

MIGRATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF WORKERS IN INDIA

A. K. SINGH* AND KARTIKEYA YADAV**

Abstract: *Migration of labour is an important factor affecting the course of socio-economic development in India. Rural-urban migration has also historically played a significant role in the urbanization process. At the same time, the economic, social and political marginalization of these migrant workers has been an area of concern. The internal migration in India accounts for a large population. Internal migrants are generally excluded from the economic, cultural, social and political life of society and are often treated as second-class citizens. The constraints faced by migrants are many fold which include lack of formal residency rights; lack of identity proof; lack of political representation; inadequate housing; low-payment / wages , insecure or hazardous work; extreme vulnerability of women and children to trafficking and sex exploitation; exclusion from state-provided services such as health and education and discrimination based on ethnicity, religion, class or gender. In the absence of proofs of identity and residence, internal migrants are unable to claim social protection entitlements and remain excluded from government sponsored schemes and programmes. Children face disruption of regular schooling, adversely affecting their human capital formation and contributing to the inter-generational transmission of poverty. Migration and urbanization are an integral part of economic development and societal transformation, and historical experience has shown that it cannot be stopped. The rising contribution of cities to India's GDP would not be possible without migration and migrant workers. A holistic approach to addressing the multiple challenges associated with internal migration is yet to be developed. Present paper highlights the emerging trends in internal migration of workers and their employment in India.*

INTRODUCTION

The internal migration in India accounts for a large population. Internal migrants are generally excluded from the economic, cultural, social and political life of society and are often treated as second-class citizens. The constraints faced by migrants are many fold which include lack of formal residency rights; lack of identity proof; lack of political representation; inadequate housing; low-payment/ wages , insecure or hazardous work; extreme vulnerability of women and children to trafficking and sex exploitation; exclusion from state-provided services such as health and education

* Assistant Director, Regional Centre for Urban and Environmental Studies, Lucknow University, Lucknow.

** Research Scholar, department of Public Administration, Lucknow University, Lucknow.

and discrimination based on ethnicity, religion, class or gender. In the absence of proofs of identity and residence, internal migrants are unable to claim social protection entitlements and remain excluded from government sponsored schemes and programmes. Children face disruption of regular schooling, adversely affecting their human capital formation and contributing to the inter-generational transmission of poverty. Migration and urbanization are an integral part of economic development and societal transformation, and historical experience has shown that it cannot be stopped. The rising contribution of cities to India's GDP would not be possible without migration and migrant workers. A holistic approach to addressing the multiple challenges associated with internal migration is yet to be developed.

It is widely believed that rapid rural employment growth is on account of seasonal migrant workers to urban construction sites. Rural to urban movement of population is an indispensable part of the development process. In the initial stages as urban-rural development disparities grow, rural residents migrate to urban areas for a variety of reasons. Seeking sources of livelihood, better employment opportunities, schooling for children, remittance to rural relatives and overcoming rural indebtedness and poverty are some of the factors which have drawn a great deal of attention. Also, rural migrants provide an important source of labour supply to the urban areas. Since India's urbanization is not being prompted by rapid industrialization; the urban areas are less likely to offer productive employment opportunities to the unskilled and semi-skilled variety of workforce in petty and marginal activities unravels seclusion and vulnerability. In certain instances migration takes place in search of even a low productivity job in the urban informal sector in order to escape the severity of poverty at the place of rural origin. On the other hand, many among the rural poor cannot afford to migrate as the social and economic costs of migration are enormous. Seasonal migrant workers contribute significantly to the national, state and urban economy, and yet they remain on the extreme margins in their urban work destinations, living in dismal housing conditions on construction sites or in the most vulnerable informal settlements and tenure arrangements off-site. Access to basic services like water and sanitation is lacking or profoundly inadequate in most instances while access to social infrastructures of health and education for their children is a major challenge.

