted land, 39 (75.00%) reported that they were cultivating the land allotted to them. The 13 (25%) remaining beneficiaries who were not cultivating the allotted land gave various reasons for doing so. More than half — 7 of them said that the land was not suitable for cultivation. Another reported that bullocks were not available for the purpose. Two of the beneficiaries expressed their inability to till their land due to **non-availability of Agricultural implements** whereas one beneficiary lamented his inability to reclaim the land due to lack of funds. Two more beneficiaries gave other reasons for not being in a position to cultivate the land allotted to them.

8.42 On study of the district-wise figures we find that 39 beneficiaries from 6 districts had reported to be cultivating the land allotted to them. Out of these 24 belonged to Koraput (Orissa) and the remaining to 5 districts of Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Ganjam, Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan), the number of these beneficiaries varied between 2 and 4.

8.43 There were 13 beneficiaries from 5 districts who had reported to be not cultivating the allotted land; and they advanced various reasons in support of their response. Seven of the beneficiaries from four districts said that the land was not suitable for cultivation, the number of beneficiaries reporting this fact was 1 to 3 in these districts i.e. Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan). Four beneficiaries from Koraput (Orissa) and one from Kota (Rajasthan) had reported non-availablility of bullocks for not being able to cultivate their allotted land. Again two beneficiaries from Koraput (Orissa) could not cultivate their allotted land due to non-availability of Agricultural Implements and another one from the same district due to non-availability of funds. Finally, 2 beneficiaries from Raigarh (MP) gave other miscellaneous reasons for not being in a position to cultivate the land allotted to them.

8.44 It is surprising that the State/district authorities failed to provide the required inputs to the ex-bonded labour resulting in non-utilisation of the allotted land. This was the position at the time of the study. It is hoped that the concerned authorities might have taken steps for remedy the situation in the light of the subsequent guidelines of the Ministry of Labour. The concerned authorities at the Centre and States should review the situation urgently.

Distribution of beneficiaries according to quality of land allotted and its type

8.45 From a study of the table, we find that out of a total of 782 beneficiaries selected for the study, 52 were allotted land. Out of these 21 (40.38%) reported the land to be of average quality whereas the majority of the 31 (59.62%) said that the land was of below Average Quality. Of the 31 beneficiaries reporting the land to be of below Average quality, 22 said that it was stony whereas another 2 stated it to be sandy. Ten of the beneficiaries pointed many other miscellaneous defects rendering the land allotted to them as below average.

8.46 It is evident that the authorities did not bother to assess the utility and usefulness of the land allotted to the poor ex-bonded labour.

8.47 On perusal of the district-wise figures we find that 21 (40.38%) beneficiaries from five districts reported the land allotted to be Average Quality. Of these 10 belonged to Koraput (Orissa) and in the remaining four districts i.e., Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Raigarh (MP), Kalahandi (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan), the number of such beneficiaries varied between 1 and 4. There were 31 (59.62%) beneficiaries from six districts who said that the land allotted to them was of below average quality. Twentyone of these beneficiaries belonged to Koraput (Orissa) and ten to the remaining five districts i.e. Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Ganjam and Phulbani (Orissa), Raigarh (MP) and Kota (Rajasthan).

8.48 Out of the 31 beneficiaries reporting the land to be of below average quality, 22 said that the land allotted was stony. Most of these beneficiaries (16) were from Koraput (Orissa) and the remaining six from four districts—one each from Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Kota (Rajasthan) and two each from Ganjam and Phulbani (Orissa). Two beneficiaries, i.e. one each from Raigarh (MP) and Ganjam (Orissa) said that the land was sandy. Ten of these beneficiaries pointed out miscellaneous other defects like Rooty and Rocky land in respect of the land allotted to them. It may be observed from the fore-going paragraphs that most of the beneficiaries (about 66%) who were allotted land for cultivation were from Koraput (Orissa) and more than 50% of them reported the land to be of below average quality. The main reasons given by them was that the land was stony.

Distribution of beneficiaries who repoted facilities other than allotment of land

8.49 Apart from allotment of land some other facilities such as irrigation wells, pumpsets, bullock, implements, agricultural inputs etc. were also provided to the rehabilitated bonded labourers. Out of 782 selected respondents 310 (39.64%) reported having availed these facilities under land based schemes. Their State-wise break-up is given in table No. 8.4.

8.50 The table on the next page shows that maximum number of beneficiaries (286) were supplied bullocks. This was followed by 110 in case of implements, 59 agriculture inputs, 53 miscellaneous, and 2 each in irrigated and pumpsets. Their percentage to total ranged from 0.65 to 92.26. In all 512 bnefits were availed of by 310 respondents which means that majority of the respondents had availed of more than one facility.

8.51 Out of 8 States studied, in 2 States viz., Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu not even a single respondents reported having availed any facility. In 6 States where the facilities were availed the number of beneficiaries were ranged from 3 in Rajasthan to 118 in Andhra Pradesh.

8.52 With regard to districtwise position in five districts viz., Bhagalpur, Nalanda, Jabalpur, Raigarh and Perivar none of the respondents availed these facilities. In remaining 13 districts where benefits were availed number of respondents varied from 2 each in Ganjam and Kalahandi to 52 in Mehboobnagar.

8.53 On perusal of districtwise figures from the summary table No. 8.5 we find that in 13

of the 18 districts, maximum number of beneficiaries 286 (92.26%) availed of the facility of bullocks. The number of beneficiaries availing this facility in 8 of these districts i.e. Medak, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (A.P.), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka), Koraput (Orissa) and Tehri Garhwal (UP) ranged from 18 to 52. In the remaining 5 districts namely, Monghyr (Bihar), Ganjam, Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan), number was very small varying between 2 and 5. Next to this 110, (35.48%) beneficiaries were provided implements in six of the selected districts. In three of these districts i.e. Santhal

TABLE 8·4

State-wise break-up of beneficiaries who reported facilities availed

State	No. of selected beneficiaries	Total number who availed benefits	Distribution of beneficiaries according to facilities availed											
			Irrigation well	Percentage to total	Pumping sets	Percentage to total	Bullock	Percentage to total	Implement	Percentage to total	Agriculture input	Percentage to total	Others	Percentage to total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Andhra Pradesh	180	118 (65·55)	2	1·69	0	0·00	117	99·15	0	0·00	0	0·00	1	0·85
Bihar .	192	25 (13·00)	0	0·00	1	4·00	22	88·00	17	68·00	8	32·00	0	0·00
Karnataka .	120	59 (49·17)	0	0·00	1	1·69	51	86·44	9	15·25	0	0·00	7	11·86
Madhya Pradesh	31	0 (0·00)	0	0·00	0	0·00	0	0·00	0	0·00	0	0·00	0	0·00
Orissa .	79	54 (68·35)	0	0·00	0	0·00	47	87·04	46	85·19	40	74·07	44	81·48
Rajasthan .	60	3 (5·00)	0	0·00	0	0·00	3	100·00	0	0·00	0	0·00	1	33·33
Tamil Nadu	60	0 (0·00)	0	0·00	0	0·00	0	0·00	0	0·00	0	0·00	0	0·00
Uttar Pradesh	60	51 (85·00)	0	0·00	0	0·00	46	90·20	38	74·51	11	21.57	0	0·00
Total .	782	310 (39·64)	2	0·65	2	0·65	286	92·26	110	35·48	59	19·03	53	17·10

Parganas (Bihar,) Koraput (Orissa) and Tehri Garhwal (UP) the number of beneficiaries getting implements varied between 17 and 38 whereas in the remaining 3 districts of Kolar (Karnataka), Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa), this number was between 1 and 9.

8.54 Agricultural inputs were supplied to 59 (19.03%) beneficiaries belonging to five district i.e. Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kalahandi Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.) whereas in Koraput, the number of beneficiaries availing this facility was 35, in the remaining 4 districts, this number varied between 1 and 11.

8.55 There were two beneficiaries each availing the facility of irrigation well and Pumpsets. These beneficiaries were 2, from Rangareddy (A.P.) availing 'Irrigation Well' and one each from Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Chitradurga (Karnataka) availing pumpset facilities.

8.56 It may be observed from the foregoing paragraphs that maximum number of beneficiaries in most of the district, had availed of 'Bullocks' and 'Implements'.

Distribution of beneficiaries reporting difficulties faced in availing the facilities/inputs and suggestions for improvement

TABLE 8·6

Beneficiaries reporting difficulties faced in availing facilities

	No.	Percentage
Total no. of selected beneficiaries .	782	
No. reporting facilities availed .	310	39·64
No. reporting difficulties faced .	92	29·68
Procedure cumbersome . .	17	18·48
Disbursement not timely . .	71	77·17
Disbursement not regular . .	1	1·09
Officials unhelpful . . .	5	5·43
Any other	14	15·22

TABLE NO. 8·5

Districtwise distribution of beneficiaries reporting facilities other than allotment of land.

Name of Item/ facility	No. of Bene- ficiaries	Percen- tage	Name of Districts
1	2	3	4
Bullocks .	286	92.26	Medak (26) Mehboobnagar (52) Rangareddy (39) Monghyr (3) Santhal Parganas (19) Chitradurga (18) Kolar (33) Ganjam (2) Kalahandi (2) Koraput (38) Phulbani (5) Kota (3) Tehrigarhwal (46)
Implements .	110	35·48	Santhal Parganas(17) Kolar (9) Kalahandi (1) Koraput (41) Phulbani (4) Tehrigarhwal (38)
Agricultural inputs	59	19·03	Santhal Parganas (8) Kalahandi (1) Koraput (35) Phulbani (4) Tehrigarhwal (11)
Others . .	53	17·10	Rangareddy (1) Chitradurga (7) Kalahandi (2) Koraput (38) Phulbani (4) Kota (1)
Irrigation well .	2	0·65	Rangareddy (2)
Pumping set .	2	0·65	Santhal Parganas (1) Chitradurga (1)

Note : The figures in brackets represent the No. of beneficiaries availed the facility in the district.

8.57 From the summary given above we find that out of a total of 782 selected beneficiaries 310 (39.64%) had availed facilities. Out of these 92 (29.68%) beneficiaries had faced difficulties in availing the facilities. Majortity of the beneficiaries i.e. 71 (77.17%) had stated that the disbursement was not regular. Another 17 (18.48%) beneficiaries complained that procedure involved was cumber some and time consuming. Five (5.43%) of the beneficiaries stated that the officials were not helpful whereas one beneficiary said that the disbursement was not regular. There were about 14(15.22%) beneficiaries who reported many other miscellaneous type of difficulties faced.

8.58 On study of districtwise figures it is observed that difficulties in availing the facilities were faced in seven of the selected districts of Medak and Rangareddy (AP), Kolar (Karnataka), Ganjam, Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa) and Tehri Garhwal (UP). In three of these districts i.e. Rangareddy, Korput and Kolar maximum number of beneficiaries ranging from 14 to 35 experienced these difficulties whereas the number of such beneficiaries in the remaining four districts was between 1 and 8. Among the difficulties faced, disbursment not timely was reported by maximum number of beneficiaries-71, from five of the selected, districts, mainly Rangareddy 26, Kolar 14 and Koraput 28. Procedure cumbersome the next important reason was reported by 17 beneficiaries from there districts i.e. Rangareddy 7, Koraput 9 and Phulbani 1. Officials unhelpful was reported from three districts i.e. Rangareddy 3, Ganjam and Koraput one each. There were 14 beneficiaries reporting miscellaneous difficulties faced by them. These were 8 from Tehri Garwal and 2 each from Ganjam, Koraput and Phulbani. From the above noted facts and figures it is amply clear that most of the beneficiaries numbering 88 from six of the selected districts faced two main difficulties i.e. disbursement not timely and procedure cumbersome.

Suggestions of beneficiaries

8.59 On going through districtwise figures we find that the suggestion disbursement should be timely came from majority of the beneficiaries, mainly from thre districts i.e. Rangareddy (AP) 24 (68.57%), Kolar (Karnataka), 10 (71.43%) and Koraput (Orissa) 25 (86.21%). Two beneficiaries from Ganjam (Orissa) and one from Medak (AP) also gave the same suggestion. Procedure should be simplified was the next important suggestion advanced by 8 beneficiaries each in two districts Rangareddy (AP) and Koraput (Orissa). All formalities should be done at one place was put forth by two beneficiaries in Koraput (Orissa). One beneficiary each in districts Rangareddy (AP) and Koraput (Orissa) suggested that these cases should be handled by committed officials. Other miscellaneous suggestions were given by 16 beneficiaries in five districts i.e. two each in Rangareddy (AP), Ganjam, Koraput and Phulbani (Orissa) and 8 in Tehri Garhwal (UP).

8.60 It may be noted that most of the suggestions came from beneficiaries belonging to districts Rangareddy, Kolar, Koraput and Tehri Garhwal. The State and district authorities should consider the suggestions for implementation of the programme in future.

TABLE 8·7

Distribution of beneficiaries according to the year of Financial/assistance received, sufficiency and suggestions

Summery of Suggestions

Year	No. reporting having recd. Assistance/Loan
1976	..
1977	..
1978	..
1979	19 (24·05%)
1980	27 (34·18%)
1981	33 (41·77%)
Total	79 (10·10%)
No. reporting assistance sufficient .	71 (89·87%)
Not sufficient . . .	8 (10·13%)
No. reporting suggestions .	8 (100%)
No. reporting main suggestion—quantum should be increased .	7 (87·50%)

8.61 On going through figures of the summary table given above we find that only 79 (10.10%) out of the selected 782 beneficiaries received Financial Assistance/Loan. The Assistance/Loan was received in three years i.e. 1979, 1980 and 1981 by 19,27 and 33 beneficiaries respectively. Out of these beneficiaries reporting having received assistance/loan 71 (89.87%) stated that the Assistance/Loan was sufficient whereas the remaining 8 (10.13%) said that it was 'not sufficient'. These 8 beneficiaries gave suggestion and majority of them i.e. seven wanted that the quantum of assistance should be increased. In 1981, 33 beneficiaries took Assistance/Loans from four States and most of these — 30 belonged to U.P. Out of 79 beneficiaries from various States receiving Assistance/Loans 71 (89.87%) said that the Assistance was sufficient. These States are Andhra Pradesh 1, Bihar 22, Orrissa 14, Rajasthan 4 and U.P. 30. The remaining 8 beneficiaries belonging to UP, however, reported that the Assistance/Loan was not sufficient. Seven of these beneficiaries suggested that the quantum of Assistance/Loan be increased.

8.62 A study of districtwise figures reveal that in 1979 the 19 beneficiaries receiving Assistance/Loan belonged to three districts. The names of these districts and their individual number of beneficiaries receiving the benefit are Santhal Parganas (Bihar) 12, Koraput (Orissa) 5 and Kota (Rajasthan) 2. In 1980 the number of beneficiaries receiving the Assistance/Loan was 27 and belonged to the districts Monghyr 3 and Santhal Parganas 7 (Bihar), Koraput 8 (Orissa), Kota 1 (Rajasthan) and Tehri Garhwal 8 (UP). In the year 1981 the number of beneficiaries receiving Assistance/Loan, increased to 33. These beneficiaries were from four districts i.e. one each from Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh), Koraput (Orissa) and Kota (Rajasthan) and 30 from Tehri Garhwal (UP).

Average net income during 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81

TABLE 8.8

Average Net income during 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81 and percentage increase or decrease over previous years (all India)

Year	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
Total no. of beneficiaries	782	782	782
No. reporting	159	261	294
	(20.33%)	(33.38%)	(37.60%)
Net total amount of income	10881	28265	37075
Average per family	68.43	108.30	126.11
Percentage increase or decrease over 1978-79	-	58.25	84.27
Percentage increase or decrease over 1979-80	-	-	16.45

8.63 On perusal of the figures given in the above summary table we find that out of a total No. of 782 selected beneficiaries, 159 (20.33%) beneficiaries in 1978-79, 261 (33.38%) in 1979-80 and 294 (37.60%) in 1980-81 reported to have earned net incomes of Rs. 10881, 28265 and 37075 respectively. Average net income per beneficiary during the respective years works out to Rs. 68.43, 108.30 and 126.11. The percentage increase of income over 1978-79 was 58.25 and 84.27 in 1979-80 and 1980-81. This increase was 16.45% in 1980-81 over 1979-80.

8.64 On going through districtwise figures we find that for 1978-79 the information is available for seven districts. It may be observed that a total net amount of Rs. 1500-1600 (approx.) each was earned by 18 (30.00%) beneficiaries in Medak, by 47 (78.33%) in Mehboobnagar and by 29 (48.33%) in Rangareddy districts of Andhra Pradesh. Five beneficiaries (10.42%) in Koraput (Orissa) earned a net income of Rs. 1687 whereas in Tehri Garhwal 57 (95%) beneficiaries earned an income of Rs. 4044. The average net income earned per family ranged from Rs. 70 to 100 in four districts i.e., Medak (AP), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kota (Rajasthan) and Tehri Garhwal (UP). In districts Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (AP) the average net income per family was Rs. 35 and 55 respectively whereas this was the highest i. e. Rs. 337.40, in district Koraput of Orissa. In 1979-80, we find that there was a phenomenal increase in average net income per family and the number of beneficiaries reporting the fact also increased. The number of districts also went upto 11. The average net income per family ranged from Rs. 70 to 118 in five districts i.e. Medak, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (AP), Kota (Rajasthan) and Tehri Garhwal (UP). In districts Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Koraput (Orissa), this income was quite high i.e. 193.39 and 330.48 respectively. In three of the remaining four districts i.e. Chitradurga (Karnataka), Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa), this income

varied between Rs. 15 and 30. In Chitradurga (Karnataka) this income was 57.93. The percentage increase of net income over 1978-79 ranged from 20 to 41 in four of the districts i.e. Medak and Rangareddy (AP),)Kota (Rajasthan) Tehri Garhwal (UP). In Mehboobnagar and Santhal Parganas, the percentage increase was 147.73 and 93.39 respectively. However, there was a slight decrease of this percentage i.e. 2.05 in the case of Koraput (Orissa) perhaps due to four fold increase in the number of beneficiaries reporting net income.

8.65 In the year 1980-81 there was slight increase in the number of beneficiaries reporting income, hence the increase in net average income per family was also marginal. The average net income per family ranged from Rs. 67 to 129 in seven of the selected districts, these being Medak, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (AP), Monghyr (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Kota (Rajasthan) and Tehri Garhwal (UP). In Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Koraput (Orissa) this income was very high i.e. Rs. 201.06 and 385.00 respectively. In two of the districts i.e. Kalahandi (Orissa) and Kolar (Karnataka) the average net income was too low i.e. 35.50 and 43.33 respectively.

8.66 The percentage increase of net income in 1980-81, over 1978-79 ranged between 70 to 184 in three of the districts namely, Mehboobnagar (AP), Santhal Parganas (Bihar) and Kota (Rajasthan). In four more districts this percentage increase varied between 14 and 36, the districts being Medak and Rangareddy (AP), Koraput (Orissa) and Tehri Garwal (UP). The percentage increase in 1980-81 over 1979-80 was not much as compared to that over 1978-79. It was so because the income cannot go on increasing uniformly and in the same proportion every year, rather it becomes stationery and stable after 2-3 years and there can be a decrease also. Thus we find that the percentage increase in most of the districts ranged from 1 to 20 only. It was only in two districts i.e. Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka) that the percentage increase was as large as 71.93 and 41.47 respectively. The reason behind this high percentage increase was the late participation of the beneficiaries in the scheme i.e. in 1979-80. It may be observed that there was a decrease trend in three of the districts i.e. Rangareddy (AP), Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa).

8.67 It is disappointing to observe that in the majority of districts numbering 16 out of 18 the average monthly income per family (of the selected beneficiaries) was below 100. It was further noted that this income is as low as Rs. 35 in one of the districts namely, Mehboobnagar of Andhra Pradesh. The position was also not very encouraging during 1979-80 and 1980-81. During 1980-81 in one of the districts the average monthly income was just Rs. 68. If we work out the per capita income, per family it will be about Rs. 7 during 1978-79 and Rs. 14 in 1980-81. This indicates the utter failure of the implementing agencies in their rehabilitation efforts which seem to be half hearted.

8.68 The above discussions regarding rehabilitation schemes, their norms, selection criterion etc. indicates that in majority of cases enough efforts were not made to identify viable schemes/programmes for the rehabilitation of the released bonded labourers. In majority of cases, where land was allotted, it was reported to be not of good quality and was located generally far away from the houses of the bonded labourers. Except in few districts like Medak and Ranga Reddy (Andhra Pradesh), no irrigation facilities were made available to the beneficiaries as a result of which they were unable to utilise allotted land. Similarly, in a good number of cases where milch animals were provided, the breed was of improved variety which required clean surroundings, a shed to avoid extremes of temperature and good feeding arrangements besides, veterinary facilities. The absence of these requirements had resulted into not only affecting adversely the improved breed milch animals but also the economic conditions of the beneficiaries. In some cases, it was also reported that these animals died due to non-existence of longenial surroundings mentioned above. It could have been better if local breeds of animals were supplied to the released bonded labourers so that they could stand the local climate, rough handling and ordinary feeds. In few cases, it was also observed that the officers and beneficiaries are not clear about the nature of benefits as to whether it was a loan or a grant.

8.69 In several districts like Ranga Reddy, Santhal Parganas, Jabalpur, Monghyr and Koraput, the district authorities felt that the quantum of rehabilitation assistance of Rs. 4000 was totally inadequat and had suggested that an amount between Rs. 10000 to 15000 is a barest minimum if a bonded labourer is to be rehabilitated suitably. This is more so in the case of land based schemes where irrigation facilities and other inputs are required to be supplied.

CHAPTER IX

CREDIT FACILITIES

To ascertain whether the bonded labour was assisted by the various financial and cooperative societies for rehabilitation necessary information was collected in the beneficiary schedule and is analysed below :—

Membership of various cooperative societies

The following table indicates the distribution of beneficiaries according to membership of various cooperative societies such as agricultural cooperatives, multi-purpose cooperatives, milk cooperative and industrial cooperative society etc.

Name of the Cooperative Society	Number reporting Membership
1. Agricultural Cooperative Society . .	19
2. Multi-purpose/service society . . .	63
3. Milk Cooperative Society . . .	28
4. Industrial Cooperative Society . . .	62
5. Others	1
Number of beneficiaries as members of various cooperatives	185
Number reporting membership of any society	174

9.2 It will be seen that only 174 beneficiaries became members of the above societies. Eleven of the beneficiaries have become members of more than one society and hence the membership of various cooperative societies is 185. The actual number of beneficiaries who became the members of these societies is, however, only 174 and this works out to 22.25% of total of 782 selected beneficiaries.

9.3 It was also noted that none of the beneficiaries became member of the marketing cooperatives, poultry cooperatives and the consumer cooperatives.

9.4 Out of the 18 districts where the evaluation study was conducted there were 4 districts of Medak (Andhra Pradesh), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka) and Kota (Rajasthan) where the agricultural cooperative societies offered membership to the erstwhile bonded labourers. The number of beneficiaries in these districts was 4,6,1 and 8 respectively. The erstwhile bonded labourers became members of the multi-purpose/service cooperative societies in the districts of Ranga Reddy, Monghyr, Chitradurga, Kolar, Kalahandi, Koraput, Phulbani and Kota. The membership was maximum at 43 in the district of Koraput. Two beneficiaries were members of these socities in the district of Ranga Reddy and Chitradurga, four from Monghyr, three each from Kalahandi and Kota and one from Kolar and five from Phulbani districts. The beneficiaries from two district of Kolar in Karnataka and Raigarh in Madhy Pradesh were members of the milk cooperative society. The number of members was 3 and 25 respectively. The beneficiaries from the districts of Kota and Tehri Garhwal were members of the Industrial Cooperative Society. In respect of Industrial Cooperative Society in Kota it is understood that no benefit has flown from the formation of the society to the beneficiaries so far and the share money has simply been deposited in the bank. The membership of these societies in above two districts was 60 and 2 respctively. The district-wise details of membership may be seen in Appendix Table No. 9.1.

