Chapter 3

THE STATE OF HOUSING, SANITATION, DRINKING WATER AND HEALTHCARE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 Level of living and the productivity of labour power of any economy depend very much on the quality of housing, sanitation and the healthcare facility they enjoy either with their own effort or effort on the part of the republic. When we like to make a study in a grass-root level then the importance of these level of living ingredients get enormous attention to measure the standard of living of the population under study. There is no denying that the shelter ranks itself just after food, the basic human need, in any civil society. The quality of house is not only protecting us from rain, wind, heat and from the threat of the animals and dacoits but it also appearing as the symbol of social prestige. A good house not only gives us some sort of satisfaction but it also increases the quality of life of the whole family. A quiet and satisfactory place of taking rest and sleep not only provide the opportunity of a good positive dream but also helps to provide to build up a mentality to find out the way to fulfil that good dream. Not only that a good quality of house also protects us from various diseases. So the analysis of housing is very important in any grass-root level socio-economic study. Similarly, sanitation and healthcare are also very important elements bearing on the efficiency of workers and hence on the productivity of the productive system in which they make-up an important part (Viner, 1953). But the fact remains that India's approach to poverty is centered always on food (Sarkar, 1990) except some other help to the microscopic minority in respect of shelter in some social calamities. Generally, our experts and policy makers in making the measuring rode of poverty always excluded the two important elements of measuring poverty. These two are the shelter and health care. As pleaded by many researchers and social workers during different plan periods for the inclusion of these two factors in basket used for fixing the level of poverty line(Sarkar & Kar,1990).

3.1.2 Thus the stocktaking of housing, sanitation and healthcare are very essential part of this write up. As we have already mentioned in the preceding paragraph that shelter ranks itself almost at the same level as food and clothing as a basic human

need. But Indian planners fondly thought eventually that housing and healthcare facilities would be given to the poor at free of cost. But the ground reality is that apart from giving occasional relief for housing in case of flood or other natural calamities, the Indian executives did little for giving assistance on housing. A very negligible fraction of BPL families have been supplied one or two living rooms by the government under ***"Indira Abas Yojona"*** or **"Amar *Griha Plan*".** On the other hand, healthcare remains as a prolonged neglected task to our national planners. Whatever has had been done for healthcare covers only some urban inhabitants keeping away almost a reasonable portion of our rural folk out of the proximity of the healthcare safety net. Further, for the country like India it is no exaggeration to say that housing relief so far being given to the poor is not properly executed. The question of politics always supersedes the economic reality of the poor. On the other hand, our planners and policy makers virtually handed over the charge of the healthcare to the jurisdiction of the citizen rather than state. Same is more or less true for sanitation also.

3.1.3 We have already justified in our initial chapter where we pleaded for the restructuring of the development plan of the Indian type on the ground that this type of planning system is failed to incorporate the trickle-down benefit of the centralized planning. We put forward the hypothesis that a national economic plan formulated through the aggregation of autonomous plans planned at the various grass- root area economies should be the better substitute instead of a plan that has been conceived at the custody of the central planning authority. So, if we want to formulate a plan for housing, sanitation and healthcare at the grass- root level of our type, it will be necessary to examine the existing state of housing, sanitation and healthcare facilities that have been enjoyed by the rural people within the existing socio-economic setup. Through this chapter we try to frame up this on the basis of our sample area.

3.2 HOUSING

3.2.1 As we mentioned earlier that our sample villages are all class villages and the incidence of some sort of a ruling or central village being surrounded by the subject of periphery villages is nearly non-existent. At the same time there is no village which is cent percent labourers' or cent percent farmers' village. This

simply means that people of different occupations are living together in our sample villages. Accordingly, households located themselves in cluster are not accordingly to the homogeneous economic status; rather we see that the relatively richer households are clustered along with the relatively poorer households. This proves the heterogeneity character of housing cluster in our sample. Thus, there is no special cluster of houses in our sample villages which can be termed as 'labour line' or there is no such special cluster that can be termed as 'farmer line'.

3.2.2 For the sake of simplicity here we have classified all the living rooms of the households of our sample villages into five broad categories on the basis of the roof, wall and floor materials used. They are:

Type I: Rooms with roof made of thatch or earthen tally, walls made of thatch or jute-sticks and earthen floor;

***Type II*:** Rooms with roof that consists only one shaft of corrugated tin, walls made of both bamboo- work and jute- sticks and earthen floor;

***Type III*:** Rooms with roof made of two shafts of corrugated tin, walls made of partly with bamboo- work and partly with wood and earthen floor;

***Type IV*:** Rooms with roof made of four shafts of corrugated tin, walls made of wooden framed tin and earthen or cemented floor; and

Type v: Rooms with roof made of four shafts of corrugated tin, cemented brick walls and cemented floor.

