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The provisional results of the Sixth Economic Census (2013) of establishments in the non-agricultural sector suggest that this is not a census count. A comparison with the National Sample Survey numbers shows that the number of workers in the latest census may be only a little over half the actual number. There also appear to be some serious omissions in individual states.

The launch of the Economic Census (EC) on a quinquennium or periodic basis was one of the most thoughtful decisions of those administering India's statistical system. In a complex economic system as that of India with multitudes of self-employed own-account and micro-enterprises dominating the economic scene, it is extremely difficult to get any regular count of all economic units for their principal operational and economic characteristics. Apart from the counting of the number of establishments and their worker size, the EC results are used for extraction of an “area frame” for undertaking sample studies (called follow-up surveys) for different cohesive segments of the organised and unorganised sectors or of manufacturing and services sectors. The “area frame” provides information on the number of establishments and number of workers by industry, ownership type of establishments, etc, at the village or block level (Sixth EC 2013: 2).

The follow-up surveys themselves have a deeper statistical purpose, that is, to provide inputs for estimating the gross domestic product (GDP) originating in different unorganised sectors for which indirect methods are the only way out for such estimations. The innovative method devised by the National Accounts Division of the Central Statistics Office (CSO) is to look for an estimate of gross value added (GVA) per worker for a given segment of an unorganised manufacturing or infrastructure or services sector for a benchmark year and multiply the estimated GVA per worker so arrived at for a year by the estimated number of workers, which produces the GVA originating in the sector. With this labour input method, GVA estimates are initially prepared at a detailed actively level for the base year of a national accounts series using the estimated labour input engaged and the value added per worker (VAPW) in the activity concerned (CSO 2012). Such VAPW estimates for the required activity level are provided by the follow-up surveys referred to above.

Using the census frames thrown up by the five ECs that have been conducted so far, a large number – as many as 20 – of follow-up surveys have been undertaken from time to time for successive base periods of National Accounts Statistics (NAS). With a view to filling their data gaps, these follow-up surveys have focused on unorganised enterprises in diverse sectors – manufacturing, mining and quarrying, trade and transport, storage and warehousing, hotels and restaurants, and services sectors. Many of them have been repeated over time.

The Provisional Results of the Sixth EC (All-India Report) places, to begin with understandably, very limited information in the public domain. This information is as tabulated from one schedule of the survey – Schedule 6B: Establishment Abstract. The CSO will release the results in two stages: first, data relating to the Directory of Establishments with 10 or more workers covering all the states and union territories (UTs) by December 2014; and second, an all-India report based on data collected through the main schedule, namely, the House and Establishment Listing Schedule by March 2016.

Partial Coverage of the Economy
By its very conception, the EC makes a partial coverage of the country’s economic activities. Its focus is essentially on non-agricultural establishments; establishments with fixed structures are enumerated at the place of their operation and those without any fixed structures are enumerated at the place of the residence of the owner. In the latter category of establishments, there are two subsets, first, establishments outside households without fixed structures and second, establishments inside households. As shown in Table 1 (p 79), these different types of establishments are spread across rural and urban areas, though units inside households dominate in rural areas and...
Table 1: Percentage Distribution of Establishments by Rural-Urban

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Establishments</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>All-India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Outside HHs with fixed structures</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>54.40</td>
<td>41.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outside HHs without fixed structures</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>20.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inside HHs</td>
<td>47.15</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>38.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No of establishments (%)</td>
<td>59.90</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No of persons employed (%)</td>
<td>51.91</td>
<td>48.09</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sixth EC 2013 (Figures within brackets are absolute numbers).

Table 2: Total Workforce as Estimated by the NSSO Surveys Juxtaposed against Economic Census Numbers (Numbers of Workers in Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Workforce* (Total)</th>
<th>Workforce in Sectors Excluded by Economic Censuses</th>
<th>Workforce in the Balance of Mfg. Non-Mfg and Services Sectors Covered by Economic Censuses</th>
<th>Economic Censuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crop Production and Plantation</td>
<td>Public Administration and Defence</td>
<td>(4) + (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55th</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>399.5</td>
<td>212.6</td>
<td>212.6</td>
<td>186.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61st</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>459.1</td>
<td>240.6</td>
<td>240.6</td>
<td>218.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>460.2</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>234.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68th</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>474.2</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>221.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Workforce numbers are given here and not labour force as the Economic Censuses report actual numbers of persons employed (-) Not included in comparable Economic Censuses.

