

within the scope of the States. Therefore, we have to take the States into confidence. In whatever improvement we would like to make in the field of education, we have to get the support of the States and their willing cooperation. And there cannot be any quarrel between the State and the Centre, whether in the case of language, university education or school education. We have, therefore, called a meeting of the Education Ministers to discuss the matter.

Before I conclude, I would like to mention one point with regard to the so-called imbalance in provision of grants between the Central universities and State universities. Hon. Members must remember that the Central universities are wholly financed by the University Grants Commission. Their day-to-day expenses as well as development expenses—everything—will have to be provided by the UGC, whereas in respect of State universities, there is a provision for matching grant, and then again, UGC gives development grants, but the recurring expenses are either met by the funds of the university and by those provided by the State Government. So, what is mentioned in the report here, does not actually reflect what amounts are being spent by the universities at the State level. Much more is being spent there, because States are providing funds to these universities. That should be borne in mind. Then again, the figures with regard to JNU or to the Delhi University may not be very correct, in their reflection of the real state of affairs. Much of the expenditure which has been criticized by the hon. Members was for the establishment of the university itself, and the construction of its houses, hostels etc. If we divide this by the number of students it would not really reflect the proper state of affairs. So we should not make that comparison.

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to Appendix XII of this report from where it will

be found that under the tentative allocations indicated to the universities and institutions deemed to be universities for the 5th Plan, many of them have been clubbed together with State universities. In one column we get Rs. 50 lakhs for Kashi Vidya-peeth, K. S. Vishwa Vidyalaya at Dharbanga, Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishwa Vidyalaya and so on. Similarly we find allocations of Rs. 75 lakhs and Rs. 1 crore for Agra and Annamalai universities, and A. P. Singh institution at Berhampur. In this way, it is shown that some of these universities were receiving amounts

MR. SPEAKER: You have already encroached upon the time of the Half-Hour Discussion.

DR. PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER: I would like to sit down now; I thank the hon. Members for the suggestions that they have made. They will have utmost consideration on our part.

PROF. DILIP CHAKRAVARTY: Before the Education Minister concludes, I would like him to say something about the implementation of the UGC pay-scales in all these cases and about ensuring monthly pay-packets to the teachers, without which education becomes meaningless. He has mentioned nothing about it. This problem was raised, as also the problem about corruption going on in some of the Central universities.

✓ 17.34 hrs.

RESIGNATION BY MEMBER

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received a letter dated the 21st July, 1977 from Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy, an elected Member from Nandyal constituency of Andhra Pradesh, resigning his seat in Lok Sabha. Although it is not the practice to inform the House of the reasons for resignation, in this particular case, I am happy to inform the House that he has resigned his seat in Lok Sabha in view of his election

[Mr. Speaker]

as President of the Republic. I have accepted his resignation with effect from to-day, the 21st July 1977, afternoon.

17.35 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

RURAL POOR

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to raise a discussion on the question relating to the rural poor in our country.

(MISS ABHA MAITI *in the Chair*)

Madam Chairman, rural poverty has got many facets of its own. As I have got very little time at my disposal, I think you will agree with me that all the factors cannot be discussed in a proper way, and in a proper manner. Therefore, I shall limit myself to certain facets only so that I can bring to the notice of the House the immensity or the alarming proportion of the problem.

But my first endeavour would be to really locate or rather identify the dimension of the rural poor. In this effort, instead of marshalling facts and figures and statistics from other sources, I would like merely to rely upon the editorial today in the *Economic Times*. In that editorial it has been succinctly pointed out:

“According to the National Sample Survey of 1975 one Indian out of every five is a severe destitute, one in every three is a destitute and nearly half the population of the country is below the poverty line. The poor number over 245 million.”

It goes on further to state:

“In rural India nearly 200 million people could spend less than 92 paise a day on bare necessities.”

It further continues to say:

“The poorest rural households with assets less than Rs. 500 are

concentrated in Tamil Nadu, in Andhra, in West Bengal, in Karnataka and Maharashtra in that order.”

Therefore, it is quite clear, the nation should know, this Parliament, this august House should know, what is the actual dimension of the poverty of our country. I am thankful to the Speaker, because he has allowed us to raise this very very important question on the floor of this House.

As I have mentioned earlier, rural poverty has many facets. I only want to take some of them. One is rural indebtedness. Let us try to identify the magnitude of the rural indebtedness. In that respect, I again rely on a statement made by the Reserve Bank of India. I shall say nothing from memory or sources which have no governmental authority. This is from the All India Debt and Investment Survey conducted by the Reserve Bank of India as on 30th June, 1971. There is a long list, State by State. In view of the shortage of time, I do not like to mention the figure of rural indebtedness for each State, but I certainly want to mention certain States. For example, I will mention Tamil Nadu, where the total indebtedness is Rs. 447 crores, and Andhra Pradesh Rs. 444 crores. Then I come to UP, where it is of the order of Rs. 475 crores. As I belong to West Bengal, I shall not do any injustice to my State also and to the poor people of my State. There the figure is Rs. 122 crores. If you total it up, it comes to about Rs. 4,000 crores.

Even a casual glance or a bird's eye view would reveal that the total liabilities of the rural households amount to a staggering figure of Rs. 3,921 crores, to be more exact. It further reveals that UP have a share of Rs. 475 crores, Tamil Nadu Rs. 447 crores, Andhra Pradesh Rs. 444 crores, Karnataka Rs. 400 crores and West Bengal Rs. 122 crores. On On further scrutiny it is found that out of total liabilities of all the rural house-