These five types of living rooms are locally known as ***'kheri-ghar', 'chhapra-ghar', 'dochala-ghar', 'chowari-ghar', and 'dalan-ghar'***. Besides these five types of dwelling units the relatively richer households use separate units with roof made of either thatch or one /two shaft(s) of corrugated tin or asbestos and earthen floor as cattle shed or kitchen or even as store room.

3.2.3 The poorest households have no separate room for kettle shed or kitchen – they use a portion of their living room or *barandah* as cooking place and another portion of their living room for animals like, goats, hens, ducks, etc. which is very unhygienic. We have distributed all the living rooms of our sample under five categories in table 3.1. It is clear from this table that the major numbers of living rooms are being cumulated to Type III i.e. *dochala- ghar,* only 9.85 percent and 11.04 percent of living rooms are of Type V and Type IV respectively in our

sample. Living rooms of the poorest households are being cumulated mainly to Type I and Type II.

Table 3.1: NATURE OF LIVING ROOMS OF THE HOUSEHOLDS

Types of Rooms	Number of Rooms	Percentage
Type I	306	16.56
Type II	412	22.29
Type III	744	40.26
Type IV	204	11.04
Type V	182	9.85
Total	1848	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.2.4. A breakup of these types of living rooms for every village and also for every land group of our sample is shown in table 3.2 and table 3.3 respectively.

Table 3.2: DISTRIBUTION OF LIVING ROOMS BY VILLAGES

Villages	Type I		Type II		Type III		Type IV		Type V	
	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C
Village 1	210	14.75	306	21.49	587	41.22	168	11.80	153	10.74
Village 2	96	22.64	106	25.00	157	37.03	36	8.50	29	6.83
Total	306	16.56	412	22.29	744	40.26	204	11.04	182	9.85

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

From table 3.2, it is clear that the overall housing condition of village 2 compare to village 1 is marginally worsened. From the point of view of the existence of '*chowari- ghar*' and 'dalan- *ghar' i.e. Type IV and Type V*, the symbol of rural richness, village 1 is marginally better off. Here our houses are synonyms with the living rooms. Henceforth we use the term house instead of living room in our presentation.

3.2.5 One, without any hesitation, can find from table 3.3 that there is common tendency regarding the condition of housing in our sample villages like any other sample village that as the land holding increases the better off houses are coming under the purview of the households. Here we find a clear cut inverse relationship between the quality of house and land holding for the below quality houses and positive relationship for the better quality houses. But what is surprising here is that some lands less households' possess some sort of better quality houses in

their possession. To make it clear here we divide the number of households cumulated in the land less group in two categories. They are:

***Category* A**: *The households who are mainly engaged in either service or in business.*

***Category* B**: *The households who are engaged mainly in agricultural activities and occasionally on some non-agricultural activities.*

3.2.6 The above classification divulges the ground reality of the possession of better off houses by the land less group. What is important to note here is that out of 182 Type-V houses 44 houses are being owned by the landless group, category A. In percentage form it stands at 21.89 percent.

Table 3.3: DISTRIBUTION OF LIVING ROOMS BY LAND GROUPS AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY

Land Groups (Acres)		Type-I		Type-II		Type-III		Type-IV		Type-V		All Types	
		No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C
Landless	A	Nil	Nil	39	19.40	94	46.77	24	11.94	44	21.89	201	100
	B	239	38.92	258	42.02	100	16.28	17	2.77	Nil	Nil	614	100
Up to 2 acres		67	13.76	83	17.04	241	49.48	44	9.03	52	10.68	487	100
2-4 acres		Nil	Nil	32	10.60	183	60.59	53	17.55	34	11.25	302	100
4-6 acres		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	92	57.5	38	23.75	30	18.75	160	100
Above 6 acres		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	34	40.47	28	33.33	22	26.19	84	100
Total		306	16.56	412	22.29	744	40.26	204	11.05	182	9.84	1848	100

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.2.7 Distribution of living rooms by materials of roofs for every village and for every land holding groups are given in table 3.4 and table 3.5 respectively. Again from the point of view of roof materials the households of village 1 are able to manage their living rooms as better as compared to the households of village 2. Here, we observe some sort of positive correlation between the quality of living rooms and land holding groups. This can be obtained from table 3.5 .One can

Table 3.4: LIVING ROOMS BY MATERIALS OF ROOFS BETWEEN VILLAGES

Villages	Thatch Roofed		Tin One shaft Roofed		Tin two shaft Roofed		Tin four shaft Roofed		Total	
	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C
Village-1	210	14.75	306	21.49	587	41.22	321	22.54	1424	100
Village-2	96	22.64	106	25	157	37.03	65	15.33	424	100
Total	306	16.57	412	22.29	744	40.26	386	20.89	1848	100