PROBLEMS OF MIGRANT WORKERS

The concept of migration is as old as human civilization. It is actually a cornerstone in human history. People migrate on account of economic, social, political, marital, educational and religious reasons. The migrants come from the most marginalized and impoverished sections of society including Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and OBCs. The dominant age profile of migrant labour is between 21 and 50 years of age, but older and younger people also accompany and contribute to family labour. Travel conditions between villages and work sites are often hazardous, especially over long distances. Migrants generally carry with them an initial supply of grains and provisions, utensils, and other household items. Agricultural migrations are

usually short distance, within migrants' home districts or adjoining ones. Brick kiln migrants, however, cross several districts and cover 200 to 500 km on trucks or bullock carts over a week to ten days. While short distance migrants have the advantage of being able to visit their homes in between periods of work, long distance migrants are often cut off from their villages for the entire migration period. Substantial flows of labor migrants relocate from Uttar Pradesh to Maharashtra, Delhi, West Bengal, Haryana, Gujarat, and other states across northern and central India. Within the state of UP also there is significant intra state migration to Lucknow, Kanpur and Ghaziabad. A significant proportion of the migrants are employed in the construction industry, brick kilns or as rickshaw pullers. The magnitude of inter-state migration in India was close to 9 million annually between 2011 and 2016, while Census 2011 pegs the total number of internal migrants in the country at a staggering 139 million. Uttar Pradesh and Bihar are the biggest source states, followed closely by Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttarakhand, Jammu and Kashmir and West Bengal; the major destination states are Delhi, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala. Seasonal migrants dominate the low-paying, hazardous and informal market jobs in key sectors in urban destinations, such as construction, hotel, textile, manufacturing, transportation, services, domestic work etc. They have poor access to health services, which results in very poor occupational health. Since they cannot afford private hospitals, they often go back to their villages once they fall sick. This affects their employment opportunities, as well as the loss of wages. A large number of migrants find work as unskilled labourers since they enter the job market at a very early age, experience no upward mobility and remain stuck in the most unskilled, poorly paid and hazardous jobs for their whole work-life span. The migrant workers regularly face conflicts and disputes at worksites. The common issues they face are non-payment of wages, physical abuse, accidents and even death. The existing legal machinery is not sensitive to the nature of legal disputes in the unorganized sector. Many informal sector disputes never make their way to labour courts or keep languishing in courts for lack of proof.

Construction work constitutes a major area of work for short-term and vulnerable migrants. There are about 50 million building and other construction workers as per the estimates of the NSS 2011-12. Two principal legislations concerning the building and other construction workers are: the Building and Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996; and the Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Cess Act, 1996. As per these, building and other construction workers are required to be registered with state-level Construction Workers Welfare Boards. Minimum safety standards and conditions of employment for construction workers have also been prescribed. The Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Cess Act, 1996 mandates a cess (at 1 percent of the cost of construction incurred) which is pooled into a fund, managed at the state level by the Construction Worker Welfare Boards, to be used for the provisioning of social security and related services for construction workers.

The social security benefits involve medical assistance and accident cover, pension, maternity benefits, educational assistance for children of workers, assistance to family members in case of death (by accident, at worksite or even in case of natural death), funeral assistance, and in some states, marriage assistance for children of workers. However, as per information provided by the Ministry of Labour and Employment, an average of 15 percent of funds was utilized by states in 2013. In only seven states/ Union Territories (UTs), constituting 35 percent of the 22 million registered workers, viz., Kerala, Chhattisgarh, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Puducherry, Arunachal Pradesh and Sikkim, the share of spending to collections was more than 10 percent, in twenty other states/ UTs, constituting 59 percent of registered workers, it was less than 10 percent, at an average of 3 percent and in eight states, with 6 percent of registered workers, there was no spending. The highest cess utilization is by the state of Kerala followed by Chhattisgarh. By 2015, the situation had improved somewhat, with some of the zero spending states undertaking some expenditure, but the overall spending as a share of collection remained low, rising from 15 percent to 21 percent of collections.

The nature of work sites varies widely from sector to sector, although there are underlying common elements. Work sites are usually far from habitation, often without even a road nearby. As a consequence, these locations are usually bereft of any basic facilities such as access to water, markets, schools or health centres. In some cases, even when there is a habitation nearby, migrant labourers are shunned by the local population, who tend to regard them unfavourably. Local residents may even erect extra fences around their homes to keep migrants away. There is also typically no enforcement of labour laws at work sites. Working hours are long and difficult – labourers, including children, work for 14-16 hours daily and some are required to remain on call around the clock. Work norms are set according to physical capability, but everyone – including women, children and weaker, older men have to struggle to meet them. Contractors retain control of labourers, not only financially but also physically, forcing them to work even when sick or injured. Women are also expected to work during pregnancy and immediately following childbirth. Although working conditions are very difficult, living conditions are often even worse. Living spaces are tiny and unhygienic. Most members of the family sleep under the open sky in weather conditions ranging from extreme heat to bitter cold. The available food is nutritionally inadequate. Each type of work site also has its own set of health hazards, ranging from infections and fevers, contamination and toxicity-related diseases, respiratory and gynecological problems, injuries and accidents, gradual loss of hearing, unwanted abortions among women, and malnourishment, especially among children. There are often no facilities for medical treatment and no compensation or insurance, and workers are not paid when they are unable to work even on medical grounds. The problems faced by migrants in the cities are manifold and stem from lack of identity, little or no access to social benefits and financial exclusion. These are compounded by lack of knowledge and perspective to deal with problems at destination. The families of migrant who

