

**A Journal Devoted to the Study of
Indian Economy, Polity and Society**

Vol. XXI	January-December 2009	No. 1-4
Is There a Case for Re-organisation of States?	Vikas Chitre and Abhay Tilak	1
Separation Is No Solution to the Problem of Regional Imbalance in Development	Nilakantha Rath	193
Regional Justice Perspectives and the Issue of States Re-organisation in India: A Revisit	P.R. Panchamukhi	199
The Problem of Regional Disparities in Maharashtra State and the Role of the Regional Development Boards	R.P. Kurulkar	261
Why Vidarbha State? Failure of Article 371(2) of the Constitution: Vidarbha State Is the Only Alternative	R.L. Pitale	281
The Telangana Tragedy - A Lesson in Integration and Disintegration	Gautam Pingle	297
Selected Notes by Participants		317
DOCUMENTATION		
1. <i>Report of The States Reorganisation Commission, Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs, No. 53/69/53-Public, dated 29th December, 1953</i>		356
2. <i>Thoughts on Linguistic States, Anand Sahitya Sadan, Siddhartha Marg, Chhawani - 20, Aligarh - 202001. (First Published 1955)</i>	B.R. Ambedkar	525
Book Reviews		567
Index of Volume XXI (2009)		595

Annual Subscription Rates

Journal of Indian School of Political Economy, Pune

New annual subscription rates effective from 1st January, 1999

	India (Rs)	Other Countries (US \$)
For institutions other than colleges	600.00	80.00
For individuals and colleges	300.00	40.00

Payments should be made by Demand Draft, payable to Indian School of Political Economy, Pune, drawn on any bank in Pune. For outstation cheques, please add Rs 60/- to cover collection charges.

Please mail your orders/enquiries to

Indian School of Political Economy,
'Arthabodh', 968/21-22, Senapati Bapat Road,
Pune 411 016 (India).

Phones: (020) 25657132, 25657210.

e-mail: ispe@vsnl.net

website: ispepune.org.in

Editor's Note: University and college teachers and students of Economics, Political Science and Sociology/Social Anthropology are invited to send to us questions of wider interest on the subjects of their study. We shall endeavour to publish in subsequent issues of the journal answers to selected questions received by us. This will form a separate section of the journal. The authors of the selected questions shall receive complimentary copies of one year's issues of the journal, as a token of our appreciation.

EDITOR'S NOTE

The Indian School of Political Economy organises every year, a seminar on some subject of national importance, in memory of its Founder-Director Prof. V. M. Dandekar. We organised a seminar on Friday, 27th and Saturday, 28th of August, 2010, on the theme, **‘Is There a Case for Re-organisation of States?’**

In the present Volume of the Journal, we are publishing the revised versions of selected papers and Notes submitted for the seminar. While the seminar was held in 2010, the present Volume of the Journal is for the year 2009, as the publication of the journal is delayed. Hence, the papers and Notes published here may contain references to material published in 2010.

We propose to publish the proceedings of the seminar in detail as a later Volume of the Journal.

IS THERE A CASE FOR RE-ORGANISATION OF STATES?

Vikas Chitre and Abhay Tilak

This is a revised version of a Background Note, prepared for the seminar on the question of the re-organisation of the States in India. We review at the outset the Constitutional Provisions for re-organisation of States in India and the principles adopted by the States Re-organisation Commission, 1955, to address this question. We recall the Commission's recommendations particularly in the context of Vidarbha and Telangana, and the Amendments to the Constitution, made to pacify the demands for separate statehood for these two and other regions. Taking the position that the problems in promoting balanced regional development is at the root of demands for separate States, we examine in detail the extent to which imbalances in regional development have been ameliorated particularly in Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh. Stressing the importance of ensuring economic and financial viability of the States in the interest of their autonomy, we consider the prospects of the above two regions in particular emerging as financially viable, taking into account the approach to devolution of funds laid down by the Thirteenth Finance Commission. We also evaluate the receipts and expenditure patterns of the newly created States of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand and their mother States with a view to assessing the positive and negative impacts of creation of the new States on the finances of both the newly created as well as the mother States. Finally, we make a few observations about the political considerations underlying the question of the re-organisation of States.