Source: Field Survey, 2008

Table 3.5: LIVING ROOMS BY MATERIAL OF ROOFS AMONG LAND BY LAND GROUPS

Land Groups (Acres)		Thatch Roofed		Tin One shaft Roofed		Tin two shaft Roofed		Tin four shaft Roofed		Total	
		No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C
Landless	A	Nil	Nil	39	19.40	94	46.77	68	33.83	201	100
	B	239	38.92	258	42.03	100	16.28	17	2.77	614	100
Up to 2 acres		67	13.76	83	17.04	241	49.49	96	19.71	487	100
2-4 acres		Nil	Nil	32	10.6	183	60.60	87	28.80	302	100
4-6 acres		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	92	57.50	68	42.50	160	100
Above 6 acres		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	34	40.48	50	59.52	84	100
Total		306	16.56	412	22.29	744	40.26	386	20.89	1848	100

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

see from this table that thatch roofed and Tin one shaft roofed i.e. *chapra- ghar* living rooms are mostly cumulated to the households fallen under '*landless*'(category B) and '*up to 2 acres* ' land groups. Similarly, the living rooms with 'Tin two shafts roofed' and 'Tin four shafts roofed' are mostly possessed by the households fallen under higher land groups of holding. The households of land groups '*4-6 acres*' and '*above 6 acres*' have occupied 42.50 percent and 59.52 percent of the living rooms of 'Tin four shafts roofed'. Here also we observed that the quality of living rooms in terms of roofs is an increasing function of the land holding groups.

3.2.8 There is no denying that the condition of a living room will be good or bad mostly depends very much on the wall materials. In our sample the walls of the living rooms are mainly made of thatch, jute-sticks, bamboo-work, timber, corrugated tin and bricks. In table 3.6 we have distributed all the living rooms of our sample on the basis of wall materials by villages. It can be seen from this table that more than 24 percent of the living rooms of our sample are constructed with walls made of thatch or jute- sticks and 37.93 percent of the living rooms are constructed with walls made of mainly jute- sticks along with some sort of bamboo- work. We must hasten to add that these living rooms become very indwelling in the rainy season and also in the winter season. Here also the condition of village 1 is comparatively better in respect of wall materials than that of village 2. An analogy of this on the basis of the land holding is given in table 3.7.

Table 3.6: LIVING ROOMS BY MATERIALS OF WALLS BETWEEN VILLAGES

Villages	Thatch/Jute-Sticks		Jute Sticks / Bamboo		Wood/ Bamboo		Corrugated Tin		Cemented		Total	
	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C
Village-1	308	21.63	554	38.9	241	16.92	168	11.8	153	10.75	1424	100
Village-2	142	33.49	147	34.67	70	16.51	36	8.49	29	6.84	424	100
Total	450	24.35	701	37.93	311	16.83	204	11.04	182	9.85	1848	100

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

Table 3.7: LIVING ROOMS BY MATERIALS OF WALLS AMONG LAND GROUPS

Land Groups (Acres)		Thatch/Jute-Sticks		Jute Sticks / Bamboo		Wood/ Bamboo		Corrugated Tin		Cemented		Total	
		No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C
Landless	A	Nil	Nil	87	43.28	46	22.88	24	11.94	44	21.89	201	100
	B	337	54.88	260	42.36	Nil	Nil	17	2.77	Nil	Nil	614	100
Up to 2 acres		113	23.20	211	43.32	67	13.76	44	9.03	52	10.68	487	100
2-4 acres		Nil	Nil	117	38.74	98	32.45	53	17.55	34	11.26	302	100
4-6 acres		Nil	Nil	18	11.25	74	46.25	38	23.75	30	18.75	160	100
Above 6 acres		Nil	Nil	8	9.52	26	30.96	28	33.33	22	26.20	84	100
Total		450	24.35	701	37.93	311	16.83	204	11.04	182	9.85	1848	100

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

One can see from table 3.7 that out 815 living rooms owned by the households of *'landless group'*, 684 living rooms with walls made of either thatch or jute- sticks and in percentage form it accounts for 83.92 percent. Again 66.52 percent of the living rooms of the households fallen under land group *' up to 2 acres'* are also with walls made of mainly thatch or jute- sticks. Obviously, the dwellers of these living rooms become the victim of cold wind, dusty wind and rain water. Similarly, the better quality living rooms in terms of wall materials i.e. walls made of wooden-framed-corrugated tin or cemented bricks are cumulated to the households belonging to the relatively better off households in terms of land holding. Here also we see that the wall quality goes up with the increase in the holding size. Due to the easy availability of bamboo the households of all categories are habituated to use bamboo- work (*hadla*) as wall materials. Not only that some households of village-2 have bamboo garden (*bansbari*) within the periphery of their homestead. This kind of phenomenon is very common among the inhabitants of the Tarai-Duars region.