Source: NSSO Employment and Unemployment Rounds and Economic Census Reports.
estimates of establishments and the number of persons employed in them.

In the above respect, the CSO themselves have sought to cross-validate their EC results with the estimated results of the NSSO’s 67th round on Economic Characteristics of Unincorporated Non-Agricultural Enterprises (Excluding Construction) in India (July 2010-June 2011), amongst a couple of other sources. Though details are not known, it is presumed that the cross-validation was a success, in that presumably the EC results were found to be reasonably close to those of the NSSO’s 67th round. However, our examination of the data does not vouch for this presumption that the NSSO’s 67th round validates the Sixth EC results.

It is to be noted that the NSSO 67th round estimates are blown-up figures based on relative sample sizes and to the extent samples are representative of follow-up survey segment, the totals given in the NSSO estimates for any such segment should be comparable with the EC results of a closer period for the corresponding segment except to the extent of sampling and non-sampling errors that may have crept into the NSSO’s sample study results. It is also true that this process of comparison of one set of census results with another set of global estimates based on a sample study involves an inverted method, that is, going from sample results to census-like results. Statisticians, amongst them sampling theory puritans, may have some misgivings against such a comparison because when sample results are inverted to arrive at the census results, they can never reach such mirror image population level results as sampling and non-sampling errors are not measurable with such an exactitude.

Notwithstanding the above objection, there is merit in examining as to how close and comparable are the EC estimates of 2013 with the inverted results from the central sample to all-India and state-level estimates of unincorporated non-agricultural enterprises (excluding construction) for 2011-12, keeping of course in view the coverage differences in the two studies. The Sixth EC is a census study covering all size groups and all types of establishments in the sectors covered in the study. As for the coverage of sectors and activities is concerned, the EC has a number of exclusions as explained earlier. On the other hand, the 67th round of NSSO covers only non-agricultural unincorporated enterprises, that is, enterprises not incorporated under the Companies Act. Thus, the coverage has been restricted to proprietary and partnership enterprises, in addition to self-help groups (SHGs), private non-profit institutions (NPIs) including non-profit institutions serving households (NPISHs) and trusts. Apart from excluding agriculture entirely, unlike EC which excludes only crop production and plantation but includes agricultural services and allied activities, the 67th round excludes construction. Thus, the 67th round covers all other non-agricultural enterprises, namely, manufacturing, trade and other services.

As a result of this differing coverage, it is not possible to make a straightforward comparison of the two sets of results under consideration. Also, for the present, the Sixth EC is understandably providing only limited information. Even so, it is possible for us to attempt a