9.5 The year-wise membership of all the cooperative societies discussed in earlier paragraphs is indicated as below :

Distribution of beneficiaries according to year of becoming members

Year	No. of Membership	Percentages
Prior to 1975	5	2·87
1975 . . .	2	1·15
1976 . . .	8	4·60
1977 . . .	3	1·72
1978 . . .	15	8·62
1979 . . .	134	77·01
1980 . . .	9	5·17
1981 . . .	6	3·45
Total No. of Membership	182	104·59
No reporting Membership of any society . .	174	100·00

9.6 It will be seen that the highest number of membership of 134 or 77.01% was achieved in the year 1979. This was followed by 15 members in 1978, 9 in 1980 and 8 in 1976. It will be seen that the cooperative credit sector has not done much to involve the erstwhile bonded labour in becoming members of the various societies for helping them in their rehabilitation efforts. This may be due to lack of proper dissemination of information. The State-wise position of the year-wise membership may be seen in Appendix Table No. 9.2.

9.7 It will be seen that one beneficiary each from the district Medak and Ranga Reddy and Kolar became members of the cooperatives prior to 1975 while there were 2 beneficiaries from the

district of Santhal Parganas who became member in the year 1975. 8 beneficiaries became members of these cooperatives in 1976. Out of these 4 were from Monghyr, 2 each from Santhal Parganas and Phulbani. 2 beneficiaries from Kota and one from Tehri Garhwal became members in 1977. In 1978 there was increase in membership of cooperatives in the districts of Medak (Andhra Pradesh), Chitradurga (Karnataka) and Tehri Garhwal (UP).

9.8 In order to induce the earstwhile bonded labour to become members of the various cooperative societies to help them in their rehabilitation effort, attempts were made to induce them various agencies. The sources which induce the erstwhile bonded labour to become members are detailed below :

No. of reporting inducement given by various persons to become member of cooperatives

Name of the person who induced	No. reporting	Percentage
Another bonded labour . .	1	0·57
Someone from the village . .	11	6·32
His own caste leader . . .	2	1·15
Some Social worker . . .	Nil	..
Some Govt. Official . . .	152	87·36
Some research worker . . .	Nil	—
Others	18	10·34
Total	184	105·74
No. of beneficiaries reporting .	174	100·00

9.9 It will be seen from the above table that only 174 beneficiaries out of 782 selected for the study had reported inducement given to them by various sources to become members of the cooperative societies. It will be seen that State Government officials form the majority among the source for inducing the bonded labourers to become members. The percentage is 87.36. Other sources who induced the bonded labourers for this purpose were another bonded labour, someone from the village forming 6.32%, his own caste leader and some research workers. It is rather disappointing to note that no social worker or voluntary agency has been indicated as a source of inducement by the beneficiaries. This shows complete lack of involvement of these agencies in the task of rehabilitation of the bonded labour. In regard to the district-wise position it was observed that all these selected beneficiaries from the districts of Kolar, Jabalpur, Phulbani, Koraput, Kota and Tehri Garhwal reported Government officials as their source of inducement. The details of the other sources in various States may be seen in the Appendix Table No. 9.3.

9.10 In order to induce the bonded labourers for becoming members of the various cooperative societies some incentives were offered. The type of incentive and a number of beneficiaries involved may please be seen in the table below :

Type of incentives	No. of Beneficiaries	Percentages
Full Assistance towards sharemoney .	142	81·61
Share money in instalment . . .	4	2·30
Preferential treatment for availing facilities	16	9·20
Any other	7	4·02
No. of incentives offered . . .	169	97·13
No. of beneficiaries reporting . .	166	95·40
No incentives	8	4·60

9.11 It will be seen from the above table that about 166 beneficiaries out of 782 had reported some kind of incentive for becoming members of the cooperative society. The nature of incentives related to (i) full assistance towards share money (ii) share money in instalment and (iii) preferential treatment for availing facilities.

9.12 In regard to district-wise position it was seen that all the selected beneficiaries who became members of the cooperatives received full assistance towards share money as their incentive, in the districts of Santhal Parganas, Kalahandi, Koraput, Phulbani, Kota and Tehri Garhwal. The State-wise position may please be seen in Appendix Table No. 9.3.

9.13 Attempt was made to find out the ways in which the cooperative societies proved useful to the beneficiaries.

Distribution of beneficiaries reporting the ways in which the society proved useful is detailed below

Type of help	Number of beneficiaries	Percentages
Able to secure loan (cash) . . .	61	91·04
Able to secure loan (kind) . . .	8	11·94
Able to get good price for the produce	3	4·48
Get regular employment . . .	Nil	..
Received dividends on share money .	2	2·99
Any other	Nil	..
No. reporting type of help . . .	74	110·45
No. of beneficiaries reporting . .	67	100·00

9.14 It will be seen from the above table that 67 beneficiaries had reported various ways in which the society proved useful to them. This number is rather disappointing as compared to the total membership of 182. Majority of the beneficiaries numbering 61 had reported that they were able to secure cash loan while 8 of the beneficiaries have reported that they were able to secure loan in kind. Three beneficiaries had reported that they were able to get good price for the produce (Milk) from the societies. While two beneficiaries had reported that they received

dividents from share money. In regard to the districtwise situation it was found that the beneficiaries from districts of Medak and Ranga Reddy in Andhra Pradesh, Santhal Parganas in Bihar, Chitradurga in Karnataka, Kalahandi and Koraput in Orissa and Kota in Rajasthan (Agriculture Society) had benefitted by securing cash loans. Beneficiaries from the districts of Koraput had reported that all the members were getting facilities of loan in kind. The Statewise details may please be seen in Appendix Table No. 9.4.

9.15 Efforts were also made to collect information about the difficulties encountered by the beneficiaries in getting facilities from the societies. The difficulties faced by the beneficiaries are detailed below :

Reasons	Beneficiaries	Percentages
Loans not given	13	11·30
Procedure cumbersome	3	2·61
Rate of interest high	2	1·74
Products not fetching good price	Nil	0·00
Not functioning properly	28	24·35
Any other	69	60·00
Total	115	100·00

9.16 It will be observed that about 115 beneficiaries out of 174 had reported that the society was not proved useful due to various reasons. These related to loans not given, procedure cumbersome, rate of interest high, products not fetching good price and society is not functioning properly etc. It wil also be seen that 13 beneficiaries had reported that no loans were provided to the members by the society while 28 reported that the societies were not functioning properly. The State-wise details are given in Appendix Table No. 9.5.

9.17 In order to improve the system of providing assistance to the beneficiaries information relating to suggestions for improvement was collected and is given below :

Suggestions	Number of Beneficiaries	Percentages
Procedure should be simplified	9	5·17
Officials should be helpful	14	8·05
Loan should be disbursed quickly	4	2·30
Management should be improved	27	15·52
Services should be improved	2	1·15
Any other	66	37·93
No. of suggestions offered	122	70·12
No. of Beneficiaries offering suggestions	116	66·67
No. response	58	33·33

9.18 It will be seen that the suggestions tor improving related to (i) procedures should be simplified (ii) officials should be helpful (iii) loans should be distributed without delay (iv) management of the societies should be improved etc. The suggestions by beneficiaries in various States may be seen in Appendix Table No. 9.5.

9.19 It will be seen that the cooperative credit societies have not been able to do much in assisting the proper rehabilitation of the erstwhile bonded labourers. In regard to one of the societies, namely, the Kota Zila Bandhak Shramik Audogic Sehkari Samiti may be mentioned that this society has not been able to give any benefit to the target group so far. It is also reported that the society has not yet started even functioning for the benefit of the rehabilitated bonded labour.

CHAPTER X

IMPACT ON THE TARGET GROUP

Extent of Satisfaction After Rehabilitation

The beneficiaries were asked to comment whether they were fully satisfied, partially satisfied or not satisfied at all from the rehabilitation schemes to assess the overall impact of the rehabilitation schemes. Out of a total of 782 beneficiaries selected, 291, (37.2 percent) reported fully satisfied, 232 (29.7 percent), reported partially satisfied and 259 (33.1 percent) were not satisfied at all. Amongst the 18 districts studied, beneficiaries from eight districts reported a very high percentage of dissatisfaction so much so the Raigarh (M.P.) and Ganjam (Orissa) where only two beneficiaries were selected reported 100 percent dissatisfaction. In Periyar (Tamil Nadu) and Kota (Rajasthan) the percentage of beneficiaries dissatisfied were 98.3 and 78.3 percent respectively. In the other 4 districts the percentages of beneficiaries dissatisfied were 66.7 in Rangareddy (A.P.). 61.5 percent in Nalanda (Bihar), 71.4 percent in Phulbani (Orissa), and 59.1 percent in Kalahandi (Orissa). In the other 2 districts namely, Monghyr (Bihar) and Jabalpur (M.P.) the percentage of dissatisfaction was 49.1 and 41.4 percent respectively. In the remaining 6 districts the percentage of dissatisfaction ranged from as low as 3.3 to 15.0 percent. It may be pointed out that there was only one district namely, Chitradurga (Karnataka) where not a single beneficiary out of 60 selected showed complete dissatisfaction.

Reasons for dissatisfaction

10.2 All those beneficiaries who were either partially satisfied or not satisfied at all were asked to spell out the reasons for their dissatisfaction. The following reasons were offered by the selected beneficiaries :—

TABLE 10.1

Reasons for dissatisfaction from Schemes

Reasons offered	No. of Responses	Percentage
Not suitable to his background . .	32	6·5
Not sufficient for his needs . .	248	50·5
Quality of scheme not good . .	151	30·8
Not suited to his areas . . .	55	11·2
Others	52	10·6
Beneficiaries giving one response .	419	100·0
Total responses . . .	538	109·6

10.3 It could be seen from above that 419 selected beneficiaries out of a total of 782 who were either partially or wholly not satisfied with the schemes gave 538 responses for reasons of dissatisfaction which indicates that some beneficiaries gave more than one reason for their dissatisfaction.

10.4 The most important reason given by 50.5 percent of the dissatisfied beneficiaries was that the schemes given to them were not sufficient for their needs or in other words the size of the scheme like milch animals, goats, agricultural land etc. was not sufficient to earn living for the released bonded labour and his family. They naturally wanted that more milch animals, goats etc. should be provided instead of the present provision. This reason was given by 100 percent dissatisfied beneficiaries of districts Ganjam and Kalahandi (Orissa) 83 percent of Koraput (Orissa) and 78.2 percent, 76.9 percent and 60.0 percent of such beneficiaries from the 3 selected districts namely, Mehboobnagar, Medak and Rangareddy respectively of Andhra Pradesh. In other districts the percentage reporting this reason ranged from as high as 59.3 in Kota (Rajasthan) and as low as 3.3 percent in Periyar (Tamil Nadu).

10.5 The next most important reason given by about 31 percent of the beneficiaries was that the quality of scheme was not good. This actually meant that if it was allotment of land the quality of land was not good and as such could not be cultivated and it was supply of milch or draught animals the yield of milk was poor and the animals were weak. They wanted a better quality of land and animals so that the schemes could be of some use. This reason was given by 100 percent of the dissatisfied beneficiaries from Ganjam (Orissa) and as high as 73 percent, 66 percent in districts of Periyar (Tamil Nadu) and Chitradurga (Karnataka) respeciively. The other reasons were 'not suitable to his background' and 'not suited to his areas' which were given by 6.5 and 11.2 percent of the dissatisfied beneficiaries.

10.6 It could be stated that the rehabilitation assistance besides not being sufficient, it was not planned according to the background of the individuals and also of the areas and surrounding in which they lived. In other words there was lack of planning in the rehabilitation programme. Please see Appendix Table No. 10.1.

10.7 The selected beneficiaries were askd about their present employment status to know whether some of the so called released and rehabilitated beneficiaries were still working with the old masters and if so what could be the reasons. The following table gives the employment status of all the selected beneficiaries :

TABLE 10·2

Employment status of selected beneficiaries

Employment status	No. of beneficiaries reported	Percentage
Working with earlier master . .	49	6·3
Working with other villagers .	451	57·7
Working on Govt. works . . .	16	2·0
Self employed	300	38·7
Any other	31	4·0
Total responses	847	108·7
Total selected beneficiaries . . .	782	100·0

10.8 It could be seen that the total responses from the selected 782 beneficiaries were 847 which means that there were some beneficiaries who were placing two occupations on the same footing. The point of interest here is that about 39 percent of the beneficiaries reported that they were self employed and 6.3 percent reported that they were employed with the old masters. Even this percentage, though small, is a matter of concern because these 49 beneficiaries might have been outspoken and talked frankly whereas there could still be others who may be working with the old masters but not bold enough to say so. This is another factor which further indicates the failure of rehabilitation efforts which may be due to half hearted approach of the functionaries towards the programme.

10.9 The reasons for working with the old masters are summarised below :

TABLE 10·3

Reasons for working with old masters

Reasons	No. reporting	Percentage
1	2	3
Not really released . .	27	55·1
Regular work not available .	6	12·2
No owned homestead . . .	4	8·2
Taken fresh loan	3	6·1
Others	9	18·4
Total	49	100·0

10.10 It could be seen from above that out of a total of 49 beneficiaries who were still working with the old masters 27 (55%) reported that they were 'not really released' and these beneficiaries belonged to the districts of Monghyr and Nalanda in Bihar. The other beneficiaries, though small in number, came out with very important reasons. The only consolation, if at all, is that the main reason 'Taken fresh loan' due to which the system of bondage has been perpetuating was reported by only 3 beneficiaries. But there is a danger inherent to these so called rehabilitated bonded labourers who continue to stay in the house provided by the Master. Efforts are, therefore, required to be made to see that there is a homestead available or allotted to the released bonded labourers and regular work is available so that there is no need to take fresh loans and depend on the old master which might ultimately lead to bondage again. Almost all the beneficiaries indicated above belonged to Bihar State. The other reasons given by 9 beneficiaries were pressure from earlier master. Only one out of 9 said that is he was working with his earlier master because he is being treated as a member of family.

10.11 As per table 10.2 and 10.3 there were still 49 beneficiaries working with the earlier masters and about 27 of them mentioned that they were not really released. Even these numbers may appear small but should be a matter of great concern to the State Governments because only a few of them who were bold enough could express their opinions frankly whereas there could be many more cases of labourers working with the old master or may not have been released so far. This may, therefore, indicate only a tip of the iceberg and there may be several cases of relapsing into bondage. This situation, therefore, indicates the stronghold of the brutal system of inhuman bondage in the rural areas. We, therefore, recommend that the Govt. of India should direct the States to resort to identification as well as follow up action on a continuing basis till the time this shameful and inhuman system becomes a thing of the past.

10.12 It is, however, heartening to note that although there were 162 beneficiaries (20.7 percent) of the total selected who had no homestead of their own, only 4 beneficiaries were working with their old masters for want of this facility. As the necessity of homestead was realised and could ultimately lead to relapsing into bondage, these 162 beneficiaries who had no homestead of their own were asked to give their preferences for the case the homesteads were allotted to them. About 94 percent reported that they would prefer a homestead within the village of their present abode. The main reason for this was that they did not want to leave this old association. This is a good feedback and provides a basis for Planning for housing of the ex-bonded labour released under the 20 Point Programme.

Awareness of Human Rights :

10.13 For finding out the general impact of the rehabilitation schemes, the beneficiaries were asked to comment whether they were leading an honourable life or they had any fear to go back

into bondage again ? About 92 percent of the selected beneficiaries reported that they were leading an honourable life after the release and rehabilitation because there was no restrictions on them now and could breath in free air (58 percent), could earn more (51 percent) and could think about the future (9 percent). There were only 8 percent of the selected beneficiaries who reported that they were not leading an honourable life. These beneficiaries belonged to the States of Bihar (Monghyr and Nalanda districts), Karnataka (Chitradurga and Kolar districts), Madhya Pradesh (Jabalpur district) and Tamil Nadu (Pariyar district). The main reasons given by these beneficiaries were as follows :—

TABLE 10·4

Reasons for not leading honourable life

Reasons	No. reporting	Percentage
1	2	3
Earnings from schemes not sufficient .	19	29·69
Earlier master exerted pressure .	13	20·13
Has to depend on ex-master for petty needs	8	12·50
Employment not sufficient . .	4	6·25
Others . .	22	31·37
Total	66	103·12
No. reporting not leading honourable life	64	100·00

10.14 It could be seen from above that although the number of beneficiaries reporting not leading an honourable life was 64 but the total responses/reasons given are 66 which indicates that one or two beneficiaries have given more than one reason for their misery.

Fear of going back to bondage

10.15 In view of the socio-economic problems and the type of rehabilitation schemes, it was felt necessary to find out from the selected beneficiaries whether there was any fear with them to go back to bondage again Out of a total of 782 selected beneficiaries only 49 or 6.3 per cent expressed a fear of going back to bondage again. The real number could be much higher than what the limited evaluation study could find. The reasons expressed by them were as follows :—

TABLE 10·5

Reasons for fear of going back to bondage

Reasons	Number	Percentage
1	2	3
Earnings not sufficient . . .	11	22·5
Has to depend on ex-master for petty needs	6	12·2
Earlier master still exerts pressure .	14	28·6
Any other	18	36·7
Total	49	100·0

Expenditure on items other than food, clothing, jewellery, assets etc. as indicator of socio-economic change

10.15 The bgeneficiaries were asked to say whether they had been able to spend some money now on items on which they were not able to spend earlier to rehabilitation. The responses received are as follows :—

TABLE 10·6

No. of beneficiaries incurring expenditure on item after rehabilitation

Items of Expenditure	No.	Percentage
1	2	3
Education of children	48	6·1
Social functions	173	22·1
Visit to religious places . . .	33	4·2
Visit to relatives	199	25·4
Entertainment	47	6·0
Medicines	178	22·8
No expenditure on any of the above items	179	22·9
Any other	89	11·4
Total selected beneficiaries . . .	782	100·0

10.17 It could be seen from above that about 23 percent of the beneficiaries reported that they were not able to spend any money on any of the items like education of children, social functions, visit to religious places, visit to relatives, entertainment, medicines etc. whereas 77 percent beneficiaries reported that they were able to spend some money on either one or a combination of these items. The most important items on which they were able to spend some money now were visit to relatives reported by 25.4 percent, medicines (22.8 percent), social functions (22.1 percent). This is an indicator of mobility which was absent during the days of unhuman bondage.

10.18 It is again painful and disappointing to state that within the districts there was only 1 district namely, Nalanda (Bihar) again from where all the selected beneficiaries reported that they were not able to spend any money on any of the above mentioned items. The maximum percentage of beneficiaries reporting no expenditure on these items were from Monghyr (Bihar—63 percent), Phulbani (Orissa—43 percent), Koraput (Orissa—42 percent), Kota (Rajasthan—45 percent) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.—40 percent). Amongst the top three items i.e. visit to relatives, medicines and social functions, the 72 percent beneficiaries from Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh) and 70 percent beneficiaries from Periyar (Tamil Nadu) reported having made some expenditure on visits to relatives. Social functions got the maximum priority in the districts of Bhagalpur (Bihar) and Kolar (Karnataka) where 48 percent beneficiaries reported having spent some money on this item. The health care got maxiximum

priority in the districts of Mehboobnagar (Andhra Pradesh) and Chitradurga (Karnataka), where 63 percent and 95 percent beneficiaries reported expenditure on medicines.

10.19 In order to find out the overall financial dependence of the selected beneficiaries, sources of monetary help in the event of shortfall was probed into. Out of a total of 782 selected beneficiaries only 46 percent reported that the earnings from all sources were sufficient to meet the day today requirements of the family. Of the 54 percent beneficiaries who reported that earnings were not sufficient, the sources of help to make good the shortfall are given in the following table :—

TABLE 10·7

Sources of Monetary help by those reporting earnings not sufficient

Source of help	No. reporting	Percentage
1	2	3
Borrowings from landlords/moneylender	49	11·6
Borrowings from friends . . .	88	20·9
Borrowings from relatives . . .	105	24·9
Going without meal . . .	121	28·7
Begging	2	0·5
Others	80	19·0
Total	440	105·6
No. reporting earnings not sufficient .	421	100·0

10.20 It may be seen from the above table that some beneficiaries have given more than one source of monetary help as the responses are more than the number of beneficiaries reporting. The main source of help is through borrowings either from money lender, friends or relatives. A sizeable number (28.7 percent) reported that they would go without a meal in the event of shortfall in the earnings. The beneficiaries (57 percent) depending upon borrowings are open to the danger of going back to bondage since there seems to be no capacity to repay the loans once taken. In the long-run when the beneficiaries are not able to repay to their friends and relatives, they may have to resort to the borrowings from moneylender to clear off the loans of friends and relatives thereby entering into near bondage again. There is, therefore, a need to strengthen the financial condition of rehabilitated bonded labourers by giving them more viable schemes. Begging and going without meals are again the evidences of failure of the rehabilitation assistance.

10.21 Amongst the selected districts all the selected beneficiaries from Raigarh (M.P.), Ganjam (Orissa) and Pariyar (Tamil Nadu) reported that the earnings were not adequate. The other districts from where beneficiaries reported inadequate earnings were Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh 62 and 75 percent), Nalanda & Santhal Parganas (Bihar—92 and 68 percent), Kolar (Karnatak—72 percent), Jabalpur (M.P.—72 percent), Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa—86 percent each), and Kota (Rajasthan—83 percent). In the remaining 6 districts the percentage of beneficiaries reporting earnings not adequate ranged from as low as 6 percent in Tehri Garhwal (U.P.) and as high as 33 percent in Medak (Andhra Pradesh). Please see Appendix Table No. 10.2.

10.22 The only two sources of alternative monetary arrangements were borrowings and going without meals to fill the gap between earnings and expenditure. In Bihar a very high percentage of such beneficiaries reported that they were going without meals—62 percent from Bhagalpur, 60 percent from Monghyr and 42 percent from Nalanda. Similarly, 40 percent and 60 percent reported going without meals from Chitradurga and Kolar of Karnataka State. In Koraput (Orissa) 75 percent of these beneficiaries reported that they substantiate the shortfall in earnings through going without meals. In other districts the percentage ranged between 5 percent to 33 percent.

Position of Indebtedness before and after rehabilitation

10.23 For finding the impact of the rehabilitation schemes, the position of indebtedness was studied before and after rehabilitation. The position emerges as in the following table.

TABLE 10·8

Position of Loan outstanding before and after rehabilitation—Agencywise

Name of agency	Loans outstanding			
	Before rehabilitation		After rehabilitation	
	No. reporting	Percentage	No. reporting	Percentage
1	2	3	4	5
Moneylender/Landlord	142	18·2	68	8·7
Friends . . .	2	0·3	8	1·0
Relatives . .	3	0·4	11	1·4
Cooperatives . .	2	0·3	24	3·1
Govt. Agencies .	3	0·4	10	1·3
Any other . .	0	0·0	14	1·8
Total . . .	152	29·6	135	17·3
Total selected beneficiaries	782	100·0	782	100·0

10.24 It may be seen from above that there were about 30 percent beneficiaries out of a total of 782 selected who were having loans outstanding from one agency or the other. Before rehabilitation the major agency being moneylender/landlord. But on the date of visit only 17.3 percent had loans outstanding. This could be taken to mean that about 12 percent beneficiaries could repay their old debts out of the earnings of the rehabilitation schemes. Another

trend observable from above table is that dependence of money lender/landlord was becoming less and dependence on other sources was growing particularly friends, relatives and cooperatives. This shift in dependence could also mean greater confidence amongst the beneficiaries as well as their credibility with their friends, relatives and cooperatives. It is, however, disappointing that majority of the beneficiaries numbering about 68 or 50 percent out of 135 still depended on the landlords for meeting their credit needs.

Reactions of influential people about the programme (as reported by the beneficiaries).

10.25 The bonded labourers who were released and rehabilitated had good opinion about the programme. It was, however, felt necessary to find out the views of the well to do and influential persons in the village on the programme. The beneficiaries were asked to comment about their group reactions. towards the rehabilitation programme. The table below gives the position of all the selected beneficiaries.

TABLE 10·9

Reactions of well off and influential villagers about the programme

Reaction	No. reporting	Percentage
1	2	3
Good	195	24·9
Indifferent	199	24·5
Negative	380	48·6
No knowledge . . .	8	1·0
Total	782	100·0

10.26 It may be seen from above that about 50 percent of the beneficiaries reported that the well off and influential villagers did not like the programme of release and rehabilitation. This could be due to the setback they might have suffered in getting the easily available cheap labour in the form of bonded labourer. This section of the beneficiaries reflect the unhelpful and exploitative attitude of a section of the society towards the former bonded labour. About 25 percent of the beneficiaries however, reported that there were also some villagers who had a good opinion of the programme and another 25 percent were found to be indifferent opinion.