3.2.9 Another important indicator in measuring the quality of living is the average number of living rooms possessed by the each household. To test this indicator here we distributed all the households of our sample on the basis of the number of living rooms. This is shown in table 3.8. One can observe from this table that 20.78 percent of the households have only one living room and 46.32 percent of the households have two living rooms to use. These households mainly belong to the land groups of *'landless' (Category B)* and *'up to 2 acres'* .Only 32.90 percent of the households of our sample have three or more living rooms. Here also we observe that the number of three and more rooms households increases with the increase in the land holding size. But what is alarming in this area economy is that more than 20 percent households have no option but to use a portion of their living room as their kitchen. These households also kept their pet and domestic animals either in a corner of their living room or they use a portion of their veranda as cattle shed. This kind of practice not only pollutes the inner atmosphere of the living room but also enhances the scope of animal transmitted diseases to the inhabitants of these dwelling units. It also hampers the education of the school going children.

Table 3.8: HOUSEHOLDS BY THE NUMBER OF LIVING ROOMS

Land Groups (Acres)	One Room households		Two Rooms households		Three and more Rooms households		Total	
	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C	No.	P.C
Landless	104	36.49	97	34.03	84	29.48	285	100
Up to 2 acres	40	18.87	115	54.24	57	26.89	212	100
2-4 acres	Nil	Nil	66	60.55	43	39.45	109	100
4-6 acres	Nil	Nil	34	56.67	26	43.33	60	100
Above 6 Acres	Nil	Nil	9	33.33	18	66.67	27	100
Total	144	20.78	321	46.32	228	32.9	693	100

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.2.10 Researchers of any grass-root area economy also use the concept of size of the room, room per household and room-man ratio in analysing the quality of housing. We also measure here all these for our grass- root rural area economy. This is given in table 3.9. One can observe clearly from this table that on an

average the size of the rooms increases with the increase in the holding size. But there is no such clear-cut relation releases in case of rooms per household. However, the room –man ratio for our sample is positively related with the holding size.

Table 3.9: AVERAGE SIZE OF LIVING ROOM AND NUMBER OF LIVING ROOMS PER HOUSEHOLD BY LAND GROUPS

Land Groups (Acres)		No. of Households	Population	Total No. Rooms	Average size of Rooms (Sq. ft)	Rooms per Household	Room-Man ratio
Landless	A	67	313	201	168	3.0	0.64
	B	218	1121	614	115	2.81	0.54
Up to 2 acres		212	788	487	144	2.30	0.62
2-4 acres		109	467	302	152	2.77	0.65
4-6 acres		60	220	160	168	2.67	0.73
Above 6 acres		27	103	84	192	3.11	0.81
Total		693	3012	1848	142.54	2.67	0.61

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.2.11 It is rather convenient in the analysis of housing to incorporate the concept of 'roofed space' (in sq. ft.) per household and per capita. This will add some sort of beauty to bring the picture of housing problem in true sense. To make it more conventional here we incorporate two other spaces such as social group and economic group in our presentation. We gather Information regarding these on the basis of is given in table 3.10 to table 3.12.

Table 3.10: ROOFED SPACE PER HOUSEHOLD AND PER CAPITA BY LAND GROUPS AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY

Land Groups (Acres)		No.of Households	Population	Total space (Sq.ft)	Space per household (Sq.ft)	Space per capita (Sq.ft)
Landless	A	67	313	33768	504.00	107.88
	B	218	1121	70610	323.89	62.98
Up to 2 acres		212	788	70128	330.79	88.99
2-4 acres		109	467	45904	421.13	98.29
4-6 acres		60	220	26880	448.00	122.18
Above 6 acres		27	103	16128	597.33	156.58
Total		693	3012	263418	380.11	87.45

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

Table 3.11: ROOFED SPACE PER HOUSEHOLD AND PER CAPITA BY SOCIAL GROUPS

Social Groups	No. of Households	Population	Total space (Sq.ft)	Space per household (Sq.ft.)	Space per capita (Sq.ft.)
Upper Caste	417	1778	165337	396.49	92.99
Schedule Caste	271	1207	96476	356.00	79.93
Muslim	5	27	1605	321.00	59.44
Total	693	3012	263418	380.11	87.45

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

Table 3.12: ROOFED SPACE PER HOUSEHOLD AND PER CAPITA BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME GROUPS

Annual Family Income (Rs'000)	No. of Households	Population	Total space (Sq.ft)	Space per household (Sq.ft.)	Space per capita (Sq.ft.)
Up to 50	155	698	46538	300.24	66.67
50, - 1,00	176	743	61234	347.92	82.41
1,00, - 2,00	201	842	76523	380.71	90.88
2,00, - 3,00	113	466	47108	416.88	101.09
Above 3,00	48	263	32015	666.98	121.73
Total	693	3012	263418	380.11	87.45

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

The table 3.12 supports the positive relationship between the annual family income and roofed space per household in the one hand and between the annual family income and roofed space per capita on the other. It is seen from the table that the richest households have been enjoying nearly double roofed spaces both in terms of per household and per capita than the poorest households in our grass-root area economy. This means that the relatively richer households have been enjoying relatively better facilities in terms of living, cooking, animal shedding and education for their children than the poorer households. So, what we have observed in the above few sections and what we will observe in the subsequent sections is nothing but the toss of a same coin that the poor are poor because they are poor.