INTRODUCTION

After the recent revival of demands for carving out separate states - Telangana from Andhra Pradesh, Vidarbha from Maharashtra and Bundelkhand from Uttar Pradesh - the ministry of home affairs (MHA) has informed Parliament that it has received recommendations from "various sources" for the creation of several new states, such as Bhojpur from eastern Uttar Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Bihar, Saurashtra from Gujarat, Kodagu (Coorg) from Karnataka, Koshalanchal from western Orissa, Gorkhaland from West Bengal, Mithilanchal from north Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, and Purvanchal, Harith Pradesh, Braj Pradesh and Awadh Pradesh from various regions of Uttar Pradesh. There are other suggestions and proposals for the re-organisation of the states in the country as well.

There are regional imbalances in development in most States, and in some regions there is a sense of serious injustice and a feeling of separate cultural and regional identities. There is a perception that smaller states could provide better governance, and may lead to better sharing of political power and policy making more responsive to sub-regional and local needs. Smaller states may result in a more effective control of regional resources, and exploiting better opportunities for the population of the region. There may also be hope of being able to swing greater quantum of devolution of financial resources from the Centre to the region, if it is granted statehood. That is why demands for newer states are being raised.

On the other hand, it is also feared that granting of statehood to some regions may lead to political activity being organised towards raising similar

Vikas Chitre is Honorary Fellow of Indian School of Political Economy, Pune 411016.

Abhay Tilak is Fellow of Indian School of Political Economy, Pune 411016.

The authors are grateful to Professor Nilakantha Rath for valuable discussion on an earlier draft of this paper and parts of the revised draft. They have incorporated in the present paper most of Professor D.N. Dhanagare's Note and parts of Professor Suhas Palshikar's Note submitted for the Seminar, for which they are indebted to them. The authors would like to express their sincere thanks to Shri K. G. Pachange, Joint Director, of the Statistics division in the Department of Water Resources, Government of Maharashtra and Ms. Rashmi Lad of the same department. It is only because of their efforts that we could access and use all the statistics pertaining to the present status of district-wise irrigation potential in our analysis. However, the authors alone are responsible for any errors which may still have remained in the paper.

demands in other regions as well. Will the large expenditures required for creating the administrative infrastructure and for maintaining law and order within the states jeopardise the state finances further? Could it also result in creating more states which are financially dependent on the Central Government, and which, in effect, will lose real autonomy? If a large number of small states is created, will it make States weaker *vis à vis* the Centre? What Constitutional Provisions need to be made to keep the right balance of power? Will the small states not be subject to an increased political instability since the size of the Assemblies is very small? Will the local elites not continue to prevent achieving a balanced regional development even within the smaller states? There is also a question of how best to exploit the complementarities in resource availabilities and needs and opportunities between regions, through better co-operation in the development effort. Is this task made easier or more difficult by splitting interdependent regions into separate states?

I. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

The process required to be followed for formation of new states has been stipulated in the Constitution. It requires enactment by the Parliament on the recommendation of the President to that effect after making a reference to the Legislatures of the existing States, the areas, boundaries or the names of which may be affected by such proposals.

Section 3 of the Constitution of India provides as follows:

"3. Parliament may by law-

- (a) form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States by uniting any territory to a part of any State;
- (b) increase the area of any State;
- (c) diminish the area of any State;
- (d) alter the boundaries of any State;
- (e) alter the name of any State;

Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the area, boundaries or name of any of the States, ... the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its views thereon within such period as may be specified in the reference or within such further period as the President may allow and the period so specified or allowed has expired.

Explanation I. In this article, in clauses (a) to (e) "State" includes a Union Territory, but in the proviso, "State" does not include a Union Territory.