stay behind in the villages are bereft of social, financial and emotional support provided by the male heads of the families and are increasingly vulnerable to exploitation. In view of the of reducing vulnerability and empowering the migrant labours Tata Trust has Programme Strategy towards empowering migrants and their families to optimize/utilize opportunities offered by migration, eliminate vulnerabilities and institutionalize service delivery for migrants who have in the past been excluded. Against this backdrop the present study has been conducted in Lucknow city of Uttar Pradesh It purports to examine the socio- economic profile of migrant labours , their ration purchase behavior ,outreach and access to public distribution system and also to examine their problems in availing ration.

TRENDS IN MIGRATION AND EMPLOYMENT

Migration of labour is an important factor affecting the course of socio-economic development in India. Rural-urban migration has also historically played a significant role in the urbanisation process. At the same time, the economic, social and political marginalization of these migrant workers has been an area of concern. According to Census 2011, there were 454 million migrants in India. Marriage and other family related migration, which was 72.2 percent of all migration during 1991 to 2001, now is 74.7 percent of all migration during 2001 to 2011, however, the share of marriage is diminishing while the share of other family related migration is growing. India does not have a national policy on internal migration. Such a policy would address among other issues domicile requirements, portability of benefits within and across states etc. In the absence of a coherent policy, millions of Indians are migrating from one destination to another either permanently or for short duration within a year. While a large proportion of individuals migrate within their state of residence, others move across state boundaries. There are large variations in inter and intra state migrants across the districts of India. Their motives for migration are varied: including movement from place of birth, marriage, in pursuit of education, seeking work opportunities etc. While women primarily move on account of marriage, men are more likely to report migrating for reasons related to work. In the last decade of 2001-11, on an average 1.5 million men and 0.3 million women moved every year. At the same time, there are many who migrate for short periods without changing their place of residence. They are overwhelmingly from rural India. They stay away from their homes on account of work for short periods of time during the course of the year. It is estimated that about 10 million rural households stay away from home for more than 15 days but less than 6 months in a year. Assuming that at least one person stays away from each of these households. Among those who work in the primary sector and undertake seasonal migration, nearly 36 percent work in construction sector and 15 percent work in the secondary sector. The Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation constituted Working Group in 2015 for identifying and developing strategic interventions. The Working Group submitted its report to the ministry in March, 2017. The Working Group noted the underutilization of Construction Workers Welfare Cess Fund. The

recommendation is that the funds can be used to promote rental, housing, hostels etc. The Report also focuses on the need to ensure that benefits and rights of migrants are protected. There are certain benefits that need to be made portable. Among this includes making access to the public distribution system portable.

Table 1 shows all duration migrants in urban areas in 2011 and 2001. This shows that 21.9 percent of urban residents are migrants from rural areas while another 21 percent come from other urban areas; i.e., a total of 42.9 percent of all urban residents are migrants.

Table 1
Characteristics of Urban Migrants in India

	<i>Duration</i>	<i>All Durations</i>			<i>10 Years and More</i>		
	<i>Origin</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
Share of urban population in 2011	Rural	21.9%	19.3%	24.7%	8.5%	7.7%	9.4%
	Urban	21.0%	18.4%	23.9%	8.7%	7.7%	9.9%
Share of urban population in 2001	Rural	18%	16%	20%	9.9%	8.6%	11.5%
	Urban	13%	11%	15%	6.3%	5.2%	7.6%
<i>Within district</i>	Rural	37%	31%	43%	37%	29%	44%
	Urban	30%	29%	30%	26%	25%	27%
<i>Other districts within State</i>	Rural	33%	33%	34%	34%	34%	33%
	Urban	41%	39%	42%	42%	41%	43%
<i>Inter-State</i>	Rural	30%	36%	24%	30%	37%	23%
	Urban	29%	33%	27%	31%	34%	29%

Source: Census of India

As seen in Table.2, marriage and other family related migration, which was 72.2 percent of all migration during 1991 to 2001, now is 74.7 percent of all migration during 2001 to 2011, but the share of marriage is diminishing while the share of other family related migration is growing. Only 4.8 percent were inter-state marriage migrants i.e., 1.9 percent of all migrants.