3.2.12 We have already categorized all the living rooms of our sample on the basis of the materials of roofs and walls under five broad heads. Now we like to distribute the roofed space per household and per capita of these types of living rooms for every

land group along with occupational category of the households, social groups and economic groups of our sample. These will further enrich us about the exact housing facilities enjoyed by the people of different classes and communities in this grass- root rural area economy. These are given in tables 3.13 to 3.15 below. It can be seen form table 3.13 that by and large roofed space per household and roofed space per capita increases with the increase in the land holding size. This very typical finding more or less remains same if we consider the type of housing in our consideration. But what remains to say or rather one may fall in illusion to see the figures assigned to the landless group (Category A). In many cases, irrespective of housing type this group accounts for a relatively larger figures in comparison to the marginal and small farmers. We have mentioned earlier that this group comprises with the households engaged mainly in services and in some pity businesses.

Table 3.13: ROOFED SPACE PER HOUSEHOLD AND PER CAPITA BY THEIR TYPES AMONG DIFFERENT LAND GROUPS

Land Groups (Acres)		Type-I		Type-II		Type-III		Type-IV		Type-V		All Type	
		Space per Household	Space per capita	Space per Household	Space per capita	Space per Household	Space per capita	Space per Household	Space per capita	Space per Household	Space per capita	Space per Household	Space per capita
Landless	A	Nil	Nil	97.79	20.93	235.70	50.45	60.18	12.88	110.33	23.62	504.0	107.88
	B	126.08	24.52	136.10	26.46	52.75	10.25	8.96	1.74	Nil	Nil	323.89	62.98
Up to 2 acres		45.51	12.24	56.37	15.17	163.69	44.04	29.88	8.04	35.32	9.50	330.79	88.99
2-4 acres		Nil	Nil	44.62	10.41	255.19	59.56	73.90	17.25	47.41	11.06	421.13	98.29
4-6 acres		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	257.6	70.25	106.4	29.02	84.0	22.91	448.0	122.18
Above 6 acres		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	241.78	63.38	199.11	52.19	156.44	41.00	597.33	156.58
Total		62.94	14.48	84.74	19.49	153.03	35.21	41.96	9.65	37.43	8.61	380.11	87.45

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.2.13 To see the relative social position of the various social groups of our sample we also distribute all the houses of the study area according to their type on the basis of these social groups. This is given in table 3.14. One can see at a glance that the study area supports the view as depicted by Justice Rajinder Sachar in his report given in the year 2006. If we assume that the space per capita as a measuring rode of good housing, then we see that the Muslims are enjoying 1.56 times less space than the space per capita enjoyed by the upper caste people and 1.34 times less than that of the scheduled caste people in our sample. This phenomenon can also be seen if we consider space per household also. What is important to say here is that not even a single Muslim family owned the house falls in Type V.

Table 3.14: ROOFED SPACE PER HOUSEHOLD AND PER CAPITA BY THEIR TYPES AMONG DIFFERENT SOCIAL GROUPS

Social Groups	Type-I		Type-II		Type-III		Type-IV		Type-V		All Type	
	Space per Household	Space per capita	Space per household	Space per capita	Space per household	Space per capita	Space per household	Space per capita	Space per household	Space per capita	Space per Household	Space per capita
Upper Caste	45.62	10.70	74.43	17.46	145.79	34.19	63.42	14.87	67.23	15.77	396.49	92.99
Schedule Caste	59.49	13.35	81.15	18.23	161.34	36.23	28.51	6.40	25.51	5.72	356.00	79.93
Muslim	69.6	12.88	100.32	18.57	132.24	24.49	18.84	3.49	Nil	Nil	321.00	59.44
Total	51.22	11.79	77.34	17.78	151.64	34.88	49.45	11.38	50.43	11.61	380.11	87.45

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

Table 3.15: ROOFED SPACE PER HOUSEHOLD AND PER CAPITA BY THEIR TYPES AMONG DIFFERENT ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME GROUPS