10.27 Amongst the districts, very high negative reaction was reported from 6 districts namely, Mehboobnagar (91.7 percent), Rangareddy (80.0 percent), Nalanda (92.6 percent) Chitradurga (98.3 percent). Santhal Parganas (78.0 percent) and Koraput (52.1 percent). In the remaining 12 districts the negative reaction reported ranged from as low as 1.7 percent from Tehri Garhwal to 48.3 percent from Jabalpur. Regarding the good reaction, Monghyr district of Bihar was at the top with 75.4 percent followed by Periyar of Tamil Nadu with 60 percent beneficiaries reporting good reaction from the well off and influential persons. On the other extreme there was no one reporting good reaction from 7 districts namely, Nalanda (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka), Jabalpur (M.P.), Raigarh (M.P.), Ganjam, Kalanandi and Phulbani (Orissa). In the remaining 9 districts the good reaction ranged from 1.7 percent in Mehboobnagar & Santhal Parganas to 51.7 percent in Medak (Andhra Pradesh). Please see appendix table No. 10.3.

Social disabilities and prejudices

10.28 The selected beneficiaries were asked to comment whether there was any social disabilities or prejudices with the villagers due to which they might be handicapped in getting employment or in fitting into the existing social environment after release and rehabilitation. Out of a total 782 beneficiaries selected only 230 i.e. 29.4 percent offered any type of response. In 3 districts namely, Raigarh (M.P.) Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa) there was no selected beneficiary who reported any social disability or prejudices. The highest percentage was reported from Ganjam (100%) and Nalanda (81%) and Santhal Paraganas (83%). The responses are shown in the table below:

TABLE 10·10

Beneficiaries reporting social disabilities and prejudices

Social disabilities/Prejudicies	No. reporting	Percentage
1. Looked down upon because he belonged to lower caste/Scheduled Castes	147	63·9
2. Looked down upon because he belonged to lower economic status .	47	20·4
3. Prejudiced because of untouchability	34	14·8
4. Looked down upon because he was a bonded labourer earlier . . .	16	7·0
5. Any other	6	12·6
Total responses . . .	250	118·7
No. of beneficiaries offereing responses	230	100·0

10.29 It may be seen from above that about 64 percent beneficiaries out of 230 reported that they were handicapped and looked down upon by the society because they belonged to lower castes and Scheduled Castes. This reason was most prominent in 7 districts namely, Bhagalpur and Monghyr (Bihar) with 100 percent each, Nalanda (Bihar) with 75 percent, Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka) with 87.5 and 80.9 percent respectively, Jabalpur (M.P.) with 70 percent and Periyar (Tamil Nadu) with 63.6 percent beneficiaries reporting the disability. This indicates that besides suffering as a bonded labourer, these unfortunate persons also suffered from the disabilities attached to untouchability and low caste. In 4 districts namely, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Ganjam (Orissa), Kota (Rajasthan) there was no beneficiary who reported that they had any social handicap or

prejudice. The other districts were in between these two extremes. It is a matter of great satisfaction that only 16 beneficiaries or 7 percent of those reporting prejudices reported that they were being looked down upon because they were earlier bonded labourers. These responses were repoted from 5 districts namely, Periyar (Tamil Nadu), Kolar (Karnataka), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Ganjam (Orissa) and Kota (Rajastnan). The handicap due to untouchability was reported by 14.8 percent beneficiaries from 5 districts namely, Medak (Andhra Pradesh), Bhagalpur and Monghyr (Bihar), Chitradurga (Karnataka) and Jabalpur (M.P.). About 20 percent beneficiaries reported that they were being looked down upon because of lower economic status. These beneficiaries were from 11 districts namely, Medak, Mehboobnagar and Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (M.P.), Ganjam and Koraput (Orissa), Periyar (Tamil Nadu), Kota Rajasthan) and Tehri Garhwal (U.P.).

Suggestions for overcoming social handicaps and prejudices

10.30 All those who had reported some social handicaps were in turn asked to give suggestions, if any, to solve these problems. The suggestions are shown in the following table :

TABLE 10·11

Suggestions for overcoming the social handicaps and prejudices

Suggestions	No. reporting	Percentage
People who discriminate should be punished	89	38·7
Social education programme be speeded up	56	24·4
All castes and communities should meet at one place	27	11·7
Voluntary organisations should be encouraged	19	8·3
Help of religious heads/groups to enlighten people	7	3·0
No suggestions	24	10·4
Others	15	6·5
Total suggestions	237	103·3
No. of beneficiaries offereing suggestions	230	100·0

10.31 The most important suggestion brought forward was that people who discriminate between one caste and other between one status and other should be punished. This suggestion was given by about 39 percent of those who had hinted socal disabilities. This reason was given by the beneficiaries from 8 districts namely, Medak (Andhra Pradesh), Bhagalpur, Monghyr and Nalanda (Bihar), Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (M.P.) and Pariyar (Tamil Nadu). Except two districts namely, Bhagalpur and Monghyr (Bihar) where percentage reported was 100, in the remaining districts it ranged between 25 to 80%. The other suggestions were social education be speeded up, all castes and communities should meet at one place, voluntary organisations should be encouraged and help of religious heads/groups to enlighten people should be taken for removing the social handicaps prevailing in the society. About 10 percent beneficiaries could not offer any suggestions.

10.32 Among the selected districts, it was found that beneficiaries from 6 districts namely, Nalanda, Santhal Parganas, Chitradurga, Jabalpur, Periyar and Tehri Garhwal had suggested that social education programme may be started to overcome social disabilities and prejudices. The percentages ranged between 14.29 to 50.00. Beneficiaries from the districts of Nalanda, Santhal Parganas, Jabalpur and Periyar had suggested that voluntary organisations should be encouraged. The percentage ranged between 14.29 to 18.37. Beneficiaries from six districts namely, Nalanda, Santhal Pargana, Chitradurga, Kolar, Jabalpur and Periyar had suggested that all castes and communities should meet at one place to discuss social disabilities and prejudices. The percentages ranged between 6.12 to 28.57. Some of the beneficiaries from the districts of Santhal Parganas, Kolar and Periyar had suggested that help of religious heads/groups may be taken to enlighten the people against such social practices. The percentages reported was 6.1, 4.8 and 9.1 respectively.

Pressure of ex-master to work as bonded labour

10.33 With a view to find out the attitude of the ex-master, effectiveness of the official machinery and the helplessness of the freed and rehabilitated bonded labourers, the beneficiaries were asked to state whether there were any pressure on them to go back to the ex-masters as bonded labourers. Out of a total of 782 selected beneficiaries, only 48 i.e. 6.1 percent reported that they were under pressure from the ex-master to return to them as bonded labourers. These beneficiaries belonged to 6 districts out of 18 selected namely, Monghyr (42 percent), Nalanda (73 percent), Bhagalpur (2 percent) and Santhal Parganas (2 percent) from Bihar, Kolar (3 percent) from Karnataka and Kota (2 percent) from Rajasthan. Incidentally, the majority of beneficiaries reporting pressure belong to the State of Bihar which is a backward state with deep rooted evil practice of keeping bonded labour. There is, therefore, a great need for the State Government to keep a strict vigil to avoid any lapsing back of the released bonded labour into bondage again. When asked whether any official protection was available to save them from coercion and pressures, all the beneficiaries from Bihar State belonging to 4 selected districts reported that they had no protection from Govt. agencies like police, block development officer, revenue department or department of labour. Some fact was revealed by the lone beneficiaries from Kota (Rajasthan). This shows the utter indifference on the part of the Govt. as well as society to the problem of bonded labour in these States. From

the one remaining district namely, Kolar (Karnataka) the beneficiaries reported that protection was available from Police, Block and Revenue Departments.

Reasons for 'no help' in overcoming social disabilities and pressure from ex-master

10.34 As discussed in the earlier paragraphs some beneficiaries had reported that they had suffered due to some social disabilities and handicaps and some had hinted that there was a great pressure from the ex-master to go back to them as bonded labour again. All such beneficiaries were asked whether there was some help forthcoming to solve these problems or not. Out of a total of 243 beneficiaries responding only 44 or 18.1 percent of those reported that there was some help available to them in the form of police and other protectors organising camps for social enlightenment and individual contacts for better understanding. Majority of those in distress i.e. 81.9 percent of these responding were in turn asked to comment about reasons for 'no help' coming to them. The table below gives the reasons :

TABLE 10·12

Reasons for 'no help' in overcoming social disabilities and pressure from ex-master

Item	No. reporting	Percentage
Helped	44	18·1
Not helped	199	81·9
Total no. responded	243	100·0
Reasons for 'no help'		
People at helm of affairs not serious	37	18·6
Higher caste people more influential	93	46·7
Others	12	6·0
No knowledge	57	28·7
Total	199	100·0

10.35 It could be seen from above that about 29 percent of the beneficiaries could not say anything about the reasons for the bureaucracy not coming to their help. Of the 82 percent who responded. 47 percent claimed that higher caste people exerted great influence within the village and outside with the bureaucracy so that their problems remained as they were. Another about 19 per cent reported that the people at this helm of affairs were not serious in solving the problems confronted by them. About 6 percent gave other reasons. Those who gave 'higher caste people exerted great influence' as this reason belonged to 9 districts namely, Medak (Andhra Pradesh), Bhagalpur, Monghyr Nalanda and Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu). Those reporting 'people at the helm of affairs not serious' as the reasons were from 6 districts namely, Medak (Andhra Pradesh), Santhal Parganas (Bihar), Chitradurga and Kolar (Karnataka), Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh) and Periyar (Tamil Nadu).

10.36 In view of the above observations of the selected beneficiaries it is imperative that sincere and committed officers should be posted to handle this delicate and deep rooted problem so that people do not fall into the clutches of ex-masters and moneylenders again and also it is essential that new landless labourers do not become a prey of the system of bonded labour.

Follow-up Action by State/District Authorities

10.37 It was observed during the evaluation study that by and large there were no specific staff or specific arrangements for follow up action in regard to (i) watching the progress of rehabilitation assistance to the ex-bonded labourers or (ii) to protect them from relapsing into bondage. This is evident from Table 10.3 and 10.4 vide paragraphs 10.9, 10.13 and 10.14.

Impact of Modernisation on bonded labour system

10.38 In order to assess as to whether there is any impact of modernisation in terms of electrification of villages, increase in irrigation facilities due to tubewells, pumpsets etc. and literacy, on the bonded labour system in the selected villages, data on 16 items (vide Table 10.13) relevant to accelerated rural development including items of modern amenities was collected and analysed.

10.39 It was observed that the number of tubewells possessed tend to show quite close association with the percentage of household keeping bonded labourers. Likewise the number of electric tubewells possessed also indicates quite striking relationship with the percentage of households keeping bonded labourers even now in the villages studied. It was also observed that no worthwhile relationship could be established between the remaining 15 variables and households who kept bonded labourers earlier. The analysis, however, clearly indicates that increase in irrigation facilities is accompanied with the percentage of households keeping bonded labourers at least in the selected villages studied. The analysis tends to show that the impact of modernisation in terms of electrification, irrigation facilities, literacy rates etc. has no positive effect on the reduction of bonded labour system in the selected villages. This indicates that even intellectual advancement in terms of education has also no effect on the village landlords who continued to keep bonded labour. This may be contrary to the assumption that modernisation may reduce bonded labour.

10.40. From the table it is observed that among the eight States selected for the evaluation of Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Rehabilitation of Bonded Labour, Bihar stands at the top where 19% of the households of the selected villages kept bonded labourers earlier and 7% of the households are still keeping bonded labourers inspite of its vast irrigated area and good infrastructure. In this State 55% of the total cultivated area of the selected villages is

irrigated and there are 150 tubewells, 142 pumpsets, 141 electric tubewells and 4% of the total cultivated area is under mechanised cultivation. In addition to this the selected villages of this State are having 69 improved agricultural implements, 6 small scale industries, 145 shops and establishments, 251 domestic connections and 16 commercial connections. The literacy rate of these selected villages range between 1% to 40% and the average literacy rate is 22%. The selected villages of Andhra Pradesh rank second where 2% of the households are still keeping bonded labourers and 4% of the households were keeping bonded labourers earlier. In these villages only 12% of the total cultivated area is irrigated and there are 1211 pumpsets, 23 electric tubewells. There are 185 shops and establishments, 754 domestic and 49 commercial connections. In Uttar Pradesh, 18% of the households in the selected villages were keeping bonded labourer earlier but at present the bonded labourers are not existant in those villages. The selected villages of Uttar Pradesh have very low irrigated area (8%) and have little modern amenities. Although the selected villages of Karnataka having high literacy rate (41%) irrigated area (17%) and fairly good infrastructure yet 3% of the households in the selected villages were keeping bonded labourers earlier.

10.14 The households in the selected villages of other States viz. Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Tamil Nadu do not keep bonded labourers now. The sitiuation in other parts of these States needs study.

10.42 Inspite of the availability of irrigation facility and other modern amenities there is hardly any significant reduction in the number of bonded labourers. On the contrary households having amenities like tubewell etc. tend to keep bonded labour. Perhaps the land-owners having tubewells also require more and perhaps cheap labour as Bonded Labour for their agricultural operation. The situation in the selected villages of Andhra Pradesh is just the reverse. In this case absence of irrigation and other facilities is accompanied by the existence of Bonded Labour. In other words Bonded Labour exists both in the presence and absence of modernisation. Hence there may be other factors like particular social system or the attitude of the society in various areas which may be responsible for this system.

10.43 Since this is a very limted study based on inadequate data and attempted within the available resources and constraints a more sociological survey is needed to study the mental attitude of the people who continue to keep bonded labour even after 36 years of independence and when significant progress in scientific fields and modern development has been achieved.

TABLE 10·13

State	Percentage of House Holds keeping bonded labourers	Percentage of House Holds kept bonded labourers	Irrigated Area	Area under mechanized cultivation	No. of Tractors	No. of Tube-wells	No. of pump sets	No. of improved Agri. *Implements	No. Small scale Industries	No. of shops establishments	Electricity: Tube-well connection	Electricity: Domestic connection	Electricity: Commercial connection	Literacy %	Cultivators House holds keeping/kept bonded labour
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Andhra Pradesh	1·74	4·14	11·81	0·22	7	1	1211	45	30	185	23	754	49	14·88	65·79
Bihar	7·11	19·12	54·86	4·11	10	150	142	69	6	145	141	251	16	21·90	41·70
Karnataka	0·00	3·16	17·16	12·46	21	40	276	510	20	62	40	1050	36	41·42	52·80
Madhya Pradesh	0·00	1·09	5·14	1·26	4	..	72	2	9	85	5	406	19	36·42	17·80
Orissa	0·00	1·08	13·14	..	5	4	11	40	3	105	5	50	49	18·37	23·00
Tamil Nadu	0·00	2·16	1·61	..	1	..	42	385	4	65	..	299	10	16·37	48·50
Uttar Pradesh	0·00	18·07	9·39	..	..	..	..	3	9	31	..	13	4	21·88	60·40
Districts	**State : Andhra Pradesh**														
Medak	3·46	5·09	17·02	..	3	1	496	13	3	79	1	308	20	14·32	73·66
Mehboobnagar	0·93	3·38	10·15	..	1	..	570	18	15	65	22	326	14	14·64	69·80
Rangareddy	0·00	3·72	10·49	1·13	3	..	145	14	12	41	..	120	15	16·10	78·10
Districts	**State : Bihar**														
Bhagalpur	0·00	7·70	61·67	0·20	1	..	43	4	2	31	15	25	11	14.29	23·20
Monghyr	1·29	14·26	61·42	6·43	..	17	58	9	1	19	30	1	1	12·38	46·10
Nalanda	31·52	32·95	62·47	16·16	9	131	21	54	3	30	93	23	4	35·66	54·30
Santhal Parganas	0·00	26·75	12·40	0·00	..	2	20	2	..	65	3	202	9	30·96	52·10

CHAPTER XI

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS AND ACTION PLANS

Perspective

The problem of bonded labour was being felt in the country even before independence. Some concerted efforts were made to prohibit the use of forced labour in the thirties in accordance with the ILO Convention of 1930. But a serious view was taken only after independence by making special provision in the constitution vide article 23.

2. The practice of bonded labour has been made a socio-economic offence under the Bonded Labour Abolition Act 1976. The basic ingredients of the offence are (a) Denial of freedom to participate in the labour market, (b) Denial of freedom of movement to any part of country and (c) Explotation of the innocent labourers and its family members under customary and debt conditions. The main source of the estimates of bonded labour are (a) Identifications made by State Government, (b) surveys undertaken by the NSSO and (c) Survey by Gandhi Peace Foundation and National Labour Institute. The estimates prepared by these agencies are 1.5 lakhs by State Governments, 4.5 lakhs by NSSO in 15 States and 26.17 lakhs by Gandhi Peace Foundation in 10 States. The estimates of bonded labour as discussed above vary significantly due to difference in coverage, concepts and methodology vide details given in Appendix 1.2. In view of the different estimates there is a need to have a fresh survey in all the States including those who have not declared bonded labour but have bonded labour according to the NSSO. (Paras 1.2 and 1.3).

(Action State Govts. concerned, Ministry of Labour and NSSO).

THE PEO EVALUATION STUDY, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

3. The main objective of the Bonded Labour Scheme, was to identify, release and rehabilitate the bonded labour both under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme as well as under the ongoing schemes of the State Governments. In its 5th meeting held on 9th January 1979, the Screening Committee recommended that the working of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for rehabilitation of bonded labour should be evaluated so that corrective measures, if required, could be identified and applied in the formulation of the suitable future policy for the scheme. The Ministry of Labour, therefore, requested the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission to conduct urgently such an evaluation study. (Para 2.1. and 2.3).

Objectives

4. The main objective of the evaluation study was to find out the extent to which the aims of the scheme to identify, free and rehabilitate the bonded labour have been fulfilled with particular reference to :

(a) the administrative arrangements made at various levels for the implementation of the schemes to identify, release and rehabilitate the freed bonded labour;

(b) the detailed contents of the various schemes and the extent to which they have been implemented;

(c) the impact of the various schemes towards the rehabilitation of the bonded labourers in terms of employment and income generated to the released persons;

(d) the administrative support being given and the follow up methods adopted to prevent the lapsing back of the bonded labourers into bondage;

(e) to study the impact of the programmes in bringing about any social change in the life and living conditions of the beneficiaries and the village community, and

(f) extent of integration of the released labour in the mainstream of the village community. (Para 2.4).

5. The study was conducted in 8 States, 18 districts (in which the Centrally Sponsored Scheme was being implemented), 38 blocks, 112 villages and 782 beneficiaries were selected for detailed canvassing (para 2.5).

6. The main instruments of observation followed were (i) State/District level guide-points-cum-questionnaire, (ii) Village Level Schedule and (iii) Beneficiary Schedule (Para 2.12).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

7. Administration

(i) The officials of the Revenue Department who were equipped with judicial and administrative powers, were more effective in identification and release of bonded labour. It is, therefore, recommended that for effective implementation of the programme, the identification and release of bonded labour should be dealt with in the Revenue Department and rehabilitation aspect under various schemes in the social welfare department, as far as possible (para 3.3).

(Action all State Governments and Ministry of Labour).

(ii) At district level the District Collectors or Deputy Commissioners were dealing with the

subject. At lower levels namely, taluka subdivision of block the BDO, SDO, Tehsildar or labour inspector look after the rehabilitation programme of bonded labour. It was, however, observed that the staff of the labour department in Bihar was not effective in dealing with this problem. (Para 3.4) (Action Government of Bihar).

(iii) The vigilance Committees have played an important role in the implementation of the programme. These committees should be constituted in all the districts and divisions wherever they have not been constituted so far. Efforts should also be made to see that the meetings of the Vigilance Committees are held regularly for reviewing the pace of rehabilitation schemes. It was also observed that in one district of Orissa the non-official members did not take interest in the working of the Vigiliance Committees. The reasons for their indifferent attitude should be found out and remedial measures taken. It is also recommended that attempt should also be made to nominate only active and committed members to serve on the vigilance committees. (Paras 3.7, 3.9 and 3.10) (Action State Governments).

(iv) In regard to the Statutory Registers giving details of the bonded labour, it was observed that these were not maintained in some districts and wherever they were maintained, they were not maintained satisfactorily. Discrepancies were also found in records. Since these registers contain vital and basic information about the bonded labour, these should be kept upto date and maintained systematically. (Para 3.12) (Action State Governments).

BONDAGE

8. It is difficult to trace the origin of bonded labour as the system is continuing from generations in India. However, on the basis of available informtaion collected during the study its origin and perpetuation could be traced to mainly (a) economic compulsions, coupled with social customs and traditions (b) customary and traditional bondage and (c) contractual bondage. The moneylenders took full advantage of the economic conditions and social obligations of the poor peasants and advanced small loans from time to time. As these labourers could never free themselves from the vicious circle of poverty they had to perpetuate the bondage. The indebtedness became an economic inevitability and bondage a way of life to majority of them. (Para 4.1).

9. It was observed that Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes together formed 83.2 per cent of the total selected beneficiaries. The rest belong to backward and other classes. The percentage of female selected beneficiaries was a meagre 4.2 per cent. It was also observed that the States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karanataka and U.P. had the highest number of Scheduled Castes bonded labour. Their respective percentage being 80.5, 70.8, 80.5 and 91.7. On the other hand there was concentration of Scheduled Tribes beneficiaries in the remaining States of Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Tamil Nadu. Their percentage being 71, 65.8, 86.7 and 45 respectively in these States. It is recommended that the State concerned should integrate the rehabilitation programme with the special component plan and Tribal Sub-plan, so that scope of rehabilitation assistance is enlarged (Para 4.14). (Action All States, Ministries of Labour, Home and Planning).

10. Prior to bondage 68.79 per cent beneficiaries were labourers, 11.65 percent cultivators, 4.19 per cent having animal husbandry as occupation, 1.86 as artisans and 13.3 per cent as others. During bondage the percentage of beneficiaries working as labourers went upto 90.92 per cent followed by 1.66 in animal husbandry and 7.03 per cent in other occupations like hiring of bullocks and grazing of cattles. It will be observed that there was considerable shift in occupation in terms of increase in the percentage of beneficiaries working as labourers during bondage. There was, however, some impact of rehabilitation after the beneficiaries were released and rehabilitated. Thus presently 67.39 per cent beneficiaries were working as labourers followed by 16.24 per cent as cultivators, 5.24 per cent in animal husbandry, 2.43 per cent in traditional village services like Barbar, washermen, sweepers etc. while 7.93 per cent were working in occupation as hiring of bullocks and grazing of cattles. (Para 4.22 and 4.24).

11. It was observed that 43 percent of the selected beneficiaries were bonded when they were less than 15 years of age. So much so that more than 8 per cent of them were of less than 10 years of age. There were 38 per cent of beneficiaries who were bonded between age of 15 and 25 years and the remaining 19 per cent between 25 to 55. It will thus be seen that the masters preferred young persons as bonded labourers as they could work harder and longer. (Para 4.30).

12. The longivity of the period and bondage could be an indicator of the depth to which the system of bondage was rooted. It was thus observed that about 72 per cent of the selected beneficiaries had remained in bondage for 5 years and above while about 25 per cent remained in bondage for 20 years and above Statewise it was observed that quite a high percentage of beneficiaries had come out of the clutches of bondage after 20 years and more in the States like Bihar and UP. This may lead to the conclusion that the system of bonded labour may be oldest in these States. On the contrary the system is comparatively of recent origin in the States of Orissa and Andhra Pradesh as about 90 per cent and 46 per cent of the selected beneficiaries respectively remained in bondage for less than 5 years in these two States. There is, however, a need for further research to determine the causes for varying durations.

(Paras 4.32 and 4.33).

(Action Ministry of Labour, Planning and Home).

13. As regards the cause of bondage it was revealed that about 98 per cent of the beneficiaries were bonded due to indebtedness while there were about 2 per cent who were bonded due to customary or social obligations, because of belonging to a certain caste. The social and customary bondage was found only in the States of Bihar, Karnataka, Orissa and Rajasthan. This indicates that the social customs and norms seems to be rigid in these States and the weaker sections like SC/ST suffered from such social and customary bondage. The State Directorates of Social Welfare, Tribal Development and researchers should undertake further in-depth studies of these aspects to facilitate social reforms and social development. (Para 4.35).

(Action all States and particularly Bihar, Karnataka, Orissa and Rajasthan, Research Organisation).

14. Out of the total number of 782 beneficiaries 310 (39.64 per cent) reported that an agreement was signed for entering into bondage but no copy of the agreement was given to them. While 60 per cent of the beneficiaries reported that no such agreement was signed and everything was verbal. (Paras 4.43 and 4.44).