Explanation II. The power conferred on Parliament by clause (a) includes the power to form a new State or Union Territory by uniting a part of any State or Union Territory to any other State or Union Territory.

Given above provisions, will it be easy to actually go through the exercise of the re-organisation of the present states? Will the State Assemblies support such moves? The Congress Party does not occupy as strong a position at the Centre as it did at the time of the first re-organisation of the States. Can the President over-rule the State Assemblies' views? Are the President's actions not justiceable in this matter?

The Constitution also has been amended at the time of the earlier re-organisation of States for providing attention to the requirements of development of certain regions within existing States, by making special arrangements for the purpose.

There are certain provisions applicable to Maharashtra and Gujarat (Art. 371), Nagaland (Art. 371 A), Assam (Art. 371 B), Manipur (Art. 371 C), Andhra Pradesh (371 D), Sikkim (art. 371 F), Mizoram (Art. 371 G), Arunachal Pradesh

(Art. 371 H), and Goa (Art. 371 I) which override the general provisions applicable to States as a class.

Article 371 (2) of the Constitution provides as under:

371. (2) *Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the President may by order made with respect to the State of Maharashtra or Gujarat provide for any special responsibility of the Governor for -*

- (a) *the establishment of separate development boards for Vidarbha, Marathwada, and the rest of Maharashtra as the case may be, Saurashtra, Kutch and the rest of Gujarat with the provision that a report on the working of each of these boards will be placed each year before the State legislative Assembly;*
- (b) *the equitable allocation of funds for development expenditure over the said areas, subject to the requirements for the State as a whole; and*
- (c) *the equitable arrangement providing for technical training, and adequate opportunities for employment in services under the control of the State Government, in respect of all the said areas, subject to the requirements of the State as a whole.*

Article 371D of the Constitution made the following provisions for the State of Andhra Pradesh:

371.D (1) *The President may by order made with respect to the State of Andhra Pradesh provide, having regard to the requirements of the State as a whole, for equitable opportunities and facilities for the people belonging to different parts of the State, in the matter of public employment and in the matter of education, and different provisions may be made for various parts of the State*

(2) *An order made under clause (1) may in particular,--*

- (a) *require the state Government to organise any class or classes of civil posts under the State into different local cadres posts for different parts of the State and allot in accordance with such principles and procedure as may be specified in the order the persons holding such posts to the local cadres so organised;*
 - (b) *specify any part or parts of the State which shall be regarded as local area -*
 - (i) *for direct recruitment to posts in any local cadre (whether organised in pursuance of an order under this article or constituted otherwise) under the state Government;*
 - (ii) *for direct recruitment to posts in any local cadre under any local authority within the State; and*
 - (iii) *for the purposes of admission to any University within the State or to any other educational institution which is subject to the control of the State government;*
 - (c) *specify the extent to which, the manner in which and the conditions subject to which, preference or reservation shall be given or made -*
 - (i) *in the matter of direct recruitment to posts in any such cadre referred to in sub-clause (b) ...*
 - (ii) *in the matter of direct admission to any such University or other educational institution referred to in sub-clause (b)... to or in favour of candidates who have resided or studied for any period in the order in the local area specified ...*
- (3) *the President may, by order, provide for the constitution of an Administrative Tribunal for the State of Andhra Pradesh to exercise such jurisdiction,*

powers and authority including any jurisdiction, power and authority which ... was exercisable by any court (other than the Supreme Court) or by any tribunal or other authority as may be specified in the order with respect to the following matters, namely:- (a) appointment, allocation or promotion ... (b) seniority of person ... (c) such other conditions of service of persons ... in any civil service of the State ... or {in} such class or classes of posts under control of any local authority within the State, as may be specified in the order.