Annual Family Income (Rs'000)	Type-I		Type-II		Type-III		Type-IV		Type-V		All Type	
	Space per Household	Space per capita	Space per Household	Space per capita	Space per Household	Space per capita	Space per household	Space per capita	Space per household	Space per capita	Space per household	Space per capita
Up to 50	176.24	39.13	115.32	25.61	Nil	Nil	8.68	1.93	Nil	Nil	300.24	66.67
50 - 1,00	43.32	10.26	149.06	35.31	148.86	35.26	6.68	1.58	Nil	Nil	347.92	82.41
1,00 - 2,00	2.55	0.61	41.00	9.78	250.75	59.85	72.28	17.26	14.13	3.37	380.71	90.88
2,00 - 3,00	Nil	Nil	22.68	5.50	186.53	45.24	88.98	21.58	118.69	28.78	416.88	101.09
Above 3,00	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	128.23	23.4	149.33	27.25	389.41	71.07	666.98	121.73
Total	51.22	11.78	77.65	17.86	151.37	34.83	49.45	11.37	50.42	11.6	380.11	87.45

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.2.14 To give more beauty about the housing facility enjoyed by the inhabitants under our inspection we also present the roofed space per household and roofed space per capita on the basis of all house type by annual family income groups. Table 3.15 depicts that fact in detail. The findings that have been released from this table are very traditional that simply says that the space per household and space per capita both are the increasing function of income.

3.3 SANITATION

3.3.1 Sanitation occupies a very important place in any health environment of any economy either local or regional or global. The basic ingredients of sanitation are bathing arrangement, washing arrangement, evacuation arrangement and drainage system. Our traditional villages are in general habituated with the natural drainage system rather than artificial drainage system. This is cent percent true in case of our sample villages. We have seen no artificial drainage system developed either from the initiation of the individual or from the initiation of the local level government at the time of our survey. The rain water in the rainy season normally finds their outlets through the natural slope of the land in the one hand and also through the natural drainage system developed by the nature in the course of time. Similarly, the bathing and cleaning water traditionally moved through earthen drainage system made for that purpose. The incidence of bathroom with cisterns is completely non- existent in our area economy. The households of higher income echelon, mainly the service holders have few numbers of bathrooms. These bath rooms are mainly used by the adult female members only. In some cases, the households of comparatively lower annual family income groups have constructed bathing places, not bathrooms, with walls made with jute- sticks or bamboo- work *(hadla)* and earthen floor. These bathrooms are open sky bathrooms and are used mainly by the female adults. The female members of the poorest households are accustomed to use the tube well or well side as bathing places and the living rooms for changing their wet dresses. On the whole, the other adults and children of most of the families, irrespective of income levels, use open places beside tube wells or wells, community and private ponds, river and even a very small water logged area (*pagar*) in the rainy season for their bathing.

3.3.2 Besides the bathing place, cleanliness of houses is also very important part of sanitation. Cleanliness claims that the houses must be built with proper ventilation facility and the architecture of the house should be such that it would be free from cold, dusty, wet wind and water. Side by side, the outer space of the houses must also be free from jungles and water logging. There is no denying that cleanliness and consciousness are the two sides of a single coin. Determination and mental maturity of the family member are the two important variables that should be assured this even with the less capability. However, a reasonable percentage of households still remain in some constraints to be competent to do this. Almost all the households of our sample exhibit their nature of cleanliness in a very good manner. Except few, all the households are free from the jungles and water logging. These few households are located in the land relatively lower altitude as compared to other households.

3.3.3 The arrangement of evacuation, one of the most important ingredients of sanitation, appears to be relatively better in our grass- root rural area economy. This is due to the whole hearted initiatives of Gram Panchayat and Zilla Parishad. They took the programme of ' Total Sanitation Campaign (TSC)' with the aim of making the Baneswar Anchal as' Green Area ' since 2007. As a result of this programme, more than 50 percent of the households have been provided latrines with earthen or cemented ring wells at a very subsidised rates (only Rs. 300 for BPL families and Rs. 1800 for other poorer families) through the initiation of an NGO, named 'Putimari Santi kutir Club'. Only 4.33 percent of the poorest households have latrines with dug wells and 44.73 percent of the households, who are relatively richer, have constructed latrines with earthen or cemented ring wells at their own costs and initiatives. To capture this picture of evacuation we have distributed all the households of our sample by land groups and also by annual family income groups on the basis of the type of latrine. These are given in table 3.16 and table 3.17 respectively.

3.3.4 It is crystal clear form table 3.16 that our sample villages are green villages in true sense. Not a single household can be identified that has no evacuation facility. Credit goes to the NGO and local level Governments. What is claiming is that only 30 households out of 693 households are being used latrines with dug well

and the rest households constructed their latrines with either earthen or cemented ring wells. In percentage form these two figures stand at 4.33 percent and 95.67 percent respectively. Thus in future these 4.33 percent households should be brought under the complete green area project by providing them ring-well latrine either further subsidised rate or may be at free of cost. If we achieve this in the near future it will keep our sample villages free from the diseases that should be contaminated through the open field excreta. One can see from table 3.17 that all these 30 households belong to the lower income group in the array of our income distribution. So what we said just in the preceding lines should easily be achieved through the income subsidy on the part of the republic.