### Table 3: Differences in Establishment/Enterprises and Employment between Sixth EC and NSSO 67th Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-India</td>
<td>5,84,70,096</td>
<td>5,76,73,305</td>
<td>7,96,791</td>
<td>12,77,08,076</td>
<td>10,79,78,875</td>
<td>1,97,29,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States with EC Establishments Exceeding NSSO Enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>33,75,567</td>
<td>18,62,286</td>
<td>15,13,281</td>
<td>69,19,658</td>
<td>38,03,841</td>
<td>31,15,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>61,25,902</td>
<td>51,56,479</td>
<td>9,69,423</td>
<td>1,43,76,619</td>
<td>1,01,37,220</td>
<td>42,37,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>19,53,743</td>
<td>11,51,065</td>
<td>8,02,678</td>
<td>37,34,759</td>
<td>18,44,566</td>
<td>18,90,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>29,07,388</td>
<td>21,42,435</td>
<td>7,64,953</td>
<td>61,54,670</td>
<td>37,81,755</td>
<td>23,72,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra Pradesh*</td>
<td>63,33,890</td>
<td>50,00,211</td>
<td>13,33,679</td>
<td>14,05,863</td>
<td>1,22,12,121</td>
<td>18,46,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>50,52,444</td>
<td>44,67,024</td>
<td>5,85,420</td>
<td>108,09,878</td>
<td>90,64,719</td>
<td>17,45,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>39,90,768</td>
<td>36,35,091</td>
<td>3,55,677</td>
<td>90,63,569</td>
<td>69,70,357</td>
<td>20,93,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haryana</td>
<td>11,71,475</td>
<td>10,56,732</td>
<td>1,14,743</td>
<td>32,31,311</td>
<td>19,02,366</td>
<td>13,28,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhattisgarh</td>
<td>7,73,768</td>
<td>6,76,364</td>
<td>97,404</td>
<td>18,83,785</td>
<td>13,61,272</td>
<td>5,22,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipur</td>
<td>2,17,673</td>
<td>1,23,829</td>
<td>93,844</td>
<td>3,87,880</td>
<td>1,87,846</td>
<td>2,00,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>15,12,208</td>
<td>14,43,030</td>
<td>69,178</td>
<td>35,61,950</td>
<td>25,47,515</td>
<td>10,14,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnataka</td>
<td>28,79,492</td>
<td>28,11,247</td>
<td>68,245</td>
<td>68,69,976</td>
<td>53,89,570</td>
<td>14,80,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>4,14,864</td>
<td>3,49,745</td>
<td>65,119</td>
<td>9,61,646</td>
<td>5,97,503</td>
<td>3,64,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>97,32,66</td>
<td>54,27,63</td>
<td>43,030</td>
<td>2,94,060</td>
<td>1,05,397</td>
<td>1,88,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizoram</td>
<td>54,23,00</td>
<td>20,64,00</td>
<td>33,590</td>
<td>1,14,484</td>
<td>45,439</td>
<td>69,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagaland</td>
<td>60,96,66</td>
<td>27,76,97</td>
<td>33,197</td>
<td>1,15,174</td>
<td>47,052</td>
<td>68,08,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandigarh</td>
<td>83,96,43</td>
<td>55,44,66</td>
<td>28,518</td>
<td>2,38,974</td>
<td>91,83,41</td>
<td>1,47,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arunachal Pradesh</td>
<td>36,60,22</td>
<td>21,53,86</td>
<td>15,064</td>
<td>97,11,5</td>
<td>38,90,48</td>
<td>58,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikkim</td>
<td>37,74,98</td>
<td>27,10,50</td>
<td>10,644</td>
<td>93,13,25</td>
<td>53,53,31</td>
<td>39,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghalaya</td>
<td>1,06,758</td>
<td>97,54,71</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>2,82,678</td>
<td>1,71,185</td>
<td>1,11,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andaman and Nicobar Islands</td>
<td>23,45,00</td>
<td>14,62,62</td>
<td>8,824</td>
<td>69,03,48</td>
<td>32,26,00</td>
<td>36,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daman and Diu</td>
<td>10,54,78</td>
<td>8,51,32</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>81,40,78</td>
<td>18,24,18</td>
<td>63,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshadweep</td>
<td>3,34,14</td>
<td>1,86,51</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>10,12,48</td>
<td>3,50,31</td>
<td>6,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D &amp; N Haveli</td>
<td>10,60,99</td>
<td>9,31,99</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>95,94,88</td>
<td>22,91,11</td>
<td>73,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Telangana.
Sorted as per difference in establishment.
Sources: (i) Sixth EC 2013 and (ii) NSSO (2013).
comparison and draw some valid infer-
ences based on the available information.
For doing so we adopt a staggered
approach. First, we compare the results
as they are. Second, see how best and
to what extent the ec results get cross-
validated from the 67th nssso round results .after making adjustments for the
known exclusions and inclusions.

It is here necessary to steer clear of
the definitions of “establishments” and
“enterprises” used in the two surveys.
The Sixth ec is said to cover “establish-
m ents”, whereas the nssso round under
reference is a survey on unincorporated
“enterprises”. In the Indian statistical
parlance, these institutional categories
have been clearly defined. To be brief,
an “enterprise” is an economic unit
engaged in one or more economic activ-
ities located in one or more locations,
whereas an “establishment” is by defini-
tion located in a single location and it
can be part of an enterprise. As the
institutional units covered in the 67th
nssso round are “unincorporated enter-
prises”, that is, essentially small enter-
prises – own account, proprietary or
partnership household enterprises –
their activities located in more than one
location could be rare or limited.