Table 2
Reasons and Streams of Intercensal Migration in India
(As % Share of Each Stream)

	<i>Work and Business</i>		<i>Education</i>		<i>Marriage</i>		<i>Family Related</i>		<i>Others</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011	2001	2011
Rural to Rural	9.3	6.4	1.9	2.7	61.2	59.0	19.4	24.1	8.3	7.7	56.3	47.4
Rural to Urban	29.9	24.3	4.9	4.8	21.8	22.4	34.5	40.6	8.8	7.9	21.8	22.1
Urban to Rural	14.5	8.9	3.0	2.7	28.1	25.5	42.9	55.6	11.4	7.3	6.6	7.9
Urban to Urban	21.8	17.5	4.3	3.4	21.9	18.4	42.6	47.9	9.5	12.9	15.2	22.6
Total	16.0	13.1	3.0	3.3	44.4	39.1	27.8	35.6	8.8	8.9	100.0	100.0

Source: Census of India

While the proportion of women who move for family related reasons is the same (86 percent), within the district and inter-state; within the district 59 percent is due to marriage and 23 percent move with the household, while across states, a lesser proportion, 43 percent, is due to marriage and 39 percent is with the household. This reflects the practice that rural women are less likely to marry across states, and more likely to move when their household moves (Table 3).

Table 3
Reasons for Rural-Urban Migrations in India

	<i>Male</i>					<i>Female</i>				
	<i>Work</i>	<i>Study</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Work</i>	<i>Study</i>	<i>Family</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Total</i>
Total in 2011	49.7%	4.1%	36.4%	9.9%	100%	5.1%	2.0%	86.5%	6.4%	100%
Total in 2001	55.2%	3.7%	27.8%	13.3%	100%	4.1%	1.2%	85.3%	9.3%	100%
Within district	42.2%	5.5%	35.2%	17.0%	100%	3.1%	1.6%	85.7%	9.6%	100%
Other districts within State	54.7%	4.4%	28.3%	12.7%	100%	4.7%	1.2%	84.6%	9.5%	100%
Inter-State	66.6%	1.6%	21.1%	10.7%	100%	5.0%	0.6%	85.8%	8.6%	100%

Source: Census of India

The share of migrants in the work-force is quite high, as shown in Table 4, not just for women, where women move to their husband's house after marriage (thereby becoming a migrant), it is also high in the male workforce in urban areas. In manufacturing in urban areas, 38% of the male workforce is composed of migrant workers, with a similar share in modern services.

Table 4
**Share of Migrant Workers in Total Workers
By Major Sectors in India**

<i>Sector*</i>	<i>Rural</i>		<i>Urban</i>	
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
Primary	4%	75%	20%	65%
Manufacturing	13%	59%	38%	51%
Public Services	16%	69%	40%	56%
Construction	8%	73%	32%	67%
Traditional Services	10%	65%	29%	55%
Modern Services	16%	66%	40%	52%
Total	6%	73%	33%	56%

Source: NSSO, 2007-08

Table 5 indicates that the occupational structure of migrant and non-migrant female workers is not very different, except that migrants are a little more represented in primary sectors and a little less in manufacturing. For males, while there is an expected large difference in rural areas with non-migrants being much more engaged in primary activities. Migrants are more represented in manufacturing and modern services, and a little less represented in traditional

services, but it would be difficult to argue from these aggregate patterns that there is a systematic exclusion of migrants from urban labour markets.