Table 3.16: NATURE OF LATRINE BY LAND GROUPS AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY

Land Groups (Acres)		Latrine with dug well		Latrine with earthen or cemented ring well(**)		Latrine with earthen or cemented ring well		All Types	
		No. of household	P.C	No. of household	P.C	No. of household	P.C	No. of household	P.C
Landless	A	Nil	Nil	16	23.88	51	76.12	67	100.00
	B	23	10.55	192	88.07	03	1.38	218	100.00
Up to 2 acres		07	3.30	138	65.09	67	31.60	212	100.00
2-4 acres		Nil	Nil	07	6.42	102	93.58	109	100.00
4-6 acres		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	60	100.00	60	100.00
Above 6 acres		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	27	100.00	27	100.00
Total		30	4.33	353	50.94	310	44.73	693	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09; ** At Govt. subsidized rates

Table 3.17: NATURE OF LATRINE BY ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME GROUPS

Annual Family Income Groups(Rs.'000)	Latrine with dug Well		Latrine with earthen or cemented ring well(**)		Latrine with earthen or cemented ring well(*)		All Types	
	No. of household	P.C	No. of household	P.C	No. of household	P.C	No. of household	P.C
Up to 50	23	14.83	132	85.17	Nil	Nil	155	100
50-1,00	7	3.98	143	81.25	26	14.77	176	100
1,00-2,00	Nil	Nil	78	38.8	123	61.2	201	100
2,00-3,00	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	113	100.00	113	100
Above 3,00	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	48	100.00	48	100
Total	30	4.33	353	50.94	310	44.73	693	100

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09; ** At Govt. subsidized rates

3.4 DRINKING WATER

3.4.1 There is no denying that pure drinking water is a fundamental ingredient of health environment of an economy and it has been recognised as a basic means of expanding the span of human life. Its importance also lies in the fact that an extension of the pure drinking water system will no doubt reduce the occurrence of most of the water- borne diseases that attacked the people of this area usually with a low nutrition status. Although the responsibility of supplying pure drinking water generally fixes upon the Department of Public Health and Engineering (PHE) but the department as has been seen by us has done nothing in this regard for the rural folk of our sample. The activity of the PHE department is cantered only in Baneswar village, the heart of the Baneswar Gram Panchayat. So, most of the households of our study area have been collecting their drinking water from hand tube wells or wells owned privately or owned by the community as a whole.

3.4.2 Another important point to be mentioned here is that the sources of drinking water are also being used as the places of bathing, cleaning of utensils and washing clothes. As a result the surroundings of most of the tube wells and wells become water logged and dirty and enhance the possibility that this contaminated water may be soaked back through the top soil to the water of wells and tube wells and increase the opportunity of water- borne diseases. We have noticed no periodic attempts of purification of these water sources from the part of the individual or from the part of the local authority. Attempts so far has been done are occasional only on the part of the individual.

Table 3.18: SOURCES OF DRINKING WATER IN SAMPLE VILLAGES

Villages	Deep Tube Wells		Tube Wells		Wells		All Sources	
	No. of Households	P.C	No. of Households	P.C	No. of Households	P.C	No. of Households	P.C
Village-1	13	2.43	505	94.39	17	3.18	535	100
Village-2	7	4.43	142	89.87	9	5.7	158	100
Total	20	2.89	647	93.37	26	3.75	693	100

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.4.3 It can be seen from table 3.18 that most of the households of our sample use hand tube wells as a source of drinking water. Only 2.89 percent of the households

belonging to higher land groups use deep tube well water for drinking purposes. These units are installed mainly for irrigation purposes at the govt. subsidized rate during the 1980s of the last century. Again, 3.75 percent of the households are used open wells water as drinking water, which are mostly made of by earthen ring with a minimum depth about 6 to 7 meters from the ground level. To see the impact of the land holding on the use of drinking water unit we have distributed all the households on the basis of the land holding in table 3.18. What is important to note here is that relatively richer farmers are enjoying the opportunity of the use of the deep tube well as their drinking water unit. Except this the same picture of incidence of drinking water units has come out from our study as like any other grass-root area economy of this locality.