- (4) An order made under clause (3) may -
 (a) authorise the Administrative tribunal to receive representations for the redress of grievances ...
 (b) contain such provisions with respect to powers and authorities and procedure of the Administrative Tribunal ...
 (c) provide for the transfer to the Administrative Tribunals of such classes of proceedings relating to matters within its jurisdiction and pending before any court (other than the Supreme Court) or tribunal or authority ...
- (5) The order of the Administrative Tribunal finally disposing of any case shall become effective upon its confirmation by the State government or on the expiry of three months from the date on which the order is made, whichever is earlier: Provided that the State Government may by special order made in writing and for reasons to be specified therein, modify or annul any order of the Administrative Tribunal before it becomes effective ...

...

The Andhra Pradesh Public Employment (Organisation of Local Cadres and Regulation of

Direct Recruitment) Order was made by the President, pursuant to the above-mentioned provisions.

The question is: Have the above arrangements resulted in improved performance in respect of a more balanced regional development within these States? If not, does it or does it not support the case for carving out new States out of such "neglected" regions from the existing States?

The States Re-organisation Commission (SRC) in its report submitted in 1955 had considered such arrangements, such as those included in Akola Pact and Nagpur agreement in respect of Vidarbha and Sri Baug Pact in respect of Telangana as "non-workable" both in respect of Vidarbha and Telangana. The Akola Pact made in 1947, that is prior to the framing and adoption of our Constitution, in fact, had visualised a much greater autonomy for the Vidarbha and West Maharashtra regions, by making them "sub-provinces" within a larger province, an idea which was ruled out by the rejection of the idea of "sub-provinces" by the Constituent Assembly, on account particularly of the strong opposition by Dr. B. R. Ambedkar [Phadke, 1979]. The SRC had recommended the creation of separate states of Vidarbha and Hyderabad (Telangana). However, it had also recommended constituting Special Development Boards in economically undeveloped areas "in order that the needs of these areas may be properly studied and schemes adequate to meet them formulated". It also endorsed "the possibility of a provision being made in the Constitution authorising the Centre to exercise supervisory powers in relation to the development of certain economically undeveloped areas during a period, say of ten years".

It may be remarked here in this context that independently of the size and the character of any State, the problem of balanced regional (and social) development will remain a concern in the context of every State; and it is necessary to

consider how to improve the mechanisms and arrangements to monitor and ensure satisfactory progress of development within each State from the point of view of balanced development.

The new States would have greater autonomy in policy making in respect of the fields listed in Lists II and III of the seventh schedule of the Constitution. Fields of particular relevance in this regard (say, in the context of Maharashtra and Vidarbha) may be agriculture and agricultural indebtedness, co-operative societies, irrigation and water supply, management of the power sector, mineral development, trade and commerce in and production of cotton, infrastructure for processing and export of oranges, policies relating to forests and forest produce, devolution of powers and functions to local governments, public health, development of roads and bridges, recruitment by State Public Service Commissions, working of employment guarantee schemes.

The new States could also stand to benefit from larger devolution of financial resources in view of their greater backwardness. However, it may not be desirable to create new States which may become excessively dependent on central assistance for a long duration of time.

II. REPORT OF THE STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION (SRC), 1955

The pattern of States in the Indian Union as it obtained a few years after Independence was a result of historical accident and circumstances. The States' Reorganisation Commission, consisting of Shri Saiyid Fazl Ali, Shri Hriday Nath Kunzru and Shri K.M. Panikkar was appointed by the Government of India on 29th December 1953, to carefully examine the whole question of the reorganisation of the States of the Indian Union "so that the welfare of the people of each constituent unit, as well as of the nation as a whole, is promoted". The Commission submitted its Report on 30th September 1955.

The Commission enumerated the principles governing the reorganisation of the States as follows;

- "(i) preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India;
- (ii) linguistic and cultural homogeneity;
- (iii) financial, economic and administrative considerations; and
- (iv) successful working of the national plan".