Initial Preliminary Comparison
Against this background, a simple pre-
liminary comparison at the aggregate
level of the numbers of establishments/enterprises and their respective employ-
ment sizes, is attempted in Table 3 (p 80).
In terms of coverage, the Sixth ec data
should be more comprehensive than the
estimates derived for the unincorpor-
ated enterprises as the latter do not
cover organised enterprises with higher
employment size. To repeat, the ec has
a number of special characteristics: (i) in
the first place, it is a census which is
expected to count every establishment;
(ii) secondly, it covers all – big or small,
organised and unorganised establish-
ments; and (iii) it covers agricultural es-
oblinations (excluding crop production
and plantation) unlike in the nssso survey
on non-agricultural enterprises. Besides,
the 67th round excludes construction
activities, unlike in the ec. Moreover, the
ec results belong to the latter year 2013-14
(January 2013-April 2014),1 whereas the
nssso survey results of unincorporated
non-agricultural enterprises pertain to
the period 2010-11 (July-June) that is,
two years earlier. Because of these
special characteristics, the number of
establishments and the persons employed
in them as per the Sixth ec should
definitely be much higher than the
number of unincorporated enterprises
and their employment as reported in
the nssso survey of unincorporated
non-agricultural enterprises.

The comparative figures presented in
Table 3 appear startling. First, let us look
at the state-wise information. In respect
of as many as 11 states and utrs, six of them
major ones (Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal,
Bihar, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh,
Odisha), the numbers of establishments
as per the Sixth ec of 2013 appear far
fewer than the numbers of enterprises in
the 67th round of the nssso survey for
2010-11. And in respect of almost all of
them, the numbers for employment too
appear lower. These six states alone
have shown about 50.78 lakh lower
order of establishments/enterprises in
the Sixth ec and 38.62 lakh of employ-
ment than those estimated by the nssso
67th round on unincorporated enterprises.

In a majority of the states the difference
in the number of establishments/enterprises
works out to over 25%; in respect of one
state it is as high as 87%.

Simultaneously, no doubt there are
a few states such as Assam, Kerala,
Manipur, Mizoram and Nagaland for
which the numbers of establishments in
the Sixth ec have been higher than those
of enterprises in the 67th round, but
such excesses appear to be unrealistically
high essentially in respect of these small
states. In their cases, the two sets of
data give the impression that the
number of organised sector establish-
ments far outweighs the number of
unincorporated enterprises in these
small-size states; the excesses as high
as 81% in the case of Kerala, 70% for
Assam, 76% for Manipur, 118% for
Nagaland and 157% for Mizoram. We
concede that we should not be stressing
this too far, for small-size states may
face various sources of statistical aber-
rations. What is significant is that the
excess numbers of these small states put
together are helping to wipe out the
deficit in the big-size states (Table 3).

At the aggregate level, the difference
in the number of establishments is placed
only at 7.97 lakh. However, the nssso
survey does not cover the “construction”
sector and if allowance is made for it, the
difference gets reduced. Based on the
results of the Fifth ec in this respect, the
difference in establishments gets reduced
from 7.97 lakhs to 2.78 lakhs. Further-
more, if allowance is made for possible
increase between 2010-11 and 2013-14,
the difference gets almost wiped out.

Thus, if the above inference is valid,
there arises a serious question about the
validity of the census frames that an ec can
provide for different follow-up surveys.

Total Workforce
The above review has concentrated
essentially on the ec coverage of “esta-
ablishments” which form the basis for
follow-up surveys. Yet another relevant
question that arises is as to what

---

**Table 4: An Estimate of the Numbers of Workers Excluded in Economic Censuses as Compared with NSSO Rounds of Employment and Unemployment (in million)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Total workforce as reported in NSSO rounds</td>
<td>399.5</td>
<td>459.1</td>
<td>460.2</td>
<td>474.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Excluded categories in economic censuses</td>
<td>246.2</td>
<td>280.3</td>
<td>288.0</td>
<td>280.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Crop production and plantations</td>
<td>212.6</td>
<td>240.6</td>
<td>226.0</td>
<td>214.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Estimated numbers of casual labour*</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Employment as maids, waiters, valet, butlers, laundresses, gardeners, gatekeepers, etc</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Expected to be covered in economic census (I-II)</td>
<td>153.3</td>
<td>178.8</td>
<td>172.2</td>
<td>185.4⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Actual number of workers reported in economic censuses</td>
<td>83.3 (4th EC)</td>
<td>100.9 (5th EC)</td>
<td>- 127.7 (6th EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluded agricultural casual labour which is included in crop and plantations.
@ Excluding public administration and defence, etc.
@ Excluding public administration and defence, etc.

Source: Respective NSSO rounds and Economic Census.
proportion of the economy’s total workforce do ECs capture.