IDENTIFICATION

15. It was observed during the course of the evaluation study that there was some confusion in the minds of various functionaries about the proper definition of bonded labour as distinguished from attached labour, contract labour, migrant labour etc. It is, therefore, recommended that the State Governments may hold training workshop to explain the various sections of the Bonded Labour Act including correct definition so that the implementing officials are clear about the proper application of the definition. (Para 5.12).

16. In most of the cases the identification was done only at one point of time and perhaps hurriedly as well as half-heartedly in some States and as such the process of identification itself seems to have remained incomplete in almost all the States. It is also recommended that fresh efforts should be made to identify the remaining bonded labourers by adopting some of the following methods :

(a) Most of the State Governments are conducting household surveys to locate the poorest of the poor families for giving assistance under various rural development programmes. Opportunity may be taken during such surveys to locate bonded labour on a systematic basis.

(b) Some of the States might be proposing to undertake surveys to locate the landless, siteless and houseless persons under the rural housing programme. Such surveys also could be utilised for identification of of the bonded labour.

(c) NSSO had earlier conducted the survey of Bonded Labourers alongwith their employment and unemployment survey during the 36th round and have also conducted similar survey during their 38th round (July 1983-June 1984). That agency may be requested to undertake a more detailed survey of the bonded labour in collaboration with the State Governments. Since this is one of the important items of 20 Point Programme, the NSSO might be asked to undertake a special survey on bonded labour in due course in collaboration with States.

(d) The Central Statistical Organisation which is another National Level Statistical Organisation like the NSSO is undertaking economic census every 5 years in collaboration with the State Statistical Organisation. The next census is due in 1985. Since C.S.O., N.S.S.O. and the State Statistical Bureaus undertake house listing, both in rural and urban areas, the indentification of the bonded labour could also be considered during the economic census.

(e) The Labour Bureau under the Ministry of Labour also undertakes periodic surveys including Rural Labour Enquiry etc. The Labour Bureau, therefore, as a specialised agency could also be entrusted with this work including coordination of such surveys.

The Ministry of Labour should consider the above suggestions for identification of the bonded labour so that the process of identification is complete. (Paras 5.16 and 5.17).

(Action Ministry of Labour and Employment and Planning, Department of Statistics).

17. It was observed that in all the States no preparatory work was done before launching the process of identification. Instructions were, however, issued to the district collectors to take the necessary steps in accordance with the provisions of the Act. These instructions could be of routine nature. It was only in Karnataka that wide publicity was given about the Bonded Labour Abolition Act 1976. (Para 5.13).

18. No voluntary agency as such was duly involved in the identification of bonded labour. In Andhra Pradesh some social workers in their individual capacity were reported to have brought some cases of bonded labour to the notice of authorities for necessary action. It is desirable for State Governments to encourage reputed organisations and social welfare organisations and social welfare associations to undertake the work of identification and rehabilitation of bonded labour. The State Governments should also involve an organisation of bonded lobour themselves. The university students association like NSS, young people from the weaker sections like Dalit Panthers should their energies are utilised for social good. (Para their energies are utilised for social good. (Para 5.14).

(Action all States, Ministry of Labour and Education and Universities).

19. Majority of the selected beneficiaries were identified with little or no time lag and as many as 88 per cent or so within 3 months of the first contact. The only State which reported 34 beneficiaries having identified between one to two years of the first contact was Bihar and the beneficiaries belong to the districts of Bhagalpur and Santhal Parganas. (Para 5.19).

RELEASE

20. The Bonded Labour Abolition Act 1976 stipulates preparation of the list of released bonded labourers and its maintenace in a special statutory register prescribed for the purpose. It was observed that such registers were not maintained in some of the districts and wherever they were maintained they were not maintained properly. (Para 6.1).

21. In majority of the districts of the 8 States the landlorls released bonded labourers voluntarily without making any hue and cry for fear of legal proceedings. However, in Orissa out of 1123 identified bonded labourers upto June 1981 only 329 were reported to be released. This was mainly because in Orissa prosecution was regarded as inevitable in each and every case. This fear of inevitable prosecution compelled the landlords to produce evidence against the complaint of keeping bonded labour. Only recently some flexible approach has been adopted by the Government under which the masters have been persuaded to release bonded labour voluntarily. In case of Bihar, proceedings were prolonged because many a time landlords managed to get adjournment or forced the labourers to leave station for avoiding prosecution. This also showed the lack of protection from the State Officials. (Para 6.2).

22. Out of eight States evaluated only the States of Bihar and Orissa reported some problem created by the landlords. In these two States it was reported that landlords forcibly prevented the bonded labourers from appearing in the courts. They also forced the bonded labourers to leave the States and even went to the extent of implicating them in criminal cases. Some of the reasons for the delay in release related to procedure, court proceedings and indifferent attitude of the officials. (Para 6.5).

23. There were 739 beneficiaries out of 782 who reported that they were really released while seven reported that they were partly released and 36 reported that they were not at all released. About 36 beneficiaries in Bihar reported that they were not released at all and continued to work with the same master. This shows not only lack of physical monitoring and follow up on the part of the State officials who did not verify whether all the bonded labourers were really released but also lack of administrative will and non concern to the implementation of this important item of 20 Point Programme. (Paras 6.13 and 6.15).

(Action Government of Bihar/Ministry of Labour).

24. Majority of respondents reported that the condition had improved after release. (Para 6.16).

(Action Government of Bihar).

25. About 76 per cent of the beneficiaries had reported that their masters were angry as a result of their release. They were unhappy because either they will lose a cheap source of labour or face problem of labour in peak season or may not get a person who could be at their back and call or the loan will be written off. The voluntary social development organisations, Directorates of Social Welfare, Tribal Development, Researchers, Sociologists and Anthropologists from the States should undertake indepth studies and make suggestions for reorienting the better off sections of the rural areas so that conducive atmosphere is created for rapid socio-economic change and upliftment of the rural poor. (Para 6.18).

(Action Ministries of Labour, Home and Planning).

26. It was found that more than 97% of the beneficiaries were happy after their release. However, there were also categories of the beneficiaries who were either indifferent or not happy. The number of such beneficiaries was seven. Out of seven, three beneficiaries from Monghyr, Jabalpur and Kolar had felt that they will lose permanent source of employment after release. Three of the beneficiaries from Monghyr (2) and Tehri Garhwal (1) had mentioned that they had fear from the ex-masters even after release and hence they were not happy. It appears that in these States there was lack of follow up action in this direction. It is, therefore, suggested to entrust their problems to committed officials. (Paragraphs 6.24 and 6.33).

(Action all States and particularly Bihar and U.P.).

REHABILITATION PROGRAMMES

27. By and large it was found that at the time of formulation of the programme no norms as such were prescribed by the Government of India or State Governments for allotment of various items of rehabilitation. It was thus, observed that for allotment of land in Andhra Pradesh the size of the allotted land varied between 0.4 to 0.56 acres. While in Orissa and Madhya Pradesh it was 2.5 acres per bonded labour. In regard to supply of inputs Rs. 200 were provided in district Ganjam and Rs. 170 each in districts of Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani of Orissa. In Tehri Garhwal of U.P. the required inputs were however, provided free of cost. **No norms were, however, fixed in the remaining districts in respect of supply of inputs.** In regard to development and reclamation of land, a sum of Rs. 750 was prescribed in the district of Ganjam and Rs. 600 in the districts of Kalahandi, Koraput and Phulbani of Orissa. In Tehri-Garhwal of U.P. cash grant upto Rs. 2000 was allotted. **No norms had been fixed in the**

remaining districts for this programme. In regard to supply of milch cattle etc. under non-land based scheme it was observed that no fixed norms were prescribed in various districts and the number of animals or birds varied from 1 to 2 in case of cattle and 3 to 4 in regard to goats and 4 to 5 in regard to pigs. (Para 7.8).

28. It is clear from the above that no proper planning was made in prescribing any economic size of the various units which could provide suitable income to the beneficiaries.

29. It was observed that out of 18 districts 8 districts reported that some sort of selection was made on the basis of aptitude and experience of the beneficiaries while giving schemes to them. **In the remaining 10 districts** schemes were generally chosen by the implementing agencies themselves and no choice was allowed to the beneficiaries. (Para 7.9).

30. **The main source of financial assistance** for the rehabilitation programme was the 100 per cent rehabilitation grant from the Central and State Governments on 50:50 basis. It was, however, observed that in the district of Periyar (Tamil Nadu) in addition to the rehabilitation assistance the State Bank of India and the Indian Overseas Bank also gave assistance to the beneficiaries for purchase of bullocks, baffaloes and iron ploughs. It was further noted that majority of the district authorities did not find much difficulty in utilising the meagre financial assistance. Six district authorities however reported some difficulty in providing benefits, such as delay in identification of schemes, obtaining sanctions at block and district levels, non-availability of required staff and non-acceptance of schemes by the beneficiaries. (Para 7.10).

31. Since in most of the districts the single agency like Collector at the district level and BDO/Tehsildar at the block level were responsible for coordination not much difficulty was faced in coordinating the programmes. (Para 7.11).

32. In majority if the cases no raw material was required to be provided. As regards marketing facilities it was disappointing to note that there were no arrangements for marketing of milk and other products in 17 out of 18 districts studied. It was only in Kolar district of Karnataka that marketing arrangements were reported to have been made through milk producers cooperative societies and sheep producers association for marketing of milk and livestock respectively. This shows the lack of Planning and Foresight in the 17 districts. (Para 7.13).

33. The implementing agencies made three main suggestions for improving the programme namely (a) integration of the programme with other beneficiary oriented programme (b) provision of adequate staff and (c) arrangements for providing technical knowhow. These suggestions need to be seriously considered at higher levels. (Para 7.15). (Action all States).

34. The progress of rehabilitation of released bonded labour was reported very low. Only 9493 bonded labourers were covered under various schemes in all the 18 districts studied as against the number of 22458 released bonded labourers. More than 50 per cent of the released bonded labourers were yet to be rehabilitated at the time of study. The plight of the 58 per cent of the released bonded labourers was, however, reported to be very pathetic. One of the reasons attributed to such state of affairs related to lack of urgency on the part of the officials at various levels in dealing with the problem of the released bonded labourers. Besides, there were several avoidable administrative problems like lapsing of funds, delays in the allotments of funds, frequent references between the State Governments and the Ministry of Labour for clarification etc. (Para 7.17).

35. Out of 18 districts, no money was spent in three districts for welfare and rehabilitation of the bonded labour. In Raigarh district of Madhya Pradesh the funds remained unutilised because there was no bonded labour on whom the money could be spent. Similar was the situation in Ganjam district of Orissa where only 5.7 per cent of the funds could be utilised. In Kota districts of Rajasthan 700 bonded labourers were given only paper benefits in terms of share certificates of Rs. 4000 each in the name of bonded labour industrial cooperative society and the whole of the amount of Rs. 28 lakhs was reported to have been deposited in the bank. (Para 7.23).

36. In all districts except one no efforts were reported to have been made to intergrate the rehabilitation of bonded labour schemes with other on-going beneficiary oriented programmes like Food for Work, IRDP, PWD works etc. In Kolar district of Karnataka efforts were made to employ the beneficiaries under Food for Work Programme, Janta housing scheme and employment under PWD works. (Para 7.25).

37. Over 60 per cent of the selected beneficiaries were rehabilitated any where between 2 to 4 years. It was further observed that 100 per cent of beneficiaries were rehabilitated after 3 to 4 years in Kolar of Karnataka, Jabalpur of Madhya Pradesh after 2 to 3 years in Raigarh of Madhya Pradesh and Ganjam of Orissa and after 1 to 2 years in district Nalanda of Bihar. It was further observed that 75 per cent of selected beneficiaries from Rangareddy (Andhra Pradesh), Kalahandi (Orissa), Kota (Rajasthan) were rehabilitated after 2 to 3 years of their release. In district Periyar of Tamil Nadu 85 per cent of beneficiaries were rehabilitated after 4 to 5 years of release. This is a very disappointing situation. Some of the reasons furnished for such an undue delay related to procedure, slackness on the part of officials, delay in release of funds, non-availability of funds and shortage of staff. Overall it was observed that only 41.2 per cent of the released bonded labourers were re-

habilitated in 9 States at the time of the study during 1981. This is a very disappointing situation. If a bonded labour is not rehabilitated soon after release he is likely to be exploited by the ex-master causing his relapse into bondage. (Paras 7.27, 7.28, 7.30, 7.31 and 7.32). (Action all States, Ministry of Labour).

38. Only 317 (48 per cent) beneficiaries out of a total of 782 reported that they were provided some benefit of subsistence allowance. There were about 59 beneficiaries who had not received any subsistence allowance and it is not known as to how these released bonded labourers had survived in the absence of any immediate relief. This indicates absence or failure of proper follow-up action. (Para 7.39 and 7.41).

39. Out of 782 beneficiaries 725 (93 per cent) had reported time lag between release and rehabilitation. Out of these 725, 381 (52.55 per cent) stated that their income during the intervening period was not sufficient to support their families. They gave various reasons for this such as non-availability of work, no subsistence allowance etc. To tie over the difficulty of insufficiency of income most of them namely, 139 or 36 per cent resorted to missing a meal whereas 19 per cent of them were just starving to cope with the situtation. Others adopted some other means to overcome these difficulties. It was further observed that about 74 beneficiaries in 8 districts out of the 381 who reported time lag between release and rehabilitation were just starving and struggling hard for existence during this period. Of these 51 were Scheduled Castes, 13 Scheduled Tribes, 9 backward classes and 1 others. (Para 7.46 and 7.51).

40. This indicates the failure of the concerned State-district authorities in not providing sufficient subsistence allowance during the intervening period of release and rehabilitation thereby exposing most of the beneficiaries to the danger of re-lapse into bondage. The main reasons put forward by the beneficiaries for insufficiency of income related to "work not available or no subsistence allowance given". (Para 7.48 and 7.49).

41. Out of 782 beneficiaries 326 (42 per cent) reported that the schemes were thrust upon them while 426 (58 per cent) reported that they had the choice of the scheme. All the selected beneficiaries from Tamil Nadu had no choice of the scheme which were thrust upon them. In Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan more than 95 per cent of the selected beneficiaries reported that the schemes were thrust upon them. It was only from the States of Karnataka, U.P. and Bihar that the majority of the beneficiaries had the choice of the scheme. It is evident that no steps were taken by the concerned authorities to assess the choice of the beneficiaries in the matter of rehabilitation schemes. (Para 8.2 and 8.4).

42. Out of the 782 selected beneficiaries 205 reported that benefits were adequate while 262 (33.50 per cent) reported that they were partially adequate whereas remaining 315 (40.28 per cent) reported that the benefits were not adequate and gave suggestions for improvement. Thus the majority of the beneficiaries amounting to about 73.78 per cent reported the inadequacy of the rehabilitation assistance. To overcome this inadequacy the beneficiaries made certain suggestions. These related to increase in the size of the scheme, payment of subsistence allowance on regular basisc till rehabilitation, allotment of more and good quality of land for cultivation, financial assistance for agricultural inputs and irrigation facilities. Some of the beneficiaries also suggested provision of regular wage employment, provision of grazing land, provision of feed and fodder and provision of houses/house-sites. (Para 8.32, 8.33 and 8.34).

43. The State Governments should consider these suggestions for rehabilitation in future. It is also recommended that the concerned State authorities should carry out the studies about the economic benefits to the ex-bonded labourers according to size of land allotted to them so that more land could be allotted whenever necessary. It was also recorded that the State/district authorities in many cases had failed to provide the required inputs to the ex-bonded labourers resulting in non-utilisation of allotted land. It is suggested that the concerned authorities at the Centre and in the Sates should review the situation urgently. (Para 8.34) (Action Ministry of Labour, State Govts.).

44. Out of 782 selected beneficiaries 310 (about 40 per cent) had availed rehabilitation facilities. Out of these about 92 beneficiaries had faced certain difficulties in availing these facilities. Majority of them had said that the disbursement of assistance was irregular and/or procedure involved was cumbersome and time consuming. Some of them even reported that the officials were not helpful. (Para 8.57).

(Action All States).

45. It was noted that only 79 beneficiaries forming a meagre percentage of 10 per cent out of 782 beneficiaries received financial assistance/loan. The assistance/loan was received in three years i.e. 1979, 1980 and 1981. Some of the beneficiaries reported that the assistance was not sufficient and suggested that the quantum of assistance should be increased. (Para 8.61).

46. The analysis regarding rehabilitation schemes, their norms, selection criterion etc. indicates that in majority of cases enough efforts were not made to identify viable schemes/programmes for the rehabilitation of the released bonded labourers. In majoriy of cases, where land was allotted, it was reported to be not of good quality and was located generally far away from the houses of the bonded labourers. Except in few districts like Medak and Ranga Reddy (Andhra Pradesh), no irrigation facilities were

made available to the beneficiaries as a result of which they were unable to utilise allotted land. Similarly, in a good number of cases where milch animals were provided, the breed was of improved variety which required clean surroundings, to avoid extremes of temperature and good feeding arrangements besides, veterinary facilities. The absence of these requirements had resulted into not only affecting adversely the improved breed milch animals but also the economic conditions of the beneficiaries. It could have been better if local breeds of animals were supplied to the released bonded labourers so that they could stand the local climate, rough handling and ordinary feeds. In few cases, it was also observed that the officers and beneficiaries were not clear about the nature of benefits as to whether it was a loan or a grant. (Para 8.68).

47. The amount of Rs. 4,000 fixed by the Gov-Government of India was not found enough for proper rehabilitation of the bonded labour. The study of the models in Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka indicate that an amount between Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 15,000 should be provided for proper rehabilitation of these bonded labourers on the long term basis. In the case of the bonded labourers who were in possession of some 'Inami' land or were provided some piece of land would require an assistance of Rs. 10,000 for an irrigation well besides the additional amount of Rs. 5,000 for pumpsets and other agricultural implements. Likewise, for non-land based schemes like small-scale industries, industrial estates etc., similar amount would be necessary. These resources could be better utilised if an approach of group rehabilitation is adopted. It is, therefore, recommended that the Ministry of Labour may advise the State Governments to provide rehabilitation on group basis. The Ministry may also examine raising the amount of rehabilitation assistance from Rs. 4,000 to Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 15,000 depending upon the nature of rehabilitation. (Para 8.69).

48. Out of the total of 782 beneficiaries only 174 beneficiaries became members of the various cooperative societies like agricultural cooperatives, multi-purpose cooperatives, milk cooperatives and industrial cooperatives. It was also noted that not a single beneficiary became member of the marketing cooperative, poultry cooperative and consumer cooperative. This may be due to lack of dissemination, guidance and assistance from the concerned agencies. No social worker or voluntary agency had been responsible for inducing the beneficiaries in becoming members or involving them in the cooperative efforts and by and large they were induced mostly by government agencies followed by fellow villagers, another bonded labour etc. (Para 9.2, 9.3, 9.8 and 9.9).

49. Out of the 174 members of the various cooperative societies majority of 115 beneficiaries reported certain difficulties such as non-availability of loan, cumbersome procedure, higher rate of interest, low price for their produce, some of them also reported that the societies were also not functioning properly. By and large the cooperative credit societies have not been able to do much in assisting proper rehabilitation of the erstwhile bonded labourers. (Para 9.19).

50. Out of 782 beneficiaries 291 (37 per cent) reported full satisfaction, 232 (30 per cent) reported partial satisfaction and 259 (33 per cent) reported full dissatisfaction with the rehabilitation programmes. Majority of the beneficiaries amounting to about 63 per cent had not felt positive impact of the programmes and they were not satisfied with the rehabilitation assistance. Among the district studied beneficiaries from 8 districts viz. Raigarh (MP), Ganjam (Orissa), Periyar (T. Nadu), Kota (Rajasthan), Ranga-Reddy (A.P), Nalanda (Bihar), Phulbani and Kalahandi (Orissa) reported a very high degree of dissatisfaction. (Para 10.1).

51. Among the reasons put forward by the beneficiaries for dissatisfaction, the most important one related to insufficiency of the scheme/ assistance for their needs. This was followed by the drawbacks like bad quality of land, poor animals, inadequate yield of milk, schemes not suitable to their background and schemes not suited to their areas etc. It could be seen that rehabilitation assistance besides not being sufficient was not planned according to the background and aptitude of the individuals and also of the area and surrounding which they lived. (Para 10.4 and 10.6).

52. The study had revealed that there were some labourers though reported to be released and rehabilitated but were still working with the old master. The NSSO survey has also brought out that there were much more bonded labour than what the nine states have identified and rehabilitated. Besides this there were other states who failed to identify bonded labour but the NSSO has found bonded labour in such states like Gujarat, Maharashtra etc. The efforts made so far are therefore inadequate. It is, therefore, recommended that the Government of India should direct the States to resort to indentification and rehabilitation of bonded labour on a continuing basis till this system becomes a thing of the past. (Para 10.11). (Action Ministry of Labour, State Govt.).

53. About 92 per cent of the selected beneficiaries reported that they were leading an honourable life after release and rehabilitation because they could now breathe in fresh air, earn more and as human beisg could think about the future. Eight per cent of the beneficiaries which came from the States of Bihar, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh reported that they were not leading an honourable life because either their earnings from the scheme were not sufficient, earlier master was exerting pressure or had to depend on the ex-master for the petty things and employment was not

sufficient 49 of the beneficiaries also reported the fear of going back into bondage for the reasons stated above. This again indicates the failure of the rehabilitation schemes and lack of follow up action on the part of the authorities particularly from the States of Bihar, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu.

54. The majority of beneficiaries reported that they were able to spend money on several new items such as education of children, social functions, visit to religious places and relatives, entertainment, medical care etc. Thus it will be seen that majority of the beneficiaries have started a new and better life in terms of the socio culural activities mentioned above. They had also freedom of movement and mobility in terms of domestic tourism e.g. visits to religious places etc. **There was only district namely, Nalanda in Bihar from where all the selected beneficiaries reported that they were not able to spend any money on any of the above mentioned items.** (Para 10.16, 10.17 and 10.18).

55. Out of the 782 beneficiaries only 46 per cent reported that their earnings were sufficient to meet their day to day requirements of their family. The remaining 54 per cent beneficiaries who reported insufficient income indicated that their source of supplementing the income as borrowing from landlords or moneylenders, borrowing from friends and relatives. It was further revealed that 121 beneficiaries resorted to going without meals and two of them resorted to begging for lack of sufficient income. The concerned State Governments should take prompt follow up action to see that borrowing by the released bonded labourers do not relapse into bondage. It is also desirable to see that sufficient income is generated to the beneficiaries who were going without meals or resorting to begging. The districts from where the beneficiaries reported to be starving or begging were Bhagalpur, Monghyr and Nalanda of Bihar, Chittradurga and Kolar of Karnataka and Koraput of Orissa where the percentage of beneficiaries resorting to such means was also quite high. (Para 10.19, 10.20 and 10.22) (Action State Govts.)

56. About 30 per cent of the selected beneficiaries were indebted prior to rehabilitation. After rehabilitation it was found (on the date of the field study) that only 17.3 per cent had loan outstanding with them. The source of borrowing were moneylenders, landlords, friends, relatives, cooperatives, government, agencies etc. After rehabilitation however, the dependence on borrowing from moneylender had come down to 8.7 per cent from 18.2 per cent after rehabilitation. It is, however, desirable that the dependence of these ex-bonded labourers on the landlords and moneylenders should be totally eliminated in the interest of abolition of the bonded labour system.

(Para 10.24). (Action all States).

57. The released and rehabilitated bonded labours had obviously a good opinion and feeling about the rehabilitation programme. However, in order to find out how the rural society felt about the released and rehabilitated ex-bonded labourers they (the bonded labour) were asked to give their reactions in this regard. About 50 per cent of the beneficiaries reported that the well off and influential villagers did not like the programme of release and rehabilitation. This feeling could be due to the setback they might have suffered in not getting easily available cheap labour from the bonded labour. Among the districts high degree of negative reaction of the village community was reported from six districts of Mehboobnagar, Ranga reddy, Nalanda, Chittradurga, Santhal Parganas and Koraput. (Para 10.26 and 10.27).