While the principle listed at (i) is an essential, primal and over-riding consideration and principles (iii) and (iv) are important qualifications, it may be argued that pressing demands for re-organising the States of the Indian Union, as constituent units of the Union/Federation, on homogeneous linguistic-cultural basis, was the *raison d'être* of the setting up of the Commission. The Commission was indeed set up following the grant of Statehood to Andhra Pradesh on the linguistic basis, on the unfortunate death of Shri Potti Sriramulu after his 58 days of fast unto death. The question of re-organising the erstwhile Princely States which had in recent years acceded to the Indian Union and being shown in Parts B and C of Schedule I of the Constitution did not enjoy equal democratic rights with other States provided by the Constitution, had to be resolved and they had to be re-organised as States or appropriately integrated with the neighbouring States.

II.1. States Re-organisation Commission on Vidarbha and Telangana

The Commission recommended a separate Vidarbha State and a bilingual State consisting of Marathi speaking parts of the then Bombay and Hyderabad States and Gujarati speaking parts of Bombay State and Saurashtra and Kutch. The Commission's justification for the recommendation of the bilingual State was: "If the separation of the city [of Bombay] from Maharashtra is administratively not desirable, the effects on the growth and development of the city

in future may prove to be equally adverse, if Greater Bombay were to form part of Maharashtra, but were administratively independent of Gujarat". About the development prospects of the new State of Vidarbha (consisting of the then existing districts of Buldhana, Akola, Amravati, Yeotmal, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chanda), the Commission wrote: "Vidarbha will be one of the most important cotton-growing areas in the country. It will, however, be reasonably industrialised at the same time. The cotton textile industry of the existing State of Madhya Pradesh is heavily concentrated in this area. Only minor and medium irrigation works have been undertaken in this area so far. But in view of the proposals to utilise the waters of the Kanhan, Penganga, and Wainganga rivers, large scale development may hereafter be possible. The further opening up of the Pench and Kanhan valley coal fields will benefit this State. ... There is enough prima facie evidence to suggest that Vidarbha can be a stable and prosperous State even if it stands by itself".

On the question of Telangana, the Commission concluded "that it will be in the interests of Andhra as well as Telangana if, for the present, the Telangana area is constituted into a separate State, which may be known as the Hyderabad State, with the provision for its unification with Andhra after the general elections likely to be held in or about 1961, if by a two-thirds majority the legislature of the residuary Hyderabad State expresses itself in favour of such unification".

II.2. SRC on the Question of the State Boundaries

While deciding about the allocation of the (multi lingual) boundary areas to the neighbouring States, the Commission's approach was as follows: "... as far as possible, adjustments below the district level should be avoided except where important administrative, economic or other considerations would justify a departure".

For example, while deciding about whether to include the different taluks of Belgaum district in the proposed Karnataka or Bombay State, a question which keeps on hotting up every now and then, the Commission wrote:

"347. The Chandgad taluk of Belgaum district is predominantly Marathi-speaking - the Marathi majority in the taluk is as high as 92.4 per cent. It can conveniently be administered by the State of Bombay, and Karnatak should have no objection to the proposal.

348. ... The Marathi majorities in Khanapur and Belgaum taluks are slight, being 53.9 and 51.4 per cent, respectively. Six of the remaining seven taluks are predominantly Kannada-speaking, and in the seventh, namely, Chikodi, the Kannadigas constitute the largest single language group. All the taluks of Belgaum district have economic relations with both the Marathi as well as the Kannada speaking areas. Belgaum town is the centre of the transit trade in this area, which is chiefly in cotton and oil seeds. Neither the Belgaum town nor the other disputed areas, however, have any particularly marked economic affiliations with Marathi-speaking districts of Bombay. There is no case, therefore, for detaching either Khanapur or Belgaum or portions of Chikodi from the rest of Belgaum district.

349. ... If as many as nine out of the eleven taluks go to Karnataka (Chandgad going to Bombay and Belgaum town being disputed), then, on administrative grounds, the Belgaum town, which is the district headquarters, along with the Belgaum taluk, should also go to Karnataka. ..."