Table 5
Occupation Structure of Migrant and Non-Migrant Workers in India

Industry Type	Male				Female			
	Rural		Urban		Rural		Urban	
	Non-Migrant	Migrant	Non-Migrant	Migrant	Non-Migrant	Migrant	Non-Migrant	Migrant
Primary	65%	37%	7%	3%	76%	84%	10%	15%
Manufacturing	8%	17%	22%	27%	12%	6%	28%	23%
Public Services	4%	11%	8%	11%	6%	5%	34%	34%
Construction	8%	10%	10%	9%	2%	2%	4%	6%
Traditional Services	12%	20%	41%	33%	4%	2%	15%	15%
Modern Services	2%	5%	12%	16%	1%	1%	10%	8%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: NSSO, 2007-08

Estimate of total industrial employment in India is shown in Table 6. Total industrial employment in India was estimated 471.4 million in 2011-12. Out of it, about 48 per cent employment was recorded in agriculture sector while manufacturing and construction sector accounted for slightly less than 1/4th employment. There has been significant increase in industrial employment during 2004-05 to 2011-12. However, employment in construction sector increased by about two-fold.

Table 6
Estimate of Total Industrial Employment in India

Sectors	(In Millions)		
	1999-2000	2004 -05	2011-12
Agriculture	240.3	257.7	225.4
Mining and Quarrying	2.3	2.5	2.6
Manufacturing	43.9	56.1	60.8
Utilities	1.0	1.2	1.6
Construction	17.6	26.0	49.9
Trade, Hotel etc	40.9	49.8	56.1
Transport, Storage, and Communication	14.5	18.7	21
Financing, Insurance, Real estate, and business services	5.0	7.8	12.9
Community, social and personal services	33.0	37.7	40.9
Total	398.4	457.6	471.4

Source: NSSO Reports

Share of rural areas in total construction employment has been more than half since 1993-94 and steadily rising to 3/4th in 2011-12. The boom is wide spread across the major states. Compound annual growth rate in employment in construction sector was recorded high in Bihar (15.8 per cent) followed by Madhya

Pradesh (13.3 per cent), Uttar Pradesh (12.6 per cent), Assam (11.8 per cent) and Odisha (11.4 per cent). However, a higher growth was recorded in rural areas of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Odisha and Jammu and Kashmir as compared to growth of employment in construction sector in urban areas (Table 7).

Table 7
State Wise Growth In Construction Employment in India

	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>
Andhra Pradesh	9.8	4.2	7.0
Assam	13.3	6.7	11.8
Bihar	17.0	10.3	15.8
Gujarat	4.1	1.1	2.6
Haryana	8.4	9.4	8.7
Himachal Pradesh	6.2	0.3	5.9
J & K	11.3	6.3	10.1
Karnataka	9.4	3.0	5.3
Kerala	3.6	8.9	5.4
Madhya Pradesh	16.7	8.2	13.3
Maharashtra	8.2	3.1	5.2
Orissa	13.2	4.3	11.4
Punjab	10.7	4.2	8.9
Rajasthan	9.7	5.5	8.9
Tamil Nadu	12.2	3.9	8.8
Uttar Pradesh	14.2	7.5	12.6
West Bengal	14.1	3.8	9.9
All India	11.7	4.9	9.3

Source: NSS Employment and Unemployment Surveys

Five states, namely, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu (in descending order of shares) account for half of construction employment both in 1999 2000. In 2011 12, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, and Tamil Nadu were the top states account for 55 per cent of total construction employment (Table 8).

Table 8
Top Five States in Terms of Construction Employment in India

<i>1999 2000</i>		<i>2011 12</i>	
<i>States</i>	<i>Share In Total</i>	<i>States</i>	<i>States Share In Total</i>
Uttar Pradesh	12.6	Uttar Pradesh	17.9
Rajasthan	11.0	Rajasthan	10.5
Maharashtra	9.7	Bihar	10.1
Andhra Pradesh	8.4	Madhya Pradesh	8.7
Tamil Nadu	8.4	Tamil Nadu	8.0
Share of the 5 states	50.1	Share of the 5 states	55.2

Source: NSSO Reports.