58. About 230 or 29 per cent of the beneficiaries reported the social prejudices due to low caste, lower economic status, untouchability and being an ex-bonded labour. It was encouraging to note that in three districts namely, Raigarh (MP), Kalahandi and Phulbani (Orissa) there was no selected beneficiary who reported any disability. The highest percentage of disabilities was, however, reported from the three ditricts of Orissa and Bihar, namely, Ganjam, Nalanda and Santhal Parganas. It was reported that 64 per cent of the beneficiaries out of 230 reported that they were handicapped and looked down upon by the society because they belond to Scheduled Caste. This reason was most prominent in seven districts viz. Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Nalanda, Chittradurga, Kolar, Jabalpur and Periyar. Besides suffering as a bonded labour these persons also suffered from the disabilities attached to untouchability and caste system. A majority of the bonded labour belong to Scheduled Caste who suffer from the disability of untouchabiilty. It is therefore recommended that the Civil Rights Act may be enforced strictly and reputed voluntary organisation may be encouraged for undertaking social movement, social reform etc. (Para 10.28 and 10.29).

59. The ex-bonded labourers were asked to make suggestions to overcome the social disabilities and handicaps suffered by them from the society. 230 beneficiaries made several suggestions which included (a) people who discriminate should be punished (b) social education programme should be speeded up, (c) all caste and communities should meet at one place, (d) voluntary organisations should be encouraged to deal with social reforms and (e) help of religious heads/groups should be enlisted to enlighten people etc.

60. The State Governments and the social welfare organisations in different States should seriously consider the suggestions for educating people to overcome the age old social handicaps and prejudices so that there is rapid social change in the rural areas. (Para 10,30 and 10.31) (Action all State Governments., Ministries of Home, Education, Planning and I & B).

61. 48 beneficiaries out of 782 reported that they were under pressure from the ex-masters to return to them as bonded labourers. These beneficiaries belong to six districts namely, all the four districts of Bihar, and one each from Karnataka and Rajasthan. It was further disappointing to note that all the beneficiaries from Bihar reported that they had no protection from official agencies like police, BDO, revenue department or department of labour incharge of bonded labour for saving them from the pressure of the ex-masters. The beneficiaries also reported the reasons for unhelpful attitude as (a) people at the helm of affairs were not serious in the problem of bonded labour and of people belonging to lower castes and (b) higher caste people were more influential etc. The State Governments of Bihar, Kaarnataka and Rajasthan need to take urgent steps to see that the harassed bonded labourers are given necessary protection. (Para 10.33 and 10.35) (Action All States).

62. By and large it was observed that there was no specific staff or specific arrangement for follow up action in regard to (a) watching the progress of the rehabilitation programme for the ex-bonded labourers or (b) to protect them from relapsing into bondage. It is felt that absence of machinery for follow up action and for providing necessary protection from relapsing into bondage will defeat the very purpose of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for rehabilitation of bonded labour. It is, therefore, recommended that specific arrangements in this regard should be made by the respective State Governments and the Ministry of Labour. (Para 10.37) (Action State Govts. and Ministry of Labour).

63. There is hardly any impact of modern facilities like irrigation, development infrastructure, literacy etc. on the reduction of bonded labour system. On the country it was revealed that ownership of amenity like tubewells was also associated with keeping of bonded labourers by household from Bihar. At the same time in the State like Andhra Pradesh absence of irrigation and other facilities were also associated with the existence of bonded labour. There may be other factors like particular social system or the power and property structure in the villages or the mental attitude of the society in the various areas for this system. This needs to be investigated in detail.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1·1

No. of bonded labourers as estimated by State Governments., National Sample Survey Organisation and Gandhi Peace Foundation.

Sl. No.	State	As estimated by State Governments	As estimated by NSSO@	As estimated by Gandhi Peace Foundation**
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	12701	7300	325000
2.	Assam	..	4400	..
3.	Bihar	4218	102400	111000
4.	Gujarat	42	4200	171000
5.	Haryana	..	12900	..
6.	Himachal Pradesh	..	..	..
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	..	900	..
8.	Karnataka	62689	14100	193000
9.	Kerala	700	400	..
10.	Madhya Pradeh	1531	116200	500000
11.	Maharashtra	..	4300	100000
12.	Manipur	..	..	..
13.	Meghalaya	..	..	..
14.	Nagaland	..	..	..
15.	Orissa	337	5400	350000
16.	Punjab	..	4300	..
17.	Rajasthan	6000	2400	67000
18.	Tamil Nadu	27874	12500	250000
19.	Tripura	..	..	..
20.	Uttar Pradesh	4469	31700	550000
21.	West Bengal	..	21600	..
22.	All Union Territories	..	..	..
	ALL INDIA	120561	345000	2617000

@Sarvekshan Vol. II No. 4, April, 1979.

**Final Report January, 1981 of the Gandhi Peace Foundation.

APPENDIX 1.2

A Technical note on the methodology used by (i) The State Governments, (ii) Gandhi Peace Foundation and (iii) National Sampale Survey Organisation for estimating the number of bonded labourars in various States

The number of bonded labourers have been estimated by three agencies namely, the State Governments, the Gandhi Peace Foundation and the National Sample Survey Organisation. From the figures of the estimates of these agencies which are givean in the Appendix 1.1, it will be seen that they are quite divergent. This note attempts to explain the reasons for these variations and stresses the need for a more appropriate and scientific methodology for estimation. Prima facie, the divergent figures are due to adoption of different approach, definitions and coverage. The methodology adopted by the three agencies is discussed below :

I. **Estimates made by the State Governments.**—It will be seen that only 9 State Governments mentioned in the annexure have made attempts to identify the bonded labourers and estimate their number. The figures have been arrived at either through surveys or actual count through the Revenue Department, Labour Department or the Social Welfare Department. These figures have been arrived at in most of the cases when only one attempt was made to identify the bonded labourers. Repeat surveys and different methods have since been recommended. Since there may be still more bonded labourers yet to be identified, these estimates are incomplete. Secondly, several other Statets have not identified bonded labour and as such they do not figure in the list of States who have themselves identified bonded labourers. It was gathered during the course of investigation that some of the States did not want to admit existence of bonded labour as it may bring bad name to the authorities. However, some of the States appear in the list of NSSO as well as of the Gandhi Peace Foundation. Hence, the two reasons which could be attributed for under-estimation are (i) incomplete identification and (ii) incomplete coverage.

II. **Estimates by the Gandhi Peace Foundation.**—The Gandhi Peace Foundation (GPF) conducted a survey on bonded labour during May 1978 to December 1978. The estitmates given by them is 26.17 lakhs. The survey was conducted only in the rural areas. The Gandhi Peace Foundation has adopted the definition of bonded labour as laid down in the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act 1976. The survey of the GPF was based on random sample of 1000 villages from a total of 450119 villages in 10 States (Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh). Only those districts where the sample villages happened to be located were covered. The selection of villages was done by systematic sampling (every 450th village from the 1971 census list of villages for a State. The survey villages were distributed over 295 districts in these States. For making estimate of bonded labour they calculated at the district level four proportions, (i) proportion of bonded labourers in the population survey, (ii) proportion of bonded labourers in the population of agricultural labourers, (iii) proportion of bonded laboures in the population of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes in the disttrict and finally (iv) the average number of bonded labourers in the villages surveyed in a particular district. Using ratio estimates they built up four district level estimates. By aggregating four estimates state level estimates were prepared and then averaged The assumption made in this procedures of estimation is two-fold (i) that spread of bonded labour is uniform for all the districts and (ii) that the sample size is adequate for valid estimates at the district level. On the basis of sample size adoted in the survey, it is difficult

to say that the two assumptions made in the survey are justified. The investigators of the Gandhi Peace Foundation gathered the data on the basis of the group discussions in the villages between them and the members of the village gathering as distinct from the personal interview of the household adopted by the NSSO.

III. **The Methodology adopted by the NSSO.**—The details of geographical coverage, sample design, estimation procedures etc. adopted by the NSSO in the 32nd round are given in Annexure to this note. It will be seen that the scope of the NSSO survey is restricted to only those persons working with an employer under obligation but work not specifically compensated by any wage/salary. This has limited the scope of coverage as it excludes those who got some wages but below the fixed medium wages stipulated according to that Act. It may also be noted that the 32nd round of NSSO was not a special round for bonded labour survey as such. Its main focus was on employment-unemployment situation in the country. While collecting data, details in respect of bonded labour were also collected. But as is usual in the NSSO, the information was collected by statistically designed household survey conducted by the trained investigators of the NSSO who had personal contact of the sample households and collected the information through interview approach. Since, however, bonded labour is not uniformly present in all the areas but concentrated in special pockets of poverty, backward areas, hill areas and tribal areas, it is doubtful whether the NSSO design which was adopted for the main survey was relevant for estimating bonded labour as well. It was only in Gujarat that regions were formed by grouping contiguous tehsils taking into consideration concentration of tribal population. Nothing is mentioned about the formation of regions for other States having considerable concentration of tribal population. The scope was further restricted by the limitation of the definition as already discussed above. The estimates might further suffer from investigators' bias because even senior officials at various levels were not clear about the proper definition of the bonded labour.

It was reported that there was a considerable difference in the estimates of the central sample and the state sample. It is discouraging to note that the differences in the central sample and the state sample have not been settled over the years even though the State Governments started collaborating with NSSO since long. However the technicalities for settling the differences between central and state sample estmates are yet being discussed and a working group has been set up for the same when we are in the Sixth Plan.

It will be seen that methodology adopted by all the three agencies has some limitations or the other. It would, therefore, be desirable to launch a complete enumeration of the bonded labour through household surveys or census as already recommended in the report.

ANNEXURE

National Sample Survay Organisation

A BRIEF NOTE ON THE GEOGRAPHICAL COVERAGE, SAMPLE DESIGN AND THE ESTIMATION PROCEDURE ADOPTED IN THE 32ND ROUND SURVEY ON EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

All. 1 Geographical Coverage.—The survey covered by the whole area of the Indian Union excepting Sikkim, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Lakshadweep, Dadra and Nagar Haveli, Ladakh district of Jammu and Kashmir, rural areas of Pal and Samri tehsils of district Bastar of Madhya Pradesh, rural areas of Rajura, Sironcha and Gadh-Chiroli tehsils of district Chandrapur and Melghat tehsil of district Amravati of Maharashtrta and rural areas of Chandigarh, Mizoram and Nagaland.

All. 2 Sampling design and sample size.—A stratified two-stage sampling design was adopted in the survey with census villages and urban blocks (Urban Frame Survey blocks formed by NSSO) as the first stage units respectively for the rural an durban areas and housceholds as the second stage units. But in the rural areas of the North Eastern States viz., Mikir Hills and North Cachar Hills of Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur and Tripura, the first stage units were clusters of villages. Altogether 8820 villages and 4940 urban blocks were selected as the first stage units. In each of the selected first stage units, 12 households were selected as second stage units (for the rural areas of North Eastern Region, 24 households were selected from each cluster of villages). The sample villages were selected with probability proportional to population and with replacement and the urban blocks with probability proportional to size (a measure of population) and with replacement. The households were selected circular systematically with equal probability after arranging all the households of a sample first stage unit according to their means of livelihood in the order; self-employed in non-agricultural occupatitons, rural labour and others in the rural sectors and according to their employment status in the order: self-employed and others in the urban sector.

All. 3 Region.—Each Sate/Union Territory was divided into a number of regions by grouping contiguous districts of similar agricultural profile. In Gujarat State, however, regions were formed by grouping contiguous tehsils taking into consideration concentration of tribal population and dry areas of the State. The total number of regions formed all over India (excluding the areas not covered by NSS) was 73. Strata for sampling had been formed within the regions.

All. 4. Stratification and allocation of sample.—The whole of India was divided into a number of basic strata so that the basic strata did not cut across district boundaries. Each district with less than 1.3 million rural population according to census 1971, formed one basic stratum by itstelf except in Gujarat and Arunachal Pradesh where some districts with less than 1.5 million population had been divided into two or more basic strata. A district with more than 1.5 million rural population (according to census 1971) was divided into a number of basic strata, depending on its rural population by grouping contiguous tehsils (sub-divisions in Bihar, Orissa and West Bengal) homogeneous as far as possible with respect to rural population density and crop pattern. Districts formed after 1971 census were also considered for formation of basic strata. Basic strata so formed were treated as basic strtata for both rural and urban sectors. In the urban sector, however, some of the basic strata having very small urban population were merged together to form the ultimate urban strata. In all such cases merging was done within a region and generally within a district. The total number of rural and urban strata thus formed were 516 and 386 respectively. Within each State and Union Territory respective total of sample villages and blocks were total allocated to the different rural and urban strata in proportion to their 1971 rural and urban population respectively. The final stratum allocations were made multiples of 4.

All. 5 Survey period and sub-round formation.—The survey was started in July, 1977 and was completed in June 1978. The entire survey period of one year was divided into four sub-rounds of three months each

APPENDIX 1.2—Contd.

coinciding approximately with the four agricultural seasons. The four sub-round periods were:

Sub-round 1 : July to September 1977
Sub-round 2 : October to December 1977
Sub-round 3 : January to March 1978
Sub-round 4 : April to June 1978

The sample villages and blocks were distributed over the four sub-rounds in equal numbers so as to provide equally valid estimates for each of the sub-rounds.

All. 6 Estimation procedure.—In order to reduce work-load at the tatbulation stage and to provide estimates at the regional level, the following estimation procedure was adopted:

$$\hat{Y} = \Sigma \hat{Y}_s^n$$

$$\hat{Y}_s = \Sigma \hat{Y}_r^n$$

and $Y_i = Y_r \times \frac{P_r}{P_n}$; where

APPENDIX 1.2—Contd.

$\hat{Y}$ = estimated rural/urban total of a characteristic for all India for any sub-round/all sub-rounds

$\hat{Y}_s^n$ = estimated rural/urban total of the characteristic for the s-th region of a State for the sub-round/all sub-rounds

$\hat{Y}_r^n$ = estimated rural/urban total of the characteristic for the r-th region of a State for the sub-round/all sub-round.

Y_r^n = rural/urban sample total of the characteristic for the r-th region.

Pr = projected rural/urban population of the r-th region for January 1978 and

P_n = total sample, persons in the sample villages/blocks of the r-th region surveyed in the sub-round/all sub-rounds.

The estimation was done separately for the rural and urban areas.

APPENDIX 2·1

List of State, District, Block and Village and number of Beneficiaries Covered.

State	District	Block	Village	No. of selected Beneficiaries
1	2	3	4	5
Andhra Pradesh . . .	Medak . . .	Gajwal	Bandamailaram	10
			Mulug	10
			Wattipally	10
		Siddipet	Marpadga	10
			Sirsingandla	10
			Vemulghat]	10
	Distt Total			60
	Mehboobnagar	Godwal	Balgera	3
			Kakulwar	
			Lathipur	3
			Marlabeed	6
			Toomkunta	10
		Makthal	Ankilla	9
			Madhwar]	8
			Masikal	7
			Singawar	10
			Tirmalapur	2
	Distt. Total			60
	ingareddy . .	Pargi	Chowdapur	10
			Kishtapur	10
			Tirmalapur	10
		Vikaraba[	Ekmamidi	10
			Narayanpur	10
			Siddulоor	10
	Distt. Total			60
	State Total			180

APPENDIX 2·1—(*Contd.*)

1	2	3	4	5
Bihar	galpur . . .	Amrapur	Khaira	7
			Kumbroo	8
		Bauka	Asrambha	2
			Bhelai	2
			Kalyanpur	24
			Koriyandha	2
		Dharia	Sain Chak	7
		Rasaun	Neema	1
		Sambhuganj	Basohara	2
	Distt. Total			**50**
	Monghyar . . .	Jamni	Jhakhua	10
			Lakhapur	10
			Sonai	10
		Sikandra	Jagdishpur	7
			Lachuar	10
			Rahai	10
	Distt. Total			**57**
	Nalanda . . .	Bihar Sarif	Pawa	16
		Rajgir	Bhindidih	10
	Distt. Total			**26**
	Santhal Parganas .	Deoghar	Kenmankothi	10
			Rohini	9
			Sangram Lodiya	10
		Sarath	Babhan Kund	10
			Dumaria	10
			Kharwajori	10
	Distt. Total			**59**
	State Total			**192**
Karnataka . . .	Chitra Durga . .	Davanagare	Naganur	10
			Nagrakatta	10
			Naraganahalli	10
		Holalkere	Gunjigagur	10
			Hireyaminganur	10
			Thali Katte	10
	Distt. Total			**60**
	Kolar . . .	Chick Ballapur	Ajjaenare	6
			C.P. Gurki	8
			Gerahalli	6
			Kamathalahalli	5
			Mandikal	10
			Peresandra	10
			Yallagalahalli	10
			Yannurkadirenhalli	5
	Distt. Total			**60**
	State Total			**120**

APPENDIX 2.1—(*Contd.*)

1	2	3	4	5
Madhya Pradesh . . .	Jabalpur . . .	Katni	Chaka	1
			Goitha	2
			Gata Kheda	4
			Pipariya	4
			Piprodh	3
		Rithi	Bandha	3
			Imlaj	9
			Patoha	3
	Distt. Total			**29**
	Raigarh . . .	Dharamjaigarh	Dharamjaigarh	1
			Kapur	1
	Distt. Total			**2**
	State Total			**31**
Orissa	**Ganjam . . .**	Gumma	Buruda	2
	Distt. Total			**2**
	Kalahandi .	Junagarh	Baladhiamal	4
			Budhipadar	1
			Chancharadhadi	1
			Gumasargiguda	5
			Kalapala	2
		Kalampur	Balichada	2
			Bijuara	1
			Churagoon	2
			Ichapur	2
			Kalampur	2
	Distt. Total			**22**
	Koraput	Koraput Sadar	Dangdeula	10
			Landiguda	10
			Mastiput	3
			Padmapur	2
			Podiguda	3
		Narayanpatna	Bijiguda	5
			Dandhadi	5
			Narayanpatna	10
	Distt. Total			**48**
	Phulbani	Darighadi	Mahagudi	2
		Tumudihandh	Tumudihandh	5
	Distt. Total			**7**
	State Total			**79**
Rajasthan . . .	Kota . .	Kishanganj	Banwargarh	10
			Garda	11
			Gordhanpura	9
		Shababad	Beta	10
			Devri	10
			Kelware	10
	Distt. Total			**60**
	State Total			**60**

APPENDIX 2.1—(*Contd.*)

1	2	3	4	5
Tamil Nadu	Periyar	Andhiyur	Bargur	10
		Sathyamangalm	Gathidathur	10
		Talawady	Germaban	10
			Hazanar	8
			Ikkalur	6
			Marur	6
		Thalawadi	Thingalur	10
	Distt. Total			60
	State Total			60
Uttar Pradesh . . .	Tehri Garhwal	Jaunpur	Alwas	11
			Biror	7
			Khairar Maror	10
			Kharson	13
			Than	9
			Thatur	10
	Distt. Total			60
	State Total			60
	Grand Total			782

APPENDIX 2.2

Programme Evaluation Organisation (Planning Commission)

Subject : Evaluation of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme on Rehabilitation of Bonded Labour

LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Dr. S. M. Shah, Adviser, Planning Commission. — Chairman
2. Prof. S. Sachchidananda, A.N. Sinha Institute, Patna. — Member
3. Shri G. Kameshwar Rao, Director, Institute of Labour Laws and Management, Andhra Pradesh (Hyderabad). — Member
4. Dr. R. C. Saxena, Professor, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Regional Engineering College, Kurkshetra(Haryana). — Member
5. Shri P. S. Krishnan, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India. — Member
6. Shri Habeeb Mohamed, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Government of India. — Member
7. Shri Y. N. Amble, Chief Executive Officer, NSSO, Department of Statistics, New Delhi. — Member
8. Shri A.V.R. Char, Adviser, Labour, Employment and Manpower Division, Planning Commission. — Member
9. Dr. Ram Pandey Project Director (Bonded Labour) Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur. — Member
10. Serectary, Labour Department, Government of Karnataka. — Member
11. Labour Commissioner, Government of Tamil Nadu, Madras. — Member
12. Director(Evaluation), Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow. — Member
13. Shri P. L. Aware, Deputy Adviser(PEO), Planning Commission. — Member-Secretary

APPENDIX TABLE No. 4.1

Distribution of Beneficiaries in selected districts according to the period of Bondage

Name of the District	Period under Bondage						
	Less than 1 year	1 to 2 years	2 to 5 years	5 to 10 years	10 to 20 years	Above 20 years	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Medak	..	3 (5·0)	17 (28·33)	20 (33·33)	14 (23·33)	6 (10·0)	60 (100·0)
Mehboobnagar	3 (5·0)	3 [(5·0)	28 (46·67)	19 (31·67)	7 (11·67)		60 (100·0)
Rangareddy	..	4 (6·67)	26 (43·33)	19 (31·67)	10 (16·67)	1 (1·67)	60 (100·0)
Bhagalpur	..	..	6 (12·0)	18 (36·0)	14 (28·0)	12 (24·0)	50 (100·0)
Monghyr	..	..	2 (3·51)	1 (1·75)	16 (28·07)	38 (66·67)	57 (100·0)
Nalanda	..	..	..	2 (7·69)	7 (26·92)	17 (65·38)	26 (100·0)
Santhal Parganas	..	..	..	1 (1·69)	20 (33·90)	38 (64·41)	50 (100·0)
Chitradurga	.. ..	1 (1·67)	11 (18·33)	21 (35·0)	17 (28··33)	10 (16·67)	60 (100·0)
Kolar	.. ..	1 (1·67)	20 (33·33)	31 (51·67)	6 (10·0)	2 (3·33)	60 (100·0)
Jabalpur	..	..	5 (17·24)	14 (48·28)	8 (27·59)	2 (6·90)	29 (100·0)
Raigarh	..	..	..	2 (100·0)	..	..	2 (100·0)
Ganjam	..	..	..	..	1 (50·0)	1 (50·0)	2 (100·0)
Kalahandi	1 (4·55)	11 (50·0)	7 (31·82)	2 (9·09)	1 (4·55)	..	22 (100·0)
Koraput	8 (16·67)	20 (41·67)	17 (35·42)	1 (2·08)	1 (2·08)	1 (2·08)	48 (100·0)
Phulbani	4 (57·14)	3 (42·86)	..	..	..	..	7 (100·0)
Kota	1 (1·67)	..	7 (11·67)	20 (33·33)	17 (28·33)	15 (25·0)	60 (100·0
Periyar	..	..	6 (10·0)	22 (36·67)	21 (35·0)	11 (18·33)	60 (100·0
Tehrigarhwal	..	..	6 (10·0)	12 (20·0)	18 (30·0)	24 (40·0)	60 (100·0)

APPENDIX TABLE No. 4.2

Distribution of Beneficiaries in selected districts according to the causes of Bondedness

Name of the Districts	Cause of Bondedness									
	Taking Advance by self	Taking Advance by his Predecessors	Taking Advance by his children	In lieu of interest on loan	Customary obligation	Social obligation	Obligation succession	Due to birth in a particular caste or community	Any other	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Medak	53 (88·33)	6 (10·0)	..	..	..	..	1 (1·67)	..	..	60 (100·0
Mehboobnagar	24 (40·0)	34 (56·67)	..	..		..	..	..	2 (3·33)	60 (100·0)
Rangareddy	43 (71·67)	17 (28·33)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	60 (100.0)
Bhagalpur	26 (52·0)	9 (18·0)	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	15 (30·0)	..	..	50 (100·0)
Monghyar	42 (73·68)	15 (26·32)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	57 (100·0)
Nalanda	3 (11·54)	21 (80·77)	..	..	..	..	..	..	2 (7·69)	26 (100·0)
Santhal parganas	32 (54·24)	24 (40·68)	..	..	..		..	3 (5·08)	..	59 (100·0)
Chitradurga	5 (8·33)	1 (1·67)	..	..	..	..	1 (1·67)	..	53 (88·33)	60 (100·0)
Kolar	19 (31. 67)	24 (40·0)	..	2 (3·33)	3 (5·0)	1 (1·67)	1 (1 67)	3 (5·0)	7 (11·67)	60 (100·0)
Jabalpur	29 (100·0)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	29 (100·0)
Raigarh	2 (100·0)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2 (100·0
Ganjam	..	..	..	..	2 (100.0)	..	..	..	..	(2) (100·0)
Kalahandi	..	21 (95·45)	..	..	..	..	..	..	1 (4·55)	22 (100·0)
Koraput	39 (81·25)	2 (4·17)	..	..	..	1 (2·08)	..	..	6 (12·50)	48 (100·0)
Phulbani	..	6 (85·71)	..	..	..	..	..	..	1 (14·29)	7 (100·0)
Kota	45 (75·0)	8 (13·33)	..	..	..	3 (5·0)	..	..	4 (6·67)	60 (100·0)
Periyar	34 (56·67)	25 (41·67)	..	..	..	..	..	..	1 (1·67)	60 (100·0)
Tehrigarhwal	46 (76·67)	14 (23·33)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	60 (100·0)