III. REGIONAL PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPMENT AND THE DEMANDS FOR STATEHOOD

We shall focus here on the question of balanced development in the specific context of Maharashtra and its major regions, particularly Vidarbha, and also summarise some of the problems being faced by Telangana, which have

been recently highlighted, though similar issues in the context of other States are also expected to be raised and discussed in the Seminar.

III.1. Maharashtra and Vidarbha

The Demand for formation of Vidarbha as a separate Province under Governor's Council was first made in the Legislative Council of Central Provinces & Berar in October 1938. The Council had then passed a resolution to that effect unanimously. The demand for 'Mahavidarbha' was later reiterated forcefully by M.S. (Bapuji) Aney in his Memorandum submitted to the State Reorganisation Commission in 1954. However, at that time Aney's focus was more on 'separate history and cultural identity of Vidarbha'. After the formation of the Bilingual State of Bombay a massive protest movement was launched by the Mahavidarbha Sangharsh Samiti. However, the movement eventually petered out though Jam-buwantrao Dhote sustained it till the late 1970s.

A question which has been raised once again recently in Vidarbha is: if Uttarakhand can get statehood, why can't they? The main reason for the demand for statehood is the economic and developmental neglect by Maharashtra which has left the region backward. In this, it shares a common platform with Uttarakhand. Vidarbha is spread over 97,404 sq km (3.04 per cent of total area of 3199.41 thousand Sq. Km. of all States taken together), Uttarakhand over 51,125 sq km. Vidarbha's population is 1.74 crore, Uttarakhand's is 65 lakh. Vidarbha has 66 assembly seats and 11 Lok Sabha constituencies, Uttarakhand 19 assembly and four Lok Sabha seats.

Today the focus of the agitation for a separate Vidarbha State has shifted from 'cultural identity' to 'development'. The feeling of 'relative deprivation among the people as well as leaders from Vidarbha has further intensified' [Dhanagare, 2010].

Between 1991 and 1996, of the Rs 31,977 crore mega projects announced for Vidarbha by the state since July 1991, projects worth over Rs 22,000 crore were dropped. In 1996, per capita capital investment was Rs 42 for Vidarbha and Rs 373 for western Maharashtra. The government set up high-tech infrastructure to export mangoes and grapes but has done little to cash in on Vidarbha's famous oranges: the fruit is cultivated on 56,663 hectares. Irrigation development is poor though agriculture is the mainstay; a mineral-rich area, it has 6,660 million tonnes of coal deposits but only 22 million tonnes are mined annually [Rattanani, 1996].

(A) Per Capita District Incomes in Maharashtra

As made abundantly clear in *Economic Survey of Maharashtra 2010-11*, the data on per capita district incomes reflect the contribution of agriculture and allied sectors somewhat reliably but that of the non-agricultural sectors is estimated indirectly by using a few proxy indicators to allocate State level estimates to districts, and so the latter particularly is not very much reliable. Therefore, and also because of the other limitations in the estimation of the State level and district level net domestic product, the data on per capita district incomes have to be used with a great deal of caution and should be considered as being only somewhat indicative of the district level economic development.

As per *Economic Survey of Maharashtra 2010-11*, the per capita net District Domestic Product (Income) (at current prices) in 2009-10 in the districts of Vidarbha (excluding Nagpur) (Preliminary estimate) ranged between Rs. 36,087 in Washim and Rs. 55,648 in Wardha against the State average of Rs. 74,027. For Nagpur district it was Rs. 81,225. The other districts of the State for which it exceeded the State average were Brihan Mumbai (Rs. 1,25,506), Thane (Rs. 1,05,914), Raigad (Rs. 87,949) and Pune Rs. (1,11,637). (See Table 1 below).