Construction work constitutes a major area of work for short-term and vulnerable migrants. There are about 50 million building and other construction workers as per the estimates of the NSSO 2011-12. Two principal legislations concerning the building and other construction workers are: the Building and Other Construction Workers (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act, 1996; and the Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Cess Act, 1996. As per these, building and other construction workers are required to be registered with state-level Construction Workers Welfare Boards. Minimum safety standards and conditions of employment for construction workers have also been prescribed. The Building and Other Construction Workers Welfare Cess Act, 1996 mandates a cess (at 1 percent of the cost of construction incurred) which is pooled into a fund, managed at the state level by the Construction Worker Welfare Boards, to be used for the provisioning of social security and related services for construction workers. The social security benefits involve medical assistance and accident cover, pension, maternity benefits, educational assistance for children of workers, assistance to family members in case of death (by accident, at worksite or even in case of natural death), funeral assistance, and in some states, marriage assistance for children of workers. However, as shown in Table 9, the funds under this head are very sparingly used, except in a few states. Based on information provided by the Ministry of Labour and Employment, it is seen that an average of 15 percent of funds was utilized by states in 2013. In only seven states/ Union Territories, constituting 35 percent of the 22 million registered workers, viz., Kerala, Chhattisgarh, Tamil Nadu, Madhya Pradesh, Puducherry, Arunachal Pradesh and Sikkim, the share of spending to collections was more than 10 percent, in twenty other states/ UTs, constituting 59 percent of registered workers, it was less than 10 percent, at an average of 3 percent and in eight states, with 6 percent of registered workers, there was no spending. The highest cess utilization is by the state of Kerala followed by Chhattisgarh. By 2015, the situation had improved somewhat, with some of the zero spending states undertaking some expenditure, but the overall spending as a share of collection remained low, rising from 15 percent to 21 percent of collections.

Table 9
State-wise Use of CWWB Cess in India

State	Regd. Workers	Amount of Cess Collected (Cr.)		Amount Spent (Cr.)		Spending As Share of Collection (%)	
		2013	2015	2013	2015	2013	2015
Kerala	7%	808.8	1234.0	728.8	1152.4	90%	93%
Chhattisgarh	4%	222.2	539.3	125.4	345.4	56%	64%
Tamil Nadu	11%	604.3	1290.9	278.0	511.9	46%	40%
Madhya Pradesh	12%	903.7	1575.6	312.8	552.0	35%	35%
Puducherry	0.2%	20.7	71.7	4.6	31.2	22%	44%
Arunachal Pradesh	0.04%	23.0	-	4.6	-	-20%	-
Sikkim	0.1%	18.6	54.7	2.4	10.8	13%	20%
Twenty other states/UTs	59%	8927.7	19660.5	279.5	2517.4	3%	13%
Eight other states/UTs	6%	70.4	1027.9	0.0	245.8	0%	24%
Total (cr.)	2.24	11599.3	25454.5	1736.2	5367.0	15%	21%

Source: Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India

The total amount of cess collected as on March, 2017 was reported Rs. 32632.96 crores in India. Major states who significantly contributed in cess were reported to be Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Karnataka, Delhi, Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh. However, amount of cess transferred to BOCWWB was recorded low in the state of Gujarat, Kerala and Uttar Pradesh as against amount of cess collected during the period of 1996 to 2017. The amount of expenditure was also recorded low in many states as against amount of cess collected (Table 10).

Table 10
State wise Amount of Cess Collection and Expenditure in India

State	Standing Committee Report		CAG Report	
	Amount of Cess Collected (Rs. in Crore) as on March, 2017	Amount Spent (Rs. in Crore) as on March, 2017	Amount of Cess Collected (Rs. In Crore) from 1996 till March, 2017	Amount of Cess Transferred (Rs. In Crore) to the BOCWWB
Andhra Pradesh	1153.61	205.46	667.50	667.53
Bihar	921.92	75.23	NA	972.93
Chhattisgarh	699.61	514.14	755.80	NA
Gujarat	1564.64	35.00	1524.36	863.04
Haryana	1847.05	172.07	1847.05	1847.05
Himachal Pradesh	335.39	44.49	353.25	360.62
Jammu & Kashmir	566.00	221.00	625.99	653.03
Jharkhand	291.28	143.46	330.95	NA
Karnataka	3861.00	240.00	4106.43	4106.03
Kerala	1474.73	1455.88	1483.81	439.47
Madhya Pradesh	1575.62	552.04	207.10	NA
Maharashtra	5074.16	255.50	5074.16	5074.16
Odisha	1100.00	361.00	1118.35	1118.35
Punjab	921.55	391.61	973.78	973.78
Rajasthan	1600.00	620.00	1069.19	1266.52
Tamil Nadu	1706.00	600.00	1870.60	1870.60
Telangana	443.12	98.69	667.53	667.53
Uttar Pradesh	2943.80	598.90	220.78	184.25
Uttarakhand	170.41	31.21	189.39	186.58
West Bengal	1149.12	531.42	NA	1713.18
Delhi	1930.00	174.71	1793.67	1846.68
Total	32632.96	7516.52	26136.75	26008.83