APPENDIX TABLE No. 4.3 & 4.4

Distribution of Beneficiaries reporting various details of Agreement under Bondage

State/District	Agreement signed	Agreement not signed	Agreement honoured by the master	Agreement not honoured by the master
1	2	3	4	5
Andhra Pradesh				
1. Medak	49 81·67	11 18·33	60 100·00	0 0·00
2. Mehboobnagar	15 25·00	45 75·00	60 100·00	0 0·00
3. Rangareddy	41 68·33	19 31·67	59 98·33	1 1·67
State Total	105 58·33	75 41·67	179 99·44	1 0·56

APPENDIX TABLE No. 4.3 & 4.4—(*Contd.*)

1	2	3	4	5
2. Bihar				
1. Bhagalpur . . .	18	32	50	0
	36·00	64·00	100·00	0·00
2. Monghyr . . .	7	50	57	0
	12·28	87·72	100·00	0·00
3. Nalanda . . .	0	26	26	0
	0·00	100·00	100·00	0·00
4. Santhal Pzrghanas . .	48	8	39	20
	81-36	13·56	66·10	33·90
State Total . .	**73**	**116**	**172**	**20**
	38·02	**60·42**	**89·58**	**10·42**
3. Karnataka				
1. Chitradurga . . .	3	57	60	0
	5·00	95·00	100·00	0·00
2. Kolar	0	60	59	1
	0·00	100·00	98·00	1·67
State Total . . .	**3**	**117**	**119**	**1**
	2·50	**97·50**	**99·17**	**0·83**
4. Madhya Pradesh				
1. Jabalpur . . .	0	29	19	10
	0·00	100·00	65·52	34·48
2. Raigarh . . .	0	2	0	2
	0·00	100·00	0·00	100·00
State Total . . .	**0**	**31**	**19**	**12**
	0·00	**100·00**	**61·29**	**38·71**
5. Orissa				
1. Ganjam . . .	0	2	2	0
	0·00	100·00	100·00	0·00
2. Kalahandi . . .	1	21	22	0
	4·55	95·45	100·00	0·00
3. Koratput	0	48	48	0
	0·00	100·00	100·00	0·00
4. Phulbani . . .	1	6	7	0
	14·29	85·71	100·00	0·00
State Total . . .	**2**	**77**	**79**	**0**
	2·53	**97·47**	**100·00**	**0·00**
6. Rajasthan				
1. Kota	56	4	50	10
	93·33	6·67	83·33	16·67
State Total . . .	**56**	**4**	**50**	**10**
	93·33	**6·67**	**83·33**	**16·67**
7. Tamil Nadu				
1. Periyar . . .	59	1	60	0
	98·33	1·67	100·00	0·00
State Total . . .	**59**	**1**	**60**	**0**
	98·33	**1·67**	**100·00**	**0·00**
8. Uttar Pradesh				
1. Tehrigarhwal . .	12	48	60	0
	20·00	80·00	100·00	0·00
State Total . . .	**12**	**48**	**60**	**0**
	20·00	**80·00**	**100·00**	**0·00**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 4.5

Distribution of Beneficiaries reporting days off with wages

State	District	No. reporting weekly off	No. reporting off days in a month (Total)	No. reporting off days in a year (Total)
1	2	3	4	5
Andhra Pradesh	Medak	..	..	..
	Mahboobnagar	..	..	..
	Rangareddy	..	..	..
State Total	..	..	..	..
Bihar	Bhagalpur	..	..	..
	Monghyr	..	..	..
	Nalanda	..	..	1 (3·85)
	Santhal Parganas	..	..	..
State Total		..	..	1 (0·52)
Karnataka	Chitradurga	..	..	..
	Kolar	4 (6·67)	19 (31·67)	6 (10·00)
State Total		4 (3·33)	19 (15·83)	6 (5·00)
Madhya Pradesh	Jabalpur	..	1 (3·45)	..
	Raigarh	..	..	..
State Total		..	1 (3·23)	..
Orissa	Ganjam	..	..	..
	Kalahandi	..	..	..
	Koraput	6 (12·50)	1 (2·08)	33 (68·75)
	Phulbani	..	..	..
State Total		6 (7·59)	1 (1·27)	33 (41·77)
Rajasthan	Kota	..	41 (68·33)	1 (1·67)
State Total		..	41 (68·33)	1 (1·67)
Tamil Nadu	Periyar	1 (1.67)	44 (73·33)	9 (15·00)
State Total		1 (1·67)	44 (73·33)	9 (15·00)
Uttar Pradesh	Tehrigarhwal	..	54 (90·00)	..
State Total	..	..	54 (90·00)	..

APPENDIX TABLE No. 5.1

Distribution of Beneficiaries showing time lag between 1st contact for identification and the actual date of identification

State/District	Total no. of selected Beneficiaries	No time lag	Time lag between 1st contact and actual identification							
			Upto one month	1—3 months	3—6 months	6—9 months	9—12 months	1—2 years	Above 2 years	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Andhra Pradesh										
1. Medak	60 (0·00)	56 (93·33)	4 (6·67)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	4 (6·67)
2. Mehboobnagar	60 (0·00)	52 (86·67)	8 (13·33)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	8 (13·33)
3. Rangareddy	60 (0·00)	50 (83·33)	9 (15·00)	0 (0·00)	1 (1·67)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	10 (16·67)
State Total	**180 (0·00)**	**158 (87·78)**	**21 (11·67)**	**0 (0·00)**	**1 (0·56)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**22 (12·22)**
2. Bihar										
1. Bhagalpur	50 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	32 (64·00)	7 (14·00)	2 (04·00)	0 (0·00)	9 (18·00)	0 (0·00)	50 (100·00)
2. Monghyr	57 (0·00)	57 (100·0)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
3. Nalanda	26 (0·00)	26 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0··0)	0 (0·00)
4. Santhal Parganas	59 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	18 (30·51)	15 (2·42)	1 (1·69)	25 (42·37)	0 (0·00)	59 (100·00)
State Total	**192 (0·00)**	**83 (43·23)**	**0 (0·00)**	**32 (16·67)**	**25 (13·02)**	**17 (8·85)**	**1 (0·52)**	**34 (17·71)**	**0 (0·00)**	**109 (56·77)**
3. Karnataka										
1. Chitradurga	60 (0·00)	60 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
2. Kolar	60 (0·00)	60 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
State Total	**120 (0·00)**	**120 (100·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0.00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**
5. Madhya Pradesh										
1. Jabalpur	29 (0·00)	29 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0··0)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
2. Raigarh	2 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	2 (100·00)	2 (100·00)
State Total	**31 (0·00)**	**29 (93·55)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**2 (6·45)**	**2 (6·45)**
6. Orissa										
1. Ganjam	2 (0·00)	2 (100·00)	0 (0··0)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
2. Kalahandi	22 (0·00)	4 (18·18)	10 (45·40)	1 (4·55)	4 (18·18)	2 (9·09)	1 (4·55)	18 (81·82)	0 (0·00)	18 (81·22)
3. Koraput	48 (0·00)	33 (68·75)	11 (22·92)	4 (8·33)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	15 (31·25)
4. Phulbani	7 (0·00)	7 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
State Total	**79 (0·00)**	**46 (58·23)**	**21 (26·58)**	**5 (6·33)**	**4 (5·06)**	**2 (2·53)**	**1 (1·27)**	**0 (00·0)**	**0 (0·00)**	**33 (41·77**
7. Rajasthan										
1. Kota	60 (0·00)	60 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
State Total	**60 (0·00)**	**60 (100·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**

Appendix TABLE No. 5.1—(*Contd.*)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
8. Tamil Nadu										
1. Periyar . . .	60 (0·00)	60 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
State Total . .	**60** (0·00)	**60** (100·00)	**0** (0.00)	**0** (0·00)	**0** (0·00)	**0** (0·00)	**0** (0·00)	**0** (0·00)	**0** (0·00)	**0** (0·00)
9. Uttar Pradesh										
1. Tehrigarhwal .	60 (0·00)	5 (8·33)	3 (5·00)	51 (85·00)	1 (1·67)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.00)	55 (91.67)
State Total . . .	**60** (0·00)	**5** (8·33)	**3** (5·00)	**51** (85·00)	**1** (1·67)	**0** (00·00)	**0** (0·00)	**0** (0·00)	0 (0.00)	**55** (91·67)

APPENDIX 7.1

Revised Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Labour while issuing sanctions

(i) The amount released would be adjusted against the total Central outlay approved for the Scheme of relief and rehabilitation of bonded labour in the State during the current financial year. The Central share of grant will, in no case, exceed Rs. 2,000 per bonded labour.

(ii) The State Government would allocate and expend a matching amount of not less than that sanctioned in this letter towards the implementation of the Scheme(s) in the State during the current financial year.

(iii) The Scheme for which the release is being sanctioned would conform to the Guidelines on the subject sent to the State Governments/Union Territories vide this Ministry's letter No. Y-11011/1/78-AL, dated the 30th May. 1978 and No. Y-11011/6/81-B.L., dated the 24th February, 1983.

(iv) Separate item-wise accounts would be maintained by the State Government in respect of each of the Schemes which should be open to test check by the Controller & Auditor General at his discretion.

(v) The State Government will ensure that the benefit of assistance under the scheme go only to those who have been identified and registered as bonded labour under the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 and the Rules framed thereunder.

(vi) The State Government would nominate a liaison officer with whom all correspondence relating to the rehabilitation Scheme(s) in question may be carried on.

(vii) It would be ensured by the State Government that the economic units proposed to be provided to the bonded labour families viz. Poultry/Goat/Sheep-rearing/milch animals/piggery/sericulture/bullocks/carts/agricultural implements and other items of craft are adequate enough to provide them with substantial income from these units to make a living for themselves and their families. No cash assistance should be given to the erstwhile bonded labourers from the Central share of grant.

(viii) The land on which it is proposed to rehabilitate the bonded labour families under the Scheme would first be reclaimed and developed into cultivable land by the State Government from out of its own resources or the resources available under some of the on-going schemes in the areas.

(ix) The State Government shall maintain accounts and reports and returns as prescribed in the Guidelines referred to para (iii) above.

(x) Any unspent amount, out of the Central assistance would not be carried forward for expenditure during the next financial year, but should be surrendered to the Central Government as per instructions contained in the Ministry of Finance O.M. No. G-26035-M.F. CCA dated the 4th June, 1977.

(xi) The State Government shall ensure that assistance from out of the grants sanctioned in this letter is not given to the bonded labourers who were already benefited from the grant released by this Ministry during the previous years under the Centrally Sponsored Schemes for the rehabilitation of bonded labour or during a previous year, from the Central/State grants under other on-going schemes.

(xii) The State Government shall send the statements giving details of expenditure actually incurred and the Utilisation of Certificates thereafter in respect of the Central Grants released during the current financial year as well as for the State Government's matching share of expenditure by 30th April of the next financial year. The State Government shall also send in time, quarterly progress reports as already prescribed in the Guidelines of the Scheme. Release of further instalments of Central grant will be subject to reduction/discontinuance. If no proper and timely progress is shown adequately in the actual execution of the programmes and in the utilisation of the sanctioned grant or in the event of non-compliance by the State Government with the requirements of the guidelines of the Scheme, or the terms and conditions regulating the sanction and release of the Central grants.

(xiii) The grant shall be utilised fully for the purpose for which it is being sanctioned to the direct benefit of the Bonded Labourers and no portion of it shall be spent on purchase of vehicles or in meeting expenditure on staff or other overhead costs on the State Government's administrative/executive machinery.

(xiv) In providing rehabilitation assistance under this Scheme, priority should be given by the State Government to those bonded labourers who have been suffering under the Bonded Labour System for a long period of time say five years or more. Ways of providing wage paid employment to the bonded labourers on a regular basis should also be found by making full utilisation of the funds available under the Integrated Rural Development Schemes before providing means of self-employment or assistance admissible to them under this scheme.

(xv) The element of Central assistance would not be utilised for any programme such as house-building, etc., which the State Government, wherever proposed in their Schemes, may cover under other on-going schemes. The Central assistance would only be spent on self-employment and income generating schemes for the bonded labour. No further assistance would be forthcoming for these bonded labour who are covered under this Central allocation.

(xvi) The State Government shall satisfy themselves after physical verification that irrigation wells, pumpsets etc. wherever proposed in their schemes are essential for the beneficiaries; and

(xvii) The implementation of the scheme would be subjected to evaluation at a time and by an agency decided by the Central Government.

APPENDIX TABLE No. 7.2

Distribution of beneficiaries reporting income not sufficient during the intervening period, reasons thereof and the way living was maintained

State/District	Total No. of selected beneficiaries	Total No. reporting time lag between release & rehabilitation	No. reporting income not sufficient	Of these in col 3, No. reporting reasons			
				Work not available	No one prepared to give work	No Subsistance allowance given	Any other
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Andhra Pradesh							
1. Medak	60	60	43	39	0	0	13
	0·00	100·00	71·67	90·70	0·00	0·00	30·23
2. Mehaboob Nagar	60	60	30	18	0	0	26
	0·00	100·00	50·00	60·00	0·00	0·00	86·67
3. Rangareddy	60	60	56	51	0	0	14
	0·00	100·00	93·33	91·07	0·00	0·00	25·00
State Total	**180**	**180**	**129**	**108**	**0**	**0**	**53**
	0·00	**100·00**	**71·67**	**83·72**	**0·00**	**0·00**	**41·09**
Bihar							
1. Bhagalpur	50	50	27	25	0	0	2
	0·00	100·00	54·00	92·59	0·00	0·00	7·41
2. Monghyr	57	57	6	0	0	6	0
	0·00	100·00	10·53	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00
3. Nalanda	26	26	3	0	0	3	0
	0·00	100·00	11·54	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00
4. Santhal Parganas	59	59	13	6	0	7	0
	0·00	100·00	22·03	46·15	0·00	53·85	0·00
State Total	**192**	**192**	**49**	**31**	**0**	**16**	**2**
	0·00	**100·00**	**25·52**	**63·27**	**0·00**	**32·65**	**4·08**
Karnataka							
1. Chitradurga	60	60	35	6	0	6	29
	0·00	100.00	58·63	17,14	0·00	17·14	82·86
2. Kolar	60	60	56	26	1	41	1
	0·00	100·00	93·33	46·43	1·79	73·21	1·79
State Total	**120**	**120**	**91**	**32**	**1**	**47**	**30**
	0·00	**100·00**	**75·83**	**35·16**	**1·10**	**51·65**	**32·97**
Madhya Pradesh							
1. Jabalpur	29	29	14	7	6	0	1
	0·00	100·00	48·28	50·00	42·86	0·00	7·14
2. Raigarh	2	2	2	2	0	0	0
	0·00	100·00	100·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
State Total	**31**	**31**	**16**	**9**	**6**	**0**	**1**
	0·00	**100·00**	**51·61**	**56·25**	**37.50**	**0·00**	**6·25**
Orissa							
1. Gunjam	2	2	2	2	0	2	1
	0·00	100·00	100·00	100·00	0·00	100·00	50·00
2. Kalahandi	22	22	0	0	0	0	0
	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
3. Koraput	48	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0.00	0·00
4. Phulbani	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
State Total	**79**	**24**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**2**	**1**
	0·00	**30·38**	**8·33**	**100·00**	**0·00**	**12·50**	**50·00**
Rajasthan							
1. Kota	60	60	33	26	0	2	5
	0·00	100·00	55·00	78·79	0·00	6·06	15·15
State Total	**60**	**60**	**33**	**26**	**0**	**2**	**5**
	0·00	**100·00**	**55·00**	**78·79**	**0·00**	**6·06**	**15·15**
Tamil Nadu							
1. Periyar	60	60	60	47	2	11	0
	0·00	100·00	100·00	78·33	3·33	18·33	0·00
State Total	**60**	**60**	**60**	**47**	**2**	**11**	**0**
	0·00	**100·00**	**100·00**	**78·33**	**3·33**	**18·33**	**0·00**
Uttar Pradesh							
1. Tehrigarhwal	60	58	1	0	0	1	0
	0·00	96·67	1·72	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00
State Total	**60**	**58**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**
	0·00	**96·67**	**1·72**	**0·00**	**0·00**	**100·00**	**0·00**

Appendix Table No. 7.2—(*Contd.*)

State/District	Of these in Col. 3 the way they were maintaining themselves					
	By begging	By Borrowing from friends	Borrowing from relatives	By missing meals	By starving	Any other
1	9	10	11	12	13	14
AndhraPradesh						
1. Medak	0 0·00	20 46·51	18 41·86	2 4·65	0 0·00	3 6·98
2. Mehboobnagar	0 0·00	17 50·67	1 3·33	10 33·33	0 0·00	4 13·33
3. Rangareddy	0 0·00	17 30·36	7 12·50	12 21·43	6 10·71	18 32·14
State Total	**0** **0·00**	**54** **41·86**	**26** **20·16**	**24** **18·60**	**6** **4·65**	**25** **19·38**
Bihar						
1. Bhagalpur	0 0·00	4 14·81	1 3·70	9 33·33	11 40·74	2 7·41
2. Monghyr	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	6 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
3. Nalanda	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	3 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
4. Santhal Parganas	0 0.00	0 0·00	0 0·00	5 38·46	3 23·08	5 38·46
State Total	**0** **0·00**	**4** **8·16**	**1** **2·04**	**23** **46·94**	**14** **28·57**	**7** **14·09**
Karnataka						
1. Chitradurga	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	4 11·43	31 85·57	0 0·00
2. Kolar	2 3·57	9 16·07	4 7·14	38 67·86	14 25·00	1 1·79
State Total	**2** **2·20**	**9** **9·89**	**4** **4·40**	**42** **46·15**	**45** **49·45**	**1** **1·10**
Madhya Pradesh						
1. Jabalpur	0 0·00	1 7·14	2 14·29	6 42·86	3 21·43	3 21·43
2. Raigarh	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 50·00	1 50·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**0** **0·00**	**1** **6·25**	**3** **18·75**	**7** **43·25**	**3** **18·75**	**3** **18·75**
Orissa						
1. Ganjam	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 50·00	2 100·00	0 0·00
2. Kalahandi	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·000	0 0·00
3. Koraput	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
4. Phulbani	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **50·00**	**2** **12·50**	**0** **0·00**
Rajasthan						
1. Kota	0 0·00	1 3·03	3 9·09	9 27·27	4 12·12	16 48·48
State Total	**0** **0·00**	**1** **3·03**	**3** **9·09**	**9** **27·27**	**4** **12·12**	**16** **48·48**
Tamil Nadu						
1. Periyar	0 0·00	3 5·00	23 38·33	33 55·00	0 0·00	1 1·67
State Total	**0** **0·00**	**3** **5·00**	**23** **38·33**	**33** **55·00**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **1·67**
Uttar Pradesh						
1. Tehrigarhwal	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 100·00
State Total	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **100·00**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 8.1

Distribution of beneficiaries according to reasons for suitability of the scheme

State/District	Total No. of selected beneficiaries	No. suggesting suitable schemes	Number reporting reasons for their choice		
			Had an earlier experience	Traditional occupation	Income will be sufficient
1	2	3	4	5	6
Andhra Pradesh					
1. Medak	60 (0·00)	21 (35·00)	7 (33·33)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
2. Mehboobnagar	60 (0·00)	35 (58·33)	1 (2·86)	2 (5·71)	2 (5·71)
3. Rangareddy	60 (0·00)	50 (83·33)	9 (18·00)	2 (4·00)	8 (16·00)
State Total	**180 (0·00)**	**106 (58·89)**	**17 (16·04)**	**4 (3·77)**	**10 (9·43)**
Bihar					
1. Bhagalpur	50 (0·00)	13 (26·00)	1 (7·69)	0 (0·00)	8 (61·54)
2. Monghyr	57 (0·00)	21 (36·89)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	6 (28·57)
3. Nalanda	26 (0·00)	14 (53·85)	5 (35·71)	1 (7·14)	1 (7·14)
4. Santhal Parganas	59 (0·00)	14 (23·73)	0 (0·00)	1 (7·14)	6 (42·86)
State Total	**192 (0·00)**	**62 (32·29)**	**6 (9·68)**	**2 (3·23)**	**21 (33·87)**
Karnataka					
1. Chitradurga	60 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
2. Kolar	60 (0·00)	30 (50·00)	0 (0·00)	1 (3·45)	11 (37·93)
State Total	**120 (0·00)**	**30 (25·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**1 (3·45)**	**11 (37·93)**
Madhya Pradesh					
1. Jabalpur	29 (0·00)	27 (93·10)	8 (29·63)	3 (11·11)	7 (25·93)
2. Raigarh	2 (0·00)	2 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	1 (50·00)
State Total	31 (0·00)	**29 (93·55)**	8 (27·59)	**3 (10·34)**	**8 (27·59)**
Orissa					
1. Ganjam	2 (0·00)	2 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	2 (100·00)
2. Kalahandi	22 (0·00)	17 (77·27)	0 (0·00)	7 (41·18)	2 (11·76)
3. Koraput	48 (0·00)	7 (14·58)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	3 (42·86)
4. Phulbani	7 (0·00)	5 (71·43)	1 (20·00)	1 (20·00)	1 (20·00)
State Total	**79 (0·00)**	**31 (39·24)**	**1 (3·23)**	**8 (25·81)**	**8 (25·81)**
Rajasthan					
1. Kota	60 (0·00)	59 (98·33)	17 (28·81)	0 (0·00)	25 (42·37)
State Total	**60 (00·00)**	**59 (98·33)**	**17 (28·81)**	**0 (0·00)**	**25 (42·37)**
Tamil Nadu					
1. Periyar	60 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
State Total	**60 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**
Uttar Pradesh					
1. Tehrigarhwal	60 (0·00)	1 (1·67)	1 (100·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
State Total	**60 (0·00)**	**1 (1·67)**	**1 (100·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 8.1—(*Contd.*)

State/District	Number reporting reasons for their choice				
	Will provide regular sources of income	Will provide Employment to whole family	Raw material easily available	Any other	Total any reasons
1	7	8	9	10	11
Andhra Pradesh					
1. Medak	2 (9·52)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	12 (57·14)	21 (100·00)
2. Mehboobnagar	25 (71·43)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	6 (17·14)	35 (100·00)
3. Rangareddy	35 (70·00)	3 (6·00)	0 (0·00)	2 (4·00)	50 (100·00)
State Total	**62 (58·49)**	**3 (2·83)**	**0 (0·00)**	**20 (18·87)**	**106 (100·00)**
Bihar					
1. Bhagalpur	4 (30·77)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	13 (100·00)
2. Monghyr	14 (66·67)	1 (4·76)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	21 (100·00)
3. Nalanda	4 (28·57)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	3 (21·43)	14 (100·00)
4. Santhal Parganas	5 (35·71)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	2 (14·29)	14 (100·00)
State Total	**27 (43·55)**	**1 (1·61)**	**0 (0·00)**	**5 (8·06)**	**62 (100·00)**
Karnataka					
1. Chitradurga	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
2. Kolar	10 (34·48)	7 (24·14)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	29 (96·67)
State Total	**10 (34·48)**	**7 (24·14)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**29 (96·67)**
Madhya Pradesh					
1. Jabalpur	9 (33·33)	4 (14·81)	1 (3·70)	0 (0·00)	27 (100·00)
2. Raigarh	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	1 (50·00)	2 (100·00)
State Total	**9 (31·03)**	**4 (13·79)**	**1 (3·45)**	**1 (3·45)**	**29 (100·00)**
Orissa					
1. Ganjam	0 (0·00)	1 (50·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	2 (100·00)
2. Kalahandi	8 (47·06)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	17 (100·00)
3. Koraput	4 (57·14)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	7 (100·00)
4. Phulbani	2 (40·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	5 (100·00)
State Total	**14 (45·16)**	**1 (3·23)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**31 (100·00)**
Rajasthan					
1. Kota	15 (25·42)	3 (5·08)	0 (0·00)	4 (6·78)	59 (100·00)
State Total	**15 (25·42)**	**3 (5·08)**	**0 (0·00)**	**4 (6·78)**	**59 (100·00)**
Tamil Nadu					
1. Periyar	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)
State Total	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**
Uttar Pradesh					
1. Tehri-garhwal	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	0 (0·00)	1 (100·00)
State Total	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**0 (0·00)**	**1 (100·00)**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 8.2