Table 3.19: SOURCES OF DRINKING WATER BY LAND GROUPS

Land Groups (Acres)		Deep Tube Wells		Tube Wells		Wells		All Sources	
		No. of Households	P.C	No. of Households	P.C	No. of Households	P.C	No. of Households	P.C
Landless	A	Nil	Nil	67	100.00	Nil	Nil	67	100.00
	B	Nil	Nil	214	98.16	04	1.84	218	100.00
Up to 2 acres		Nil	Nil	205	96.7	07	3.3	212	100.00
2-4 acres		Nil	Nil	97	89.00	12	11.00	109	100.00
4-6 acres		7	11.67	50	83.33	03	5.00	60	100.00
Above 6 acres		13	48.15	14	51.85	Nil	Nil	27	100.00
Total		20	2.89	647	93.36	26	3.75	693	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.5 NATURE OF HEALTH CARE

3.5.1 At the time of the initiation of our development planning, the then planners fondly thought that the health care service would be provided by the state at free of cost to the vulnerable people. We have already spent twelve full phased national planning and three annual planning since 1951. During this period except some infrastructural development such as improvement of block and sub divisional health care units and the introduction of multi-purpose health care service under

the initiation of World Health Organisation nothing being done for the people who are in distress. On the other hand, we have seen the several establishments in the name of nursing home in the district and sub divisional headquarters are being developed to provide the health care service for the people who are in higher income echelon under the initiation of private management. These units are generally remaining out of the proximity of the poor people.

3.5.2 For the sake of simplicity, we present here the health care picture of our sample area from three distinct corners. They are the picture of the nature of treatment by land holding groups, by annual family income and by per capita annual expenditure. All are given in tables 3.19 to 3.21. One can see in table 3.19 that the role of the village quack is very important till now. On the other hand, only one-fourth households of our sample are benefited by the service rendered by the Public Health Centres. What is alarming is that still 26.12 percent households are treated the ails with the help of the qualified private doctors and these qualified doctors are by profession the doctors of the Public Health Centres. Only 2.89 percent households of our sample rendered their faith on super natural power at the time of their sufferings. These households are absolutely poor households. But the relatively affluent households of our sample render their faith fully on the private management.

Table 3.20: NATURE OF TREATMENT ENJOYED BY THE HOUSEHOLDS UNDER DIFFERENT LAND GROUPS

Land Groups (Acres)		Village Quacks		Public Health Centre		Qualified Private Doctors		Super Natural Power		Total	
		No. Of Househol	P.C	No. Of Households	P.C	No. Of Households	P.C	No. Of Households	P.C	No. Of Households	P.C
Landless	A	14	20.89	10	14.93	43	64.18	Nil	Nil	67	100.0
	B	138	63.31	67	30.73	Nil	Nil	13	5.96	218	100.0
Up to 2 acres		100	47.17	68	32.07	37	17.45	07	3.30	212	100.0
2-4 acres		48	44.03	24	22.02	37	33.94	Nil	Nil	109	100.0
4-6 acres		14	23.33	09	15.0	37	61.67	Nil	Nil	60	100.0
Above 6 acres		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	27	100.00	Nil	Nil	27	100.0
Total		314	45.31	178	25.68	181	26.12	20	2.89	693	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.5.3 To substantiate the above findings we construct table 3.20 on the basis of annual family income. Here also we see the same reflection as we had seen in Table 3.19. But whatever may be the means of representation, we can't deny the role of the

village quack in the rural health care network in our sample area. Another fact that also reveals from our findings is that the dichotomy between the existence of the public health care unit and capability. We see that in spite of the existence of public health care unit with qualified specialist doctors more than 10 percent people of our sample are treated their ails by the qualified private doctors when these doctors render their service in private chambers.

Table 3.21: NATURE OF TREATMENT ENJOYED BY THE HOUSEHOLDS UNDER DIFFERENT ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME GROUPS

Annual Family Inco Income Groups (Rs.'000)	Village Quacks		Public Health Centre		Qualified Private Doctors		Super Natural Power		Total	
	No. Of Households	P.C	No. Of Households	P.C	No. Of Households	P.C	No. Of Households	P.C	N No. No of No. Households	P.C
Up to 50	104	67.09	38	24.52	Nil	Nil	13	8.39	155	100.0
50-1,00	94	53.41	43	24.43	32	18.18	07	3.98	176	100.0
1,00-2,00	78	38.81	85	42.29	38	18.90	Nil	Nil	201	100.0
2,00-3,00	38	33.63	12	10.62	63	55.75	Nil	Nil	130	100.0
Above 3,00	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	48	100.0	Nil	Nil	48	100.0
Total	314	45.31	178	25.68	181	26.12	20	2.89	693	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

Table 3.22: PER CAPITA ANNUAL EXPENDITURE ON HEALTH CARE

Per capita annual expenditure on health care (Rs.)	No. Of households	Percentage
Up to 200	231	33.33
201-300	184	26.55
301-400	118	17.03
401-500	97	14.00
Above 500	63	9.09
Total	693	100.00

Source: Field Survey, 2008-09

3.5.4 At the outset of this section we rather try to remember the fact what we had thought at the time of initiation of our national planning that expenditure on healthcare should be borne by the republic out of its revenue collection. Now the fact that comes out from this study that even at the very beginning decade of the present century on an average per capita annual expenditure stands at Rs.272 for

medical treatment. So, one can raise the question about the justification of indirect subsidy on health ground that provide by the Government out of its tax collection annually.