We had earlier alluded to the fact that it is difficult for us to gauge as to what proportion of the country’s workforce the EC captures. This is because the EC’s employment numbers exclude a number of categories of workers such as casual labour, domestic servants, etc, apart from crop production and plantation and public administration and defence and compulsory social security (last in the Sixth EC).

Nevertheless, an attempt is made in Table 4 (p 81) to juxtapose the EC numbers against an estimate of the possible coverage of sectors in the ECs and their estimated workforce numbers derived from the NSSO’s estimates.

The results presented in Table 4 have a problem of comparability as NSSO surveys and the EC pertain to different time periods. Even so, some tentative comparison is possible. It brings out that roughly 65 to 80 million of workers are not getting counted in the ECs. The 61st round of NSSO for 2004-05 gave an estimate of 178.8 million as the number of workers expected to be covered in the Fifth EC of 2005, but the EC reported a total workforce of only about 100.9 million, thus leaving a gap of nearly 78 million.

Closer to the Sixth EC, the expected number of workers to be covered in it as per the 2011-12 survey of employment and unemployment was 185.4 million but the EC reported only about 127.7 million thus leaving a gap of 57.7 million. Besides, between these two estimates, there is a gap of about two years. If we take a normal 4% growth in employment between the two periods, a rough estimate suggests that the gap would get widened to about 75 million.

Exclusion by Default

As hinted at earlier, there is one category of workers who may get excluded in counting in the EC; these are workers who are pure wage earners or salaried categories. Though they reside in households (HHs), they are not the focus of the survey and they are not interviewed. Informants are the heads of HHs or owners of establishments. For collecting information on the number of workers employed, persons working for the establishment are counted; they may be working as owners, co-owners, or partners or family members helping the owner in running the establishment or other persons engaged by the establishment, whether hired or not, besides regular and salaried employees, or casual or on daily wage labourers. The information blocks are designed in such a way that only persons working for the establishment on the last working day prior to the date of fieldwork are considered as workers for the establishment. But those residents within a household who are only wage earners or salaried but work outside the establishment cannot be counted as workers for the establishment. In their case too, by virtue of the study being a census study, such workers by definition have to be counted as workers of some other establishments. However, it is conceivable that there are possibilities of work arrangements whereby not all such arrangements have identifiable establishments for the census survey to capture them.

One such possibility is the employment of persons through public works undertaken through the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA). Chances are that such public works are not counted as establishments for measuring their number and the number of workers employed through them. The second category is the category of domestic workers, which the Sixth EC has not covered. We have not been able to discern the possible estimate of MGNREGA workers who may have been included in the NSSO surveys of employment and unemployment but excluded from ECs, but their number cannot be so large as to disprove the extent of inadequate coverage in the ECs estimated above. In our view, these results thus pose a possible question on the reliability of the EC estimates and on whether they serve the broader objectives set before them.

Conclusions

In conclusion, for the present, we wish to emphasise that the impression that an EC covers a preponderant part of the national economy is not borne out of facts. In terms of the number of workers covered, they cover only about a little over one-half. Even within the non-agricultural sectors, there is a large segment of casual and domestic workers who are outside their purview. In a recent study, Mehrotra et al (2014) have shown how about 63 million out of a total of 242 million workforce in the non-agricultural sectors, or nearly 26% are casual labour. The ECs have a specific objective which is to count the establishments and their worker size, and help use them as a census frame for undertaking follow-up surveys for different categories of informal sectors. If we accept that ECs have this as their primary objective, attempts to confer on them the status of an economy-wide census count of the national economy, would not be correct. The more pertinent question before us is whether in fact the ECs are serving their primary purpose of providing such a census frame and if so at what disaggregated level. In a situation where informal sectors dominate, the known large omissions of own account and other small units is sure to distort the sampling frame. On a closer examination, we do see some misgivings in this respect as well, particularly, when we observe such vast undercoverage in the Sixth EC at major states level.

NOTES

1 The Sixth EC was conducted in the entire country during January 2013 to April 2014. As specified in the report, information on the number of workers employed was collected on the last working day during visits by enumerators. For this note, Sixth EC 2013 means EC survey as above.

2 We have no way of knowing if this entire segment of non-agricultural workforce constituting “casual labour” is equivalent to the “wage-paid employees of casual nature” described in the EC reports.
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