No. of beneficiaries reporting benefits inadequate for rehabilitation

State/District	Total No. of selected beneficiaries	No. reporting benefits		
		Adequate	Partially adequate	Not adequate
1	2	3	4	5
Andhra Pradesh				
1. Medak	60	33	23	4
	0·00	55·00	38·33	6·67
2. Mehboobnagar	60	4	47	9
	0·00	6·67	78·33	15·00
3. Rangareddy	60	10	4	46
	0·00	16·67	6·67	76·67
State Total	**180**	**47**	**74**	**59**
	0·00	**26·11**	**41·11**	**32·78**
Bihar				
1. Bhagalpur	50	27	9	14
	0·00	54·00	18·00	28·00
2. Monghyr	57	22	10	25
	0·00	38·60	17·54	43·86
3. Nalanda	26	0	7	19
	0·00	0·00	26·92	73 08
4. Santhal Parganas	59	20	32	7
	0·00	33·90	54·24	11·86
State Total	**192**	**69**	**58**	**65**
	0·00	**35·94**	**30·21**	**33·85**
Karnataka				
1. Chitradurga	60	8	51	1
	0·00	13·33	85·00	1·67
2. Kolar	60	0	24	36
	0·00	0·00	40·00	60·00
State Total	**120**	**8**	**75**	**37**
	0·00	**6·67**	**62·50**	**30·83**
Madyha Pradesh				
1. Jabalpur	29	0	22	7
	0·00	0·00	75·86	24·14
2. Raigarh	2	0	0	2
	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
State Total	**31**	**0**	**22**	**9**
	0·00	**0·00**	**70·97**	**29·03**
Orissa				
1. Ganjam	2	0	0	2
	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
2. Kalahandi	22	7	9	6
	0·00	31·82	40·91	27·27
3. Koraput	48	31	11	6
	0·00	64·58	22·92	12·50
4. Phulbani	7	1	4	2
	0·00	14·29	57·14	28·57
State Total	**79**	**39**	**24**	**16**
	0·00	**49·37**	**30·38**	**20·25**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 8.2—(*Contd.*)

1	2	3	4	5
Rajasthan				
1. Kota	60	3	2	55
	0·00	5·00	3·33	91·67
State Total . . .	**60**	**3**	**2**	**55**
	0·00	**5.00**	**3·33**	**91·67**
Tamil Nadu				
1. Periyar . . .	60	0	0	60
	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
State Total . .	**60**	**0**	**0**	**60**
	0·00	**0·00**	**0·00**	**100·00**
Uttar Pradesh . . .				
1. Tehrigarhwal . .	60	39	7	14
	0·00	65·00	11·67	23·33
State Total . . .	**60**	**39**	**7**	**14**
	0·00	**65·00**	**11·67**	**23·33**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 8.3

No. of beneficiaries reporting suggestions for improvement for rehabilitation

State/District	Total no. of selected beneficiaries	Suggestion for improvement				
		Should be viable	Subsistence allowance be paid regularly till rehabilitation	Rate of subsistence allowance should be raised	Provision for urgent cash needs be made	Size of scheme should be increased
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Andhra Pradesh						
1. Medak	60	0	0	0	0	10
	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	37·04
2. Mehboobnagar	60	4	0	1	4	26
	0·00	7·14	0·00	1·79	7·14	46·43
3. Rangareddy	60	0	0	0	0	47
	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	94·00
State Total	**180**	**4**	**0**	**1**	**4**	**83**
	0·00	**3·01**	**0·00**	**0·75**	**3·01**	**62·41**
Bihar						
1. Bhagalpur	50	6	0	0	0	17
	0·00	26·09	0·00	0·00	0·00	73·91
2. Monghyr	57	11	0	0	0	15
	0·00	31·43	0.00	0·00	0·00	42·86
3. Nalanda	26	4	0	0	3	19
	0·00	15·38	0·00	0·00	11·54	73·08
4. Santhal Parganas	59	24	1	0	1	11
	0·00	61·54	2·56	0·00	2·56	28·21
State Total	**192**	**45**	**1**	**0**	**4**	**62**
	0·00	**36·59**	**0.81**	**0·00**	**3.25**	**50·41**
Karnataka						
1. Chitradurga	60	0	0	0	0	19
	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	36·54
2. Kolar	60	6	30	0	6	20
	0·00	10·00	50·00	0·00	10·00	33·33
State Total	**120**	**6**	**30**	**0**	**6**	**39**
	0·00	**5·36**	**26·79**	**0·00**	**5·36**	**34·82**
Madhya Pradesh						
1. Jabalpur	29	6	0	0	2	3
	0·00	20·69	0·00	0·00	6·90	10·34
2. Raigarh	2	0	0	0	0	0
	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
State Total	**31**	**6**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3**
	0·00	**19.35**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**6.45**	**9.68**
Orissa						
1. Ganjam	2	1	1	0	0	0
	0·00	50·00	50·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
2. Kalahandi	22	0	0	0	0	6
	0·00	0·00	0.00	0·00	0·00	40·00
3. Koraput	48	0	10	1	2	0
	0·00	0·00	58·82	5·88	11·76	0·00
4. Phulbani	7	0	0	0	0	1
	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	16·67
State Total	**79**	**1**	**11**	**1**	**2**	**7**
	0·00	**2·50**	**27·50**	**2·50**	**5·00**	**17·50**
Rajasthan						
1. Kota	60	48	3	0	0	1
	0·00	84·21	5·26	0·00	0·00	1·75
State Total	**60**	**48**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**1**
	0·00	**84·21**	**5·26**	**0·00**	**0·00**	**1·75**
Tamil Nadu						
1. Periyar	60	27	15	0	2	15
	0·00	45·00	25·00	0·00	3·33	25·00
State Total	**60**	**27**	**15**	**0**	**2**	**15**
	0·00	**45·00**	**25·00**	**0·00**	**3·33**	**25·00**
Uttar Pradesh						
1. Tehrigarhwal	60	1	0	0	2	14
	0·00	4·76	0·00	0·00	9·52	66·67
State Total	**60**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**14**
	0·00	**4·76**	**0·00**	**0·00**	**9·52**	**66·67**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 8.3 —(Contd.)

State/District	Suggestion for improvement		Allotment of land	Provision for irri. facilities	Financial assistance for agriculture inputs
	Any other	Total any suggestion			
1	8	9	10	11	12
Andhra Pradesh					
1. Medak	3 11·11	27 100·00	4 14·81	6 22·22	5 18·52
2. Mehaboobnagar	4 7·14	56 100·00	15 26·78	0 0·00	6 10·71
3. Rangareddy	1 2·00	50 100·00	2 4·00	3 6·00	0 0·00
State Total	**8** **6·02**	**133** **100·00**	**21** **15·79**	**9** **6·77**	**11** **8·27**
Bihar					
1. Bhagalpur	0 0·00	23 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
2. Monghyr	0 0·00	35 100·00	9 25·71	0 0·00	0 0·00
3. Nalanda	0 0·00	26 100·00	1 3·85	0 0·00	0 0·00
4. Santhal-parganas	2 5·13	39 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**2** **1·63**	**123** **100·00**	**10** **8·13**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**
Karnataka					
1. Chitradurga	6 11·54	52 100·00	44 84·62	0 0·00	3 5·77
2. Kolar	0 0·00	60 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	2 3·33
State Total	**6** **5·36**	**112** **100·00**	**44** **39·29**	**0** **0.00**	**5** **4·46**
Madhya Pradesh					
1. Jabalpur	16 55·17	29 100·00	3 10·34	0 0·00	0 0·00
2. Raigarh	0 0·00	2 100·00	1 50·00	0 0·00	1 50·00
State Total	**16** **51·61**	**31** **100·00**	**4** **12·90**	**0** **0.00**	**1** **3·23**
Orissa					
1. Ganjam	0 0·00	2 100·00	1 50·00	0 0·00	1 50·00
2. Kalahandi	0 0·00	15 100·00	12 80·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
3. Koraput	1 5·88	17 100·00	1 5·88	0 0·00	3 17·65
4. Phulbani	3 50·00	6 100·00	1 16·67	0 0·00	2 33·33
State Total	**4** **10·00**	**40** **100·00**	**15** **37·50**	**0** **0·00**	**6** **15·00**
Rajasthan					
1. Kota	4 7·02	57 100·00	1 1·75	0 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**4** **7·02**	**57** **100·00**	**1** **1·75**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**
Tamil Nadu					
1. Periyar	1 1·67	60 100·00	1 1·67	0 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**1** **1·67**	**60** **100·00**	**1** **1·67**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**
Uttar Pradesh					
1. Tehrigarhwal	4 19·05	21 100·00	0 0·00	2 9·52	0 0·00
State Total	**4** **19·05**	**21** **100·00**	**0** **0·00**	**2** **9·52**	**0** **0·00**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 8.4

Distribution of beneficiaries according to the size of cultivation holdings

State/District	Total no. of selected beneficiaries	Land allotted under the scheme (Total)					Total
		Upto 0·4 Hect.	0·4—0·8 Hect.	0·8—1·0 Heact.	1—2 Hect.	Above 2 Hect.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Andhra Pradesh							
1. Medak	60 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0·00	0 0·00
2. Mehaboobnagar	60 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·0 0	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
3. Rangareddy	60 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	00 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**180** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**
Bihar							
1. Bhagalpur	50 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·0	0 0·00
2. Monghyr	57 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
3. Nalanda	26 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
4. Santhal Parganas	59 0·00	2 40·00	2 40·00	1 20·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	5 8·47
State Total	**192** **0·00**	**2** **40·00**	**2** **40·00**	**1** **20·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**5** **2·60**
Karnataka							
1. Chitradurga	60 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
2. Kolar	60 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**120** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0.00**	**0·00**
Madhya Pradesh							
1. Jabalpur	29 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
2. Riagarh	2 0.00	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 50·00	0 0·00	1 50·00	2 100·00
State Total	**31** **0·00**	**0** **0.00**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **50·00**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **50·00**	**2** **6·45**
Orissa							
1. Ganjam	2 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	2 100·00	0 0.00	0 0·00	2 100·00
2. Kalahandi	22 0·00	1 25·00	3 75·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	4 18.18
3. Koraput	48 0·00	0 0·00	28 90·32	0 0·00	3 9·68	0 0·00	31 64·58
4. Phulbani	7 0·00	0 0·00	5 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	5 71·43
State Total	**79** **0·00**	**1** **2·38**	**36** **85·71**	**2** **4·76**	**3** **7·14**	**0** **0·00**	**42** **53·16**
Rajasthan							
1. Kota	60 0·00	2 66·67	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 33·33	0 0·00	3 5·00
State Total	**60** **0·00**	**2** **66·67**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **33·33**	**0** **0·00**	**3** **5·00**
Tamil Nadu							
1. Periyar	60 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**60** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**
Uttar Pradesh							
1. Tehrigarhwal	60 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**60** **0.00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 8.4—(Contd.)

State/District	Total cultivation hodling (Total)						Total
	Upto 0·4 Hect.	0·4—0·8 Hect.	0·8—1·0 Hect.	1—2 Hect.	2—4 Hect.	Above 4 Hect.	
1	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Andhra Pradesh							
1. Medak	10 43·48	8 34·78	3 13·04	2 8·70	0 0·00	0 0·00	23 38·33
2. Mehboobnagar	20 41·67	7 14·58	1 2·08	16 33·33	4 8·33	0 0·00	48 80·00
3. Rangareddy	7 24·14	6 20·69	6 20·69	8 27·59	2 6·90	0 0·00	29 48·33
State Total	**37** **37·00**	**21** **21·00**	**10** **10·00**	**26** **26·00**	**6** **6.00**	**0** **0·00**	**100** **55·56**
Bihar							
1. Bhagalpur	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
2. Monghyr	3 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	3 5·26
3. Nalanda	0 0·00	0 0.00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
4. Santhal parganas	8 29·63	10 37·04	1 3·70	7 25·93	1 3·70	0 0·00	77 45·76
State Total	**11** **36.67**	**10** **33·33**	**1** **3·33**	**7** **23·23**	**1** **3·33**	**0** **0·00**	**30** **15·62**
Karnataka							
1. Chitradurga	4 13·33	8 26·67	0 0·00	16 53·33	2 6·67	0 0·00	30 50·00
2. Kolar	7 23·33	9 30·00	0 0·00	14 46·67	0 0·00	0 0·00	30 50·00
State Total	**11** **18·33**	17 **28·33**	**0** **0·00**	**30** **50·00**	**2** **3·33**	**0** **0·00**	**60** **50·00**
Madhya Pradesh							
1. Jabalpur	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
2. Raigarh	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 50·00	0 0·00	1 50·00	0 0·00	2 100·00
State Total	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **50·00**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **50.00**	**0** **0·00**	**2** **6·45**
Orissa							
1. Ganjam	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	2 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	2 100·00
2. Kalahandi	1 25·00	3 75·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	4 18·18
3. Koraput	1 2·56	29 74·30	1 2·56	6 15·38	1 2·56	1 2·56	39 81·25
4. Phulbani	0 0·00	5 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	5 71·43
State Total	**2** **4·00**	**37** **74·00**	**1** **2·00**	**8** **16·00**	**1** **2·00**	**1** **2·00**	**50** **63·29**
Rajasthan							
1. Kota	2 50·00	1 25·00	0 0.00	1 25·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	4 6·76
State Total	**2** **50·00**	**1** **25·00**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **25·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0.00**	**4** **6·67**
Tamil Nadu							
1. Periyar	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 ·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
State Total	**0** **·000**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·000**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**
Uttar Pradesh							
1. Tehrigarhwal	42 76·36	12 21·82	0 0·00	1 1·82	0 0·00	0 0·00	55 91·67
State Total	**42** **76·36**	**12** **21·82**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **1·82**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**55** **91·67**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 9.1

Summary table indicating distribution of beneficiaries according to membership of Cooperative (Society-wise)

State/District	Total no. of selected beneficiaries	No. reporting membership of any society	Agrl. coop. society	Multipurpose/ service society	Marketing cooperative society
1	2	3	4	5	6
Andhra Pradesh					
Medak	60	4	4	..	..
Mehboobnagar	60	1	..	..	..
Rangareddy	60	2	..	2	..
State-Total	**180**	**7**	**4**	**2**	..
Bihar					
Bhagalpur	50	..	..	..	..
Monghyr	57	4	..	4	..
Nalanda	26	..	..	..	..
Santhal parganas	59	8	6	..	..
State-Total	**192**	**12**	**6**	**4**	..
Karnataka					
Chitradurga	60	6	..	2	..
Kolar	60	5	1	1	..
State-Total	**120**	**11**	**1**	**3**	..
Madhya Pradesh					
Jabalpur	29	25	..	..	..
Raigarh	2	..	..	..	..
State-Total	31	25	..	..	..
Orissa					
Ganjam	2	..	..	..	..
Kalahandi	22	3	..	3	..
Koraput	48	43	..	43	..
Phulbani	7	5	..	5	..
State-Total	**79**	**51**	..	**51**	..
Rajasthan					
Kota	60	60	8	3	..
State-Total	**60**	**60**	**8**	**3**	..
Tamil Nadu					
Periyar	60	..	..	..	..
State-Total	**60**	..		..	..
Uttar Pradesh					
Tehri-Garhwal	60	8	..	..	..
State-Total	**60**	**8**	..	..	..
ALL INDIA	**782**	**174**	**19**	**63**	..

APPENDIX TABLE No. 9.1—(Contd.)

State/District	Milk coop. society	Poultry coop. society	Consumer coop. society	Industrial coop. society	Others
1	7	8	9	10	11
Andhra Pradesh					
Medak	..	..	..	..	..
Mehboobnagar	..	..	..	..	1
Rangareddy	..	..	..	..	..
State-Total	..	..	..	..	1
Bihar					
Bhagalpur	..	..	..	..	..
Monghyr	..	..	..	..	..
Nalanda	..	..	..	..	..
Santhal Parganas	..	..	..	..	2
State-Total	..	..	..	..	2
Karnataka					
Chitradurga	..	..	..	..	4
Kolar	3	..	..	..	..
State-Total	3	..	..	..	4
Madhya Pradesh					
Jabalpur	25	..	..	..	..
Raigarh	..	..	..	..	..
State-Total	25	..	..	..	..
Orissa					
Ganjam	..	..	..	..	..
Kalahandi	..	..	..	..	..
Koraput	..	..	..	..	..
Phulbani	..	..	..	..	..
State-Total	..	..	..	..	..
Rajasthan					
Kota	..	..	..	60	..
State-Total	..	..	..	60	..
Tamil Nadu					
Periyar	..	..	..	..	..
State-Total	..	..	..	..	..
Uttar Pradesh					
Tchrigarhwal	..	..	..	2	6
State-Total	..	..	..	2	6
ALL INDIA	28	..	..	62	13

APPENDIX TABLE No. 9.2

Distribution of beneficiaries according to year of becoming member of Co-oparative (All Types)

State	No. of selected Districts	Total no. of selected Beneficieries	No. of reporting Membership	
			Year	No
1	2	2A	3	4
Andhrapradesh . . .	3	180 0·00	7 3·89	173 96·11
Bihar	4	192 0·00	12 6·25	180 93·75
Karnataka . . .	2	120 0·00	11 9·17	109 90·83
Madhya Pradesh . .	2	31 0·00	25 80·65	6 19·35
Orissa	4	79 0·00	51 64·56	28 35·44
Rajasthan . . .	1	60 0·00	60 100·00	0 0·00
Tamil Nadu	1	60 0·00	0 0·00	60 100·00
Uttar Pradesh . . .	1	60 0·00	8 13·33	52 86·67
ALL INDIA . .	18	782 0·00	**174** **22·25**	**608** **77·75**

APPENDIX TABLE No 9.2 –(Contd.)

State	Year of becoming member								
	Period to 1975	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	No response
1	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Andhra Pradesh .	2 28·57	1 14·29	0 0·00	0 0·00	2 28·57	2 28·57	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
Bihar . . .	2 16·67	1 8·33	6 50·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	3 25·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
Karnataka . .	1 9·09	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	3 27·27	0 0·00	7 63·64	0 0·00	0 0·00
Madhya Pradesh .	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	25 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
Orissa . . .	0 0·00	0 0·00	2 3·92	0 0·00	0 0·00	44 86·27	1 1·96	4 7·84	0 0·00
Rajasthan . .	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	2 3·33	3 5·00	60 100·00	1 1·67	2 3·33	0 0·00
Tamil Nadu . .	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
Uttar Pradesh .	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 12·50	7 87·50	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
ALL INDIA . .	**5** **2·87**	**2** **1·15**	**8** **4·60**	**3** **1·72**	**15** **8·62**	**134** **77·01**	**9** **5·17**	**6** **3·45**	**0** **0·00**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 9.3

Distribution of beneficiaries according to source of inducement and incentives for becoming member (All Types)

State	No. of Selected districts	Total no. of selected beneficiaries	No. reporting inducement by: Another Bonded labour	Someone from the village	His own caste leader	Some Social worker	Some Govt. official	Some Research worker	Others	Nil	Total
1	2	2A	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Andhra Pradesh .	3	180	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	0	7
		0·00	0·00	57·14	0·00	0·00	14·29	0·00	28·57	0·00	100·00
Bihar . . .	4	192	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	0	12
		0·00	0·00	50·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	50·00	0·00	100·000
Karnataka . .	2	120	1	1	2	0	7	0	0	0	11
		0·00	9·09	9·09	18·18	0·00	63·64	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Madhya Pradesh .	2	31	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	25
		0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Orissa . . .	4	79	0	0	0	0	51	0	0	0	51
		0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Rajasthan . .	1	60	0	0	0	0	60	0	10	0	60
		0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	16·67	0·00	100·00
Tamil Nadu . .	1	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0.00
Uttar Pradesh .	1	60	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	8
		0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
ALL INDIA .	**18**	**782**	**1**	**11**	**2**	**0**	**152**	**0**	**18**	**0**	**174**
		0·00	**0·57**	**6·32**	**1·15**	**0·0**	**87·36**	**0·00**	**10·34**	**0·00**	**100·00**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 9.3—(Contd)

State	No. of reporting incentive for becoming member: Full assistance toward share money	Share money in instalment	Preferential treatment for availing facility	Any other	No incentive	Total
1	12	13	14	15	16	17
Andhra Pradesh . .	0	3	1	2	1	6
	0·00	42·86	14·29	28·57	14·29	85·71
Bihar	8	0	0	0	4	8
	66·67	0·00	0·00	0·00	33·33	66·67
Karnataka . . .	2	1	2	3	3	8
	18·18	9·09	18·18	27·27	27·27	72·73
Madhya Pradesh . .	13	0	12	0	0	25
	52·00	0·00	48·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Orissa	51	0	0	0	0	51
	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Rajasthan	60	0	1	2	0	60
	100·00	0·00	1·67	3·33	0·00	100·00
Tamil Nadu . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0·00	0·00	0·00	0.00	0·00	0·00
Uttar Pradesh . . .	8	0	0	0	0	8
	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
ALL INDIA . .	**142·**	**4**	**16**	**7**	**8**	**166**
	81·61	**2·30**	**9·20**	**4·02**	**4·60**	**95·40**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 9.4

Distribution of beneficiaries according to the ways in which the Society proved useful (All Type)

State	No. of selected dist. ict.	Total no. of Selected bene-ficiaries	No. of reporting Membershp		Ways in which the society proved useful						
			Useful	Not useful	Able to secure loan (Cash)	Able to secure loan (kind)	Able to get good price for the produce	Get regular employ-ment	Received dividend on share money	Any other	Total
1	2	2A	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Andhra Pradesh .	3	180	6	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	6
		0·00	85·71	14·29	83·33	66·67	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Bihar . .	4	192	8	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	8
		0·00	66·67	33·33	87·50	12·50	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Karnataka . .	2	120	6	5	3	0	3	0	1	0	6
		0·00	54·55	45·45	50·00	0·00	50·00	0·00	16·67	0·00	100·00
Madhya Pradesh .	2	31	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
Orissa . .	4	79	38	13	38	3	0	0	0	0	38
		0·00	74·51	25·49	100·00	7·89	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Rajasthan . .	1	60	8	60	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
		0·00	13·33	100·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Tamil Nadu	1	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0·00	0.00	0.00	0·00	0.00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
Uttar Pradesh		60	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
		0·00	12·50	87·50	0 00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	100·00
ALL INDIA	**18**	**782**	**67**	**115**	**61**	**8**	**3**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**67**
		0·00	**38·51**	**66·09**	**91·04**	**11·94**	**4·48**	**0·00**	**2·99**	**0·00**	**100·00**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 9.5

Distribution of beneficiaries according to reasons for society being not useful and suggestion for improving the working (All Types)

State	No. of selected dists.	Total No. of selected beneficiaries	Reasons for society being not useful							
			Loans not given	Procedure Cumbersum	Rate interest high	Products not fetching good price	Not functioning properly	No response	Any other	Total
1	2	2A	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Andhra Pradesh	3	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
		0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	100·00
Bihar	4	192	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
		0·00	0·00	0.00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	100·00
Karnataka	2	120	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5
		0·00	20·00	40·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	40·00	100·00
Madhya Pradesh	2	31	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	25
		0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Orissa	4	79	8	1	2	0	0	0	2	13
		0·00	61·54	7·69	15·38	0·00	0·00	0·00	15·38	100·00
Rajasthan	1	60	3	0	0	0	3	0	54	60
		0·00	5·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	5·00	0·00	90·00	100·00
Tamil Nadu	1	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
Uttar Pradesh	1	60	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	7
		0·00	14·29	0·00	0·00	0.00	0·00	0·00	85·71	100·00
ALL INDIA	**18**	**782**	**13**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**28**	**0**	**69**	**115**
		0·00	**11·30**	**2·61**	**1·74**	**0·00**	**24·35**	**0·00**	**60·00***	**100·00**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 9.5—(Contd.)