Table 1. Per Capita District Incomes at Constant (2004-05) Prices and at Current Prices for 2004-05 and 2009-10

Sr. No.	Region/Dist.	Per Capita District Income at Current Prices(Z)		Per Capita District Income at Constant (2004-05) Prices			Per Capita District Income (at Current Prices)	
		2004-05 (Current Prices)	Per cent to State Average	2009-10@	Annual Compound Growth Rate (per cent)	2009-10@ Per cent to State Average	2009-10@	Per cent to State Average
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1	Mumbai #	60304	182.86	101955	11.07	177.44	125506	169.54
2	Thane	46655	141.47	84563	12.63	147.17	105914	143.07
3	Raigad	41303	125.24	67257	10.24	117.05	87949	118.81
4	Ratnagiri	25158	76.28	43523	11.59	75.75	58045	78.41
5	Sindhudurg	26458	80.23	47466	12.40	82.61	64119	86.62
KONKAN DIV		50759	153.91	88012	11.64	153.18	109824	148.36
6	Nashik	34118	103.45	54938	10.00	95.61	71526	96.62
7	Dhule	21333	64.69	36265	11.20	63.11	48008	64.85
8	Nandurbar	14798	44.87	27055	12.83	47.09	36203	48.91
9	Jalgaon	22622	68.60	43574	14.01	75.84	58797	79.43
10	Ahmednagar	25286	76.67	40493	9.88	70.47	53232	71.91
NASHIK DIV		26185	79.40	44306	11.09	77.11	58464	78.98
11	Pune	47175	143.05	85463	12.62	148.74	111637	150.81
12	Satara	28766	87.23	45861	9.78	79.82	60825	82.17
13	Sangli	27580	83.63	44352	9.97	77.19	58106	78.49
14	Solapur	26878	81.50	42037	9.36	73.16	53588	72.39
15	Kolhapur	30701	93.09	56038	12.79	97.53	71170	96.14
PUNE DIV.		35325	107.11	61433	11.70	106.92	79788	107.78
16	Aurangabad	27052	82.03	54183	14.90	94.30	71824	97.02
17	Jalna	15767	47.81	31893	15.13	55.51	43819	59.19
18	Parbhani	18160	55.07	32196	12.13	56.03	44093	59.56
19	Hingoli	15444	46.83	27271	12.04	47.46	38253	51.67
20	Beed	19946	60.48	31400	9.50	54.65	41535	56.11
21	Nanded	17357	52.63	28156	10.16	49.00	38444	51.93
22	Osmanabad	16869	51.15	27983	10.65	48.70	38145	51.53
23	Latur	19474	59.05	28761	8.11	50.06	40714	55.00
AURANGABAD DIV		19554	59.29	34302	11.90	59.70	46535	62.86
24	Buldhana	16549	50.18	30138	12.74	52.45	40527	54.75
25	Akola	22141	67.14	39817	12.45	69.30	53681	72.52
26	Washim	15214	46.13	24829	10.29	43.21	36087	48.75
27	Amravati	21830	66.19	37502	11.43	65.27	50365	68.04
28	Yavatmal	19353	58.68	35173	12.69	61.21	46521	62.84
AMRAVATI DIV.		19416	58.87	34394	12.12	59.86	46340	62.60
29	Wardha	24975	75.73	42988	11.47	74.82	55648	75.17
30	Nagpur	36393	110.35	63031	11.61	109.70	81225	109.72
31	Bhandara	23720	71.92	40565	11.33	70.60	54065	73.03
32	Gondia	18927	57.39	38497	15.26	67.00	49773	67.24
33	Chandrapur	28057	85.08	43497	9.17	75.70	55260	74.65
34	Gadchiroli	15250	46.24	26313	11.53	45.80	36286	49.02
NAGPUR DIV.		28313	85.85	48806	11.51	84.94	63179	85.35
MAHARASHTRA		32979	100.00	57458	11.74	100.00	74027	100.00

Note: District Per Capita Incomes are given by District Per capita Net District Domestic Product; @ Provisional Source: *Economic Survey of Maharashtra (ESM)*, 2006-07 and 2010-11. Per capita District Income at 2004-05 computed from ESM 2010-11, Annexure 3.10. Growth rates and percentages to state average computed.