Source: Judgment of Writ Petition (Civil) No. 318 of 2006, National Campaign Committee for Central Legislation on Construction labpur, March, 2018

CONCLUSION

There has been phenomenon increase in migration in urban centres due to pull and push factors. Urban centres provide better economic opportunities and infrastructure services and thus, people are migrating from rural areas in urban centres in search of better employment avenues and other socio-economic factors. In rural areas,

employment opportunities in agriculture sector have declined over the period and thus, rural labours are forced to migrate in urban centres. Employment in services sector has grown tremendously over the period. The migrant workers are mainly employed in construction sector however, migrant workers are mainly unskilled and therefore, their wages and working conditions are not good. As unorganized sector does not have the provision of social security. Thus, migrant workers engaged in construction and other sectors of industrial employment in unorganized sector face challenges and problems. In view of the holistic development and empowerment of the migrant labours and their dependents, multiple approaches and multi pronged strategies are required. In order to ensure effective implementation of Inter-State Migrant Workers Act, we should focus more on advocacy for formation of Rules by the concerned Ministry/ Department. We should also advocate to establish and effective functioning of Workers facilitation Centres in the context of the Unorganized Sector Worker Social Security Act which can be made focal point for provision of social security benefits as well. As a helpline for construction workers is already existing in the states, advocacy is required for its expansion to cover all migrant workers and also to work upon proper grievance redressal system.

References

- ASSOCHAM (2017), Agenda for Uttar Pradesh Government, ASSOCHAM, New Delhi.
- Balani, Sakshi (2013), Functioning of The Public Distribution System: An Analytical Report, PRIS Legislative Research, *www.pris.org*
- Bose, Prabir and Rai, Ramjee (2014), Job Search and Labour Market Conditions of Migrants at The Destination : The Case of Lucknow, Urban India, Vol. 34, Issue I, January- June, New Delhi.
- Chandrashekhar, S. (2017), Towards National Policy on Migration, Yojana, Vol. 61, April, New Delhi.
- Desai, Renu (2017), Entitlements of Seasonal Migrant Construction Workers To Housing, Basic Services and Social Infrastructure in Gujarat's Cities: A Background Policy Paper, CEPT University, Ahmadabad.
- Mitra, Arup (2017), Rural to Urban Migration and Urban Labour Market, National Institute of Labour Economics, Research and Development, New Delhi.
- MoHUPA (2017), Report of The Working Group on Migration, Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Mumgain, Rajendra and Sher Verick (2017), The State of Employment in Uttar Pradesh: Unleashing The Potential for Inclusive Growth, International Labour Organisation, Geneva.
- Nagraj, P. (2016), Employment Boom in Construction : A Tentative Explanation, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development research, Mumbai.
- NCEUS (2007), Report on Comprehensive Legislation for Minimum Conditions of Works and Social Security in Unorganized Workers, NCUES, New Delhi.
- NITI Ayog (2016), Role of Public Distribution System in Shaping Households and Nutritional Security in India, NITI Ayog, Government of India, New Delhi.

- Roy, S. N and Naik, M. M (2017), *Migrants in Construction Work: Evaluating Their Welfare Framework*, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi.
- Sekhar, CSC (2014), *Political Economy of Public Distribution System in India*, Institute of Economic Growth, New Delhi.
- Singh, A. K. (2016), *Mid Term Evaluation of Mobile Ceech Scheme for Construction Workers in Uttar Pradesh*, Sponsored by U.P. State Social Welfare Board, Lucknow, Rastriya Bal Vikas Prakashan, New Delhi.
- Srivastava, Ravi and rajib Sutradhar (2016), *Impact of Labour Migration to Construction Sector on Poverty*, Occasional Paper Series, Institute for Human Development, New Delhi.
- Tata Trusts (2017), *Uttar Pradesh Forward: Opportunities for Innovation and Partnership for Uttar Pradesh Development*, Tata Trusts, Mumbai.
- UNESCO (2016), *Social Inclusion of Internal Migrants in India*, Note for Working Group on Migration, MoHUPA, Government of India, New Delhi.