State	Suggestion for improving the working							
	Procedure should be simplified	Officials should be helpful	Loan should be disposed quickly	Management should be improved	Services should be improved	No response	Any other	Total
1	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Andhra Pradesh	0	0	1	0	0	5	1	2
	0·00	0·00	14·29	0·00	0·00	71·43	14·29	28·57
Bihar	0	0	0	2	0	7	3	5
	0·0	0·00	0·00	16·67	0·00	58·33	25·00	41·67
Karnataka	1	3	2	0	1	2	6	9
	9·09	27·27	18·18	0·00	9·09	18·18	54·55	81·82
Madhya Pradesh	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	25
	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00
Orissa	8	9	0	0	1	30	3	21
	15·69	17·65	0·00	0·00	1·96	58·82	5·88	41·18
Rajasthan	0	1	1	0	0	13	47	47
	0·00	1.67	1·67	0·00	0·00	21·67	78·33	78·33
Tamil Nadu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	0·00
Uttar Pradesh	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	7
	0·00	12·50	0·00	0·00	0·00	12·50	75·00	87·50
All INDIA	**9**	**14**	**4**	**27**	**2**	**58**	**66**	**116**
	5·17	**8·05**	**2·30**	**15·52**	**1·15**	**33·33**	**37·93**	**66·67**

*(Industrial Society Kota and Theri-Garhwal)

Reasons

1. Shares getting no profits. 2. Nothing has been earned from allotment of shares. 3. No income or employment resulted by becoming member of society. 4. No construction work allotted to society. 5. No provision of cash loan.

*(Others Societies.)

1. Collected Penalty on interest. 2. No help given by the Society. 3. Not in position to take any advantage from the Cooperative. 4. Loans are not given without surety

APPENDIX TABLE No. 10.1

Distribution of beneficiaries according to the Degree of Satisfaction of the Schemes, Reasons for Dissatisfaction and Suggestions for improvement

State-District	No. of selected beneficiaries	No. of beneficiaries			Reasons for not being satisfied				
		Satisfied	Partially satisfied	Not satisfied	Not suitable to his back ground	Not sufficient for his needs	Quality not good	Not suited to his area	Any other
1 & 2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Andhra Pradesh									
1. Medak .	60	34	23	3	4	20	1	0	6
	0·00	56·67	38·33	5·00	15·38	76·92	3·85	0·00	23·08
2. Mahboobnagar .	60	5	46	9	2	43	10	0	0
	0·00	8·33	76·67	15·00	3·64	78·18	18·18	0·00	0·00
3. Rangareddy .	60	10	10	40	0	30	22	0	1
	0·00	16·67	16·67	66·67	0·00	60·00	44·00	0·00	2·00
State-Total .	**180**	**49**	**79**	**52**	**6**	**93**	**33**	**0**	**7**
	0·00	**27·22**	**43·89**	**28·89**	**4·58**	**70·99**	**25·19**	**0·00**	**5·34**
2. Bihar									
1. Bhagalpur .	50	44	2	4	2	1	3	0	0
	0·00	88·00	4·00	8·00	33·33	16·67	50·00	0·00	0·00
2. Monghyr . .	57	28	1	28	0	13	2	14	0
	0·00	49·12	1·75	49·12	0·00	44·83	6·90	48·28	0·00
3. Nalanda . .	26	3	7	16	0	7	4	13	0
	0·00	11·54	26·92	61·54	0·00	30·43	17·39	56·52	0·00
4. Santhal Parganas	59	25	29	5	2	17	9	4	2
	0·00	42·37	49·15	8·47	5·88	50·00	26·47	11·76	5·88
State-Total .	**192**	**100**	**39**	**53**	**4**	**38**	**18**	**31**	**2**
	0·00	**52·08**	**20·31**	**27·60**	**4·35**	**41·30**	**19·57**	**33·70**	**2·17**
3. Karnataka									
1. Chitradurga .	60	21	39	0	0	20	26	0	1
	0.00	35·00	56·00	0·00	0·00	51·28	66·66	0·00	2·56
2. Kolar . .	60	23	28	9	0	21	14	1	1
	0·00	38·33	46·67	15·00	0.00	56·76	37·84	2·70	2·70
State-Total .	**120**	**44**	**67**	**9**	**0**	**40**	**40**	**1**	**2**
	0·00	**36·67**	**55·83**	**7·50**	**0·00**	**52·63**	**52·63**	**1·32**	**2·63**
5. Madhya Pradesh									
1. Jabalpur . .	29	4	13	12	6	10	4	1	6
	0·00	13·79	44·38	41·38	24·00	40·00	16·00	4·00	24·00
2. Raigarh . .	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1
	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00	0·00	50·00	50·00
State-Total .	**31**	**4**	**13**	**14**	**6**	**10**	**4**	**2**	**7**
	0·00	**12·90**	**41·94**	**45·16**	**22·22**	**37·04**	**14·81**	**7·41**	**25·93**
6. Orissa									
1. Ganjam . .	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	0
	0·00	0·00	0·00	100·00	0 00	100·00	100·00	0·00	0·00
2. Kalahandi .	22	7	2	13	0	15	0	0	0
	0·00	31·82	9·09	59·09	0·00	100·0	0·00	0·00	0·00
3. Koraput .	48	36	9	3	0	4	4	0	5
	0.00	75·00	18·75	6·25	0·00	33·33	33·33	0·00	41·67
4. Phulbani . .	7.00	1	1	5	0	5	1	0	0
	0·00	14·29	14·29	71·43	0·00	83·33	16·67	0·00	0·00
State Total .	**79**	**44**	**12**	**23**	**0**	**26**	**7**	**0**	**5**
	0·00	**55·79**	**15·19**	**29·11**	**0·00**	**74·29**	**20·00**	**0·00**	**14·29**
7. Rajasthan . .									
1. Kota . . .	60	6	7	47	16	32	2	0	23
	0·00	10·00	11·67	78.33	29·63	59·26	3·70	0·00	42·59
State-Total .	**60**	**6**	**7**	**47**	**16**	**32**	**2**	**0**	**23**
	0·00	**10·00**	**11·67**	**78·33**	**29·63**	**59·26**	**3·70**	**0·00**	**42·59**
8. Tamil Nadu									
1. Periyar . .	60	0	1	59	0	2	44	14	3
	0·00	0·00	1·67	98·33	0·00	3·33	73·33	23·33	5·00
State-Total .	**60**	**0**	**1**	**59**	**0**	**2**	**44**	**14**	**3**
	0·00	**0·00**	**1·67**	**98·33**	**0·00**	**3·33**	**73·33**	**23·33**	**5·00**
9. Uttar Pradesh									
1. Tehrigarhwal	60	44	14	2	0	6	3	7	3
	0·00	73·33	23·33	3·33	0·00	37·50	18·75	43·75	18·75
State-Total .	**60**	**44**	**14**	**2**	**0**	**6**	**3**	**7**	**3**
	0·00	**73·33**	**23·33**	**3·33**	**0·00**	**37·50**	**18·75**	**43·75**	**18·75**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 10.1—(Contd.)

State/Districts	Suggestions					
	Should be according to his background	Should be viable	Quality should be good	Should be suitable for the area	Should be near to the Residence	Others
1	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Andhra Pradesh						
1. Medak	2 7·69	11 42·31	1 3·85	0 0·00	0 0·00	13 50·00
2. Mehboobnagar	3 5·45	35 63·64	12 21·82	0 0·00	0 0·00	6 10·91
3. Rangareddy	0 0·00	39 78·00	8 16·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	3 6·00
State-Total	**5** **3·82**	**85** **64·89**	**21** **16·03**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**22** **16·79**
2. Bihar						
1. Bhagalpur	1 16·67	2 33·33	2 33·33	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 16·67
2. Monghyr	0 0·00	8 27·59	2 6·90	11 37·93	0 0·00	8 27·59
3. Nalanda	0 0·00	6 26·09	4 17·39	10 43·48	0 0·00	3 13·04
4. Santhal Parganas	2 5·88	17 50·00	9 26·47	4 11·76	0 0·00	2 5·88
State-Total	**3** **3·26**	**33** **35·87**	**17** **18·48**	**25** **27·17**	**0** **0·00**	**14** **15·22**
3. Karnataka						
1. Chitradurga	0 0·00	13 33·33	26 66·67	0 0·00	0 0·00	6 15·38
2. Kolar	0 0·00	20 54·05	14 37·84	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 2·70
State-Total	**0** **0·00**	**33** **43·42**	**40** **52·63**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**7** **9·21**
4. Madhya Pradesh						
1. Jabalpur	7 28·00	4 16·00	4 16·00	1 4·00	0 0·00	10 40·00
2. Raigarh	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 50·00	1 50·00
State-Total	**7** **25·93**	**4** **14·81**	**4** **14·81**	**1** **3·70**	**1** **3·70**	**11** **40·74**
6. Orissa						
1. Ganjam	0 0·00	2 100·00	2 100·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
2. Kalahandi	5 33·33	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	10 66·67
3. Koraput	0 0·00	3 25·00	4 33·33	0 0·00	0 0·00	6 50·00
4. Phulbani	0 0·00	3 50·00	3 50·00	0 0·00	0 0·00	0 0·00
State-Total	**5** **14·29**	**8** **22·86**	**9** **25·71**	**0** **0·00**	**0** **0·00**	**16** **45·71**
7. Rajasthan						
1. Kota	10 18·52	17 31·48	0 0·00	2 3·70	0 0·00	24 44·44
State-Total	**10** **18·52**	**17** **31·48**	**0** **0·00**	**2** **3·70**	**0** **0·00**	**24** **44·44**
8. Tamil Nadu						
1. Periyar	0 0·00	3 5·00	15 25·00	30 50·00	0 0·00	26 43·33
Srate-Total	**0** **0·00**	**3** **5·00**	**15** **25·00**	**30** **50·00**	**0** **0·00**	**26** **43·33**
9. Uttar Pradesh						
1. Tehrigarhwal	0 0·00	0 0·00	1 6·25	6 37·50	0 0·00	12 75·00
State-Total	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·00**	**1** **6·25**	**6** **37·50**	**0** **0·00**	**12** **75·00**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 10.2

Distribution of Benificiaries reporting earnings not sufficient and the manner in which the shortfall was managed.

State/District	No. of Beneficiaries	No. Reporting Earnings		
		Adequate	Partly adequate	Not adequate
1&2	3	4	5	6
1. Andhra Pradesh..				
1. Medak	60	40	16	4
	0·00	66·0	26.7	6·7
2. Mehboobnagar	60	23	32	5
	0·0	38·3	53·3	8·3
3. Rangareddy	60	15	3	42
	0·0	25·0	5·0	70·0
State-Total	**180**	**78**	**51**	**51**
	0·0	**43·3**	**28.3**	**28·3**
2. Bihar				
1. Bhagalpur	50	34	8	8
	0·00	68·0	16·0	16·0
2. Monghyr	57	42	2	13
	0·0	73·7	3·5	22·8
3. Nalanda	26	2	6	18
	0·0	7·7	23·1	69·2
4. Santhal Parganas	59	19	39	1
	0·0	32·2	66·1	1·7
State-Total	**192**	**97**	**55**	**40**
	0.0	**50·5**	**28·6**	**20·8**
3. Karnataka				
1. Chitradurga	60	50	10	0
	0·0	83·3	16·7	0.0
2. Kolar	60	17	18	25
	0·0	28·3	30·0	42·7
State-Total	**120**	**67**	**28**	**25**
	0·0	**55·8**	**23·3**	**20·8**
3. Madhya Pradesh				
1. Jabalpur	29	8	8	13
	0·0	27·6	27·6	44·8
2. Raigarh	2	0	1	1
	0·0	0·0	50·0	50·0
State-Total	**31**	**8**	**9**	**14**
	0·0	**25·8**	**29·0**	**45·2**
6. Orissa				
1. Ganjam	2	0	0	2
	0·0	0·0	0·0	100·0
2. Kalahandi	22	3	14	5
	0·0	13·6	63·6	22·7
3. Koraput	48	40	7	1
	0·0	83·3	14·6	2·1
4. Phulbani	7	1	3	3
	0·0	14·3	42·9	42·9
State-Total	**79**	**44**	**24**	**11**
	0·0	**55·7**	**30·4**	**13·9**
7. Rajasthan				
1. Kota	60	10	46	4
	0·0	16·7	76·7	6·7
State-Total	60	10	46	4
	0·0	16·7	76·7	6·7
8. Tamil Nadu				
1. Periyar	60	0	0	60
	0·0	0·0	0·0	100·00
State-Total	**60**	**0**	0	**60**
	0·0	**0·0**	**0·0**	**100·0**
9. Uttar Pradesh				
1. Tehrigarhwal	60	57	3	0
	0·0	95·0	5·0	0·0
State Total	**60**	**57**	**3**	**0**
	0·0	**95·0**	**5·0**	**0·0**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 10.2—(Contd.)

State/District	In the absence of sufficient income, the way family expenditure was managed							
	Borrowing from landlords/ Lenders	Borrowing from Friends	Borrowing from relatives	Going without meals	Begging	Stealing	No response	Any other
1 & 2	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Andhra Pradesh								
1. Medak	6 30·0	11 55.0	3 15·0	1 5·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	1 5·0
2. Mehboobnagar	6 16.2	20 54·1	9 24·3	2 5·4	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0
3. Rangareddy	6 13·3	7 15·6	7 15·6	5 11·1	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	20 44·4
State-Total	**18** **17·6**	**38** **37·3**	**19** **18·6**	**8** **7·8**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**21** **20·6**
2. Bihar								
1. Bhagalpur	1 6·3	2 12·5	1 6·3	10 62·5	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	2 12·5
2. Monghyr	3 20·0	0 0·0	2 13.3	9 60·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	1 6·7
3. Nalanda	13 54·2	3 12·5	0 0·0	10 41·7	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	1 4·2
4. Santhal Parghanas	0 0·0	11 27·5	14 35·0	5 12·5	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	10 25·0
State-Total	**17** **17·9**	**16** **16·8**	**17** **17·9**	**34** **35·8**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**14** **14·7**
3. Karnataka								
1. Chitradurga	2 20·0	3 30·0	2 20·0	4 40·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	1 10·0
2. Kolar	1 2·3	19 44·2	7 16·3	26 60·5	2 4·7	0 0·0	0 0·0	1 2·3
State-Total	**3** **5·7**	**22** **41·5**	**9** **17·0**	**30** **56·6**	**2** **3·8**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**2** **3·8**
5. Madhya Pradesh								
1. Jabalpur	0 0·0	3 14·3	5 23·8	6 28·6	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	7 33·3
2. Raigarh	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	2 100·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0
State-Total	**0** **0·0**	**3** **13·0**	**5** **21·7**	**8** **34·8**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0.0**	**0** **0·0**	**7** **30·4**
6. Orissa								
1. Ganjam	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	2 100·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0
2. Kalahandi	4 21·1	0 0·0	17 89·5	0 0.0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0
3. Koraput	0 0·0	0 0·0	1 12·5	6 75·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	1 12·5
4. Phulbani	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	2 33·3	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	4 66·7
State-Total	**4** **11·4**	**0** **0·0**	**18** **51·4**	**10** **28·6**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**5** **14·3**
7. Rajasthan								
1. Kota	4 8·0	3 6·0	2 4·0	11 22·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	31 62·0
State-Total	**4** **8·0**	**3** **6·0**	**2** **4·0**	**11** **22·0**	**0** **0.0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**31** **62·0**
8. Tamil Nadu								
1. Periyar	2 3·3	4 6·7	35 58·3	20 33·3	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0
State-Total	**2** **3·3**	**4** **6·7**	**35** **58·3**	**20** **33·3**	**0** **0.0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**
9. Uttar Pradesh								
1. Tehrigarhwal	1 33·3	2 66·7	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0	0 0·0
State-Total	**1** **33·3**	**2** **66·7**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**	**0** **0·0**

APPENDIX TABLE No. 10.3

Distribution of beneficiaries according to the reactions of well-off and influential villagers about the programme.

State/District	No. of selected beneficiaries	Reaction			
		Good	Indifferent	Negative	Cannot say/ not known/no knowledge
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Andhra Pradesh					
1. Medak	60	31	13	16	0
	0·00	51·67	21·67	26·67	0·00
2. Mehboobnagar	60	1	4	55	0
	0·00	1·67	6·67	91·67	0·00
3. Rangareddy	60	3	9	48	0
	0·00	5·00	15·00	80·00	0·00
State-Total	**180**	**35**	**26**	**119**	**0**
	0·00	**19·44**	**14·44**	**66·11**	**0·00**
2. Bihar					
1. Bhagalpur	50	19	20	8	3
	0·00	38·00	40·00	16·00	6·00
2. Monghyr	57	43	0	14	0
	0·00	75·44	0·00	24·56	0·00
3. Nalanda	26	0	1	25	0
	0·00	0·00	3·85	96·15	0·00
4. Santhal Parganas	59	1	12	46	0
	0·00	1·69	20·34	77·97	0·00
State-Total	**192**	**63**	**33**	**93**	**3**
	0·00	**32·81**	**17·19**	**48·44**	**1·56**
3. Karnataka					
1. Chitradurga	60	0	1	59	0
	0·00	0·00	1·67	98·33	0·00
2. Kolar	60	26	5	27	2
	0·00	43·33	8·33	45.00	3·33
State-Total	**120**	**26**	**6**	**86**	**2**
	0·00	**21·67**	**5·00**	**71·67**	**1·67**
5. Madhya Pradesh					
1. Jabalpur	29	0	15	14	0
	0·00	0·00	51·72	48·28	0·00
2. Raigarh	2	0	2	0	0
	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00
State-Total	**31**	**0**	**17**	**14**	**0**
	0·00	**0·00**	**54·84**	**45·16**	**0·00**
6. Orissa					
1. Ganjam	2	0	2	0	0
	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00
2. Kalahandi	22	0	22	0	0
	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00
3. Koraput	48	15	5	25	3
	0·00	31·25	10·42	52·08	6.25
4. Phulbani	7	0	7	0	0
	0·00	0·00	100·00	0·00	0·00
State-Total	**79**	**15**	**36**	**25**	**3**
	0·00	**18·99**	**45·57**	**31·65**	**3·80**
7. Rajasthan					
1. Kota	60	8	29	23	0
	0·00	13·33	48·33	38·33	0·00
State-Total	**60**	**8**	**29**	**23**	**0**
	0·00	**13·33**	**48·33**	**38·33**	**0·00**
8. Tamil Nadu					
1. Periyar	60	36	5	19	0
	0·00	60·00	8·33	31·67	0·00
State-Total	**60**	**36**	**5**	**19**	**0**
	0·00	**60·00**	**8·33**	**31·67**	**0·00**
9. Uttar Pradesgh					
1. Tehrigarhwal	60	12	47	1	0
	0·00	20·00	78·33	1·67	0·00
State-Total	**60**	**12**	**47**	**1**	**0**
	0·00	**20·00**	**78·33**	**1·67**	**0·00**

PROJECT TEAM

(A) HEADQUARTERS

(Planning, designing, coordination, processing and drafting of Report)

Shri P. L. Aware,
Project Director & Deputy Adviser

1. Shri S. S. Jain, Research Officer
2. Shri V. L. Kantha Rao, Research Officer
3. Shri D. V. Biniwale, Senior Economic Investigator
4. Shri B. S. Chaudhry, Senior Economic Investigator
5. Shri R. N. Bose, Senior Economic Investigator
6. Shri Ram Babu, Senior Economic Investigator
7. Shri Chatar Singh, Economic Investigator
8. Shri Balwinder Pal, Economic Investigator
9. Shri Ratan Singh, Economic Investigator
10. Shri Bhagwan Dass, Economic Investigator
11. Shri K. L. Kathuria, Economic Investigator
12. Shri K. M. Sharma, Personal Asstt.
13. Shri Suraj Prakash, Computer
14. Shri Chander Bhan, Tabulation Clerk
15. Smt. Sita Soni, Tabulation Clerk

(B) FIELD TEAMS

(Canvassing at State, District, Village and Beneficiary levels)

I. CENTRAL REGION

(i) Regional Evaluation Office, Jaipur

Shri S. K. Roy,
Regional Evaluation Officer

Shri Rajender Kumar,
Research Officer

1. Shri Ram Chander, Senior Economic Investigator
2. Shri C. H. Gohil, Senior Economic Investigator

(ii) Project Evaluation Office, Bhopal

1. Shri V. K. Kalvade, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri Virendra Singh, Economic Investigator
3. Shri B. L. Sharma, Senior Economic Investigator
4. Shri C. M. Kulenthwale, Economic Investigator

(iii) Project Evaluation Office, Indore

1. Shri G. P. Verma, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri M. G. Bakshi, Economic Investigator
3. Shri S. K. Sutradhar, Economic Investigator

II. NORTH CENTRAL REGION

(i) Regional Evaluation Office, Lucknow

Shri R. P. Jain,
Regional Evaluation Officer

Shri Prakash Lal,
Research Officer

1. Shri Avdesh Singh, Senior Economic Investigator
2. Shri G. R. Khanna, Senior Economic Investigator
3. Shri H. C. Dhar Dubey, Senior Economic Investigator

(ii) Project Evaluation Office, Varanasi

1. Shri R. K. Shahi, Project Evaluation Officer.
2. Shri Satish Chander, Economic Investigator
3. Shri Babu Lal, Economic Investigator

(iii) Project Evaluation Office, Meerut

1. Shri R. S. D. Batra, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri R. R. Srivastava, Economic Investigator
3. Shri N. S. Rawat, Economic Investigator

(iv) Project Evaluation Office, Patna

1. Shri K. R. Singh, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri Z. M. Ghufran, Economic Investigator
3. Shri S. N. Tiwari, Economic Investigator

(v) Project Evaluation Office, Muzaffarpur

1. Shri R. C. Rupanwar, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri S. G. Chaudhari, Economic Investigator
3. Shri Anwar Yusuf, Economic Investigator.

III. SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

(i) Regional Evaluation Office, Hyderabad

Shri K. Prasada Rao,
Reigonal Evaluation Officer

Shri B. Rama Rao,
Research Officer

1. Shri S. K. Rehmatullah, Senior Economic Investigator
2. Shri B. C. Narsimhalu, Senior Economic Investigator
3. Shri Abraham Varghese, Senior Economic Investigator
4. Shri D. Chandrappa, Economic Investigator
5. Shri L. V. S. Iyenger, Economic Investigator
6. Shri M. Kantaiah, Economic Investigator

(ii) Project Evaluation Office, Guntur

1. Shri T. Narayana, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri L. V. S. Iyenger, Economic Investigator
3. Shri P. G. Rao, Economic Investigator

(iii) Project Evaluation office, Dharwar

1. Shri G. L. N. Reddy, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri D. Chandrappa, Economic Investigator

(iv) Project Evaluation Office, Bangalore

1. Shri B. K. Kala, Project Evaluation Officer.
2. Shri Mohd. Iqbal, Economic Ivestigator
3. Shri P. S. Raju, Eccnomic Investigator

IV. SOUTHERN REGION

(i) Regional Evaluation Office, Madras

Kumari S. Rohini,
Regional Evaluation Officer

Shri H. Lakshminarsimhan,
Research Officer

1. Shri T. Lakshmanan, Senior Economic Investigator
2. Shri M· Rathinaswamy, Senior Economic Investigator
3. Shri P. S. Ragavan, Economic Investigator
4. Shri P. J. Radhakrishnan, Economic Investigator

(ii) Project Evaluation Office, Tiruchirapalli

Shri D. V. Biniwale,
Project Evaluation Officer

Shri A. N. Bhattacharjee,
Project Evaluation Officer

1. Shri A. Narayana Swamy, Senior Economic Investigator
2. Shri P. Pandian, Economic Investigator

V. EASTERN REGION

(i) Regional Evaluation Office, Calcutta

Shri I. S. Kumar,
Regional Evaluation Officer

Shri T. B. Suryakar,
Research Officer

1. Shri S. Mukhopadhyaya, Senior Economic Investigator
2. Shri R. N. Bose, Senior Economic Investigator
3. Shri B. K. Bandyopadhyaya, Senior Economic Investigator.
4. Shri R. N. Biswas, Economic Investigator

(ii) Project Evaluation Office, Sambalpur

1. Shri K. Narasimhaiah, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri R. N. Bose, Senior Economic Investigator
3. Shri B. K. Bannerjee, Economic Investigator

(iii) Project Evaluation Office, Gauhati

1. Shri K. S. Chawdhry, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri J. K. Chanda, Economic Investigator
3. Shri S. G. Chaudhari, Economic Investigator

(iv) Project Evaluation Office, Bhubaneshwar

1. Shri K. C. Pushkarna, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri A. K. Sarkar, Economic Investigator
3. Shri S. Mohanti, Economic Investigator

(v) Project Evaluation Office, Silchar

1. Shri M. Roy, Project Evaluation Officer
2. Shri B. Chakravarty, Economic Investigator

GIPN—S 2—227 PC/ND/84—19-1-85—2500