Table 1 also shows the per capita district incomes at current prices for 2004-05 and that for 2009-10 at 2004-05 prices. The annual compound growth rate in the per capita income at 2004-05 prices for Maharashtra was 11.74 per cent. Surprisingly, the same is higher than the state growth rate only for Amravati Division at 12.12 per cent, starting from a low level of Rs. 19416 in 2004-05, which was the lowest per capita income in 2004-05 among all the Divisions.

At district levels, the districts which showed an annual compound percentage growth rate between 2004-05 and 2009-10, higher than the state average were Thane (12.63), Sindhudurg (12.40), Nandurbar (12.83), Jalgaon (14.01), Pune (12.62), Kolhapur (12.79), Aurangabad (14.90), Jalna (15.13), Parbhani (12.13), Hingoli (12.04), Buldhana (12.74), Akola (12.45), Yavatmal (12.69) and Gondia (15.26).

Konkan and Pune Divisions which had per capita incomes higher than the state average in 2004-05 continue to be so even in 2009-10 in constant (2004-05) prices or current prices. The percentage by which their per capita incomes at constant prices exceeded the state average remains almost the same. The percentage by which the per capita incomes at constant prices fell short of the state average improves negligibly, by one percentage point, in Amravati and Nagpur Divisions, worsens somewhat, by over 2 percentage points, in Nashik Division and remains almost the same in Aurangabad Division.

The percentage by which the per capita incomes at current prices exceeded the state average in 2009-10 is somewhat lower than that in 2004-05 in Konkan Division, implying declining prices of products in that Division relative to the basket of products produced in the state as a whole. The decline in the percentage by which the per capita income of Nashik Division falls short of the state average declines less in current prices than in 2004-05 prices, implying a

marginal increase, again relative to the basket of products produced in the state as a whole, in the prices of products of that Division. The prices of products of Aurangabad and Amravati Division also show similar relative increase while the prices of the products of Pune Division show a marginal relative increase over the period.

Considering the per capita incomes at the district levels, of the six districts which showed per capita incomes higher than the state average in 2004-05, namely, Mumbai, Thane, Raigad, Nashik, Pune and Nagpur, all except Nashik continue to remain higher than the state average of per capita income in 2009-10 at 2004-05 prices. Of the six especially poor districts, namely, Nandurbar, Jalna, Hingoli, Washim and Gadchiroli, the per capita incomes of which were each *lower than half the state average*, only Jalna has moved up to a per capita income a little *higher than half the state average*, while Nanded and Osmanabad which had per capita incomes above the *half-way mark* of the state per capita income, have *fallen below that mark* in 2009-10, at 2004-05 prices. Of the 28 districts which had per capita incomes lower than the state average in 2004-05, only 12 districts showed a higher annual compound growth rate over the five year period from 2004-05 to 2009-10 compared to the same for the state. These were Sindhudurg in Konkan Division, Nandurbar and Jalgaon in Nashik Division, Kolhapur in Pune Division, Aurangabad, Jalna and Hingoli in Aurangabad Division, Buldhana, Akola, Yavatmal and Gondia in Amravati Division and Gondia in Nagpur Division. In spite of the slightly higher growth rates than the state average for some of the especially poor districts like Nandurbar and Hingoli, the per capita incomes of these and other most poor districts have continued to remain extremely low compared to the state average.

(B) Imbalances in Regional Development in Maharashtra

1. Road Development

(i) The Region-wise Status of Roads

The public works Department of Government

of Maharashtra publishes a booklet of basic statistics every year. The position as on 31.3.2008 for all the districts of the State is shown in the booklet for the year 2008. The Region-wise status of the total road length as on 31.3.2008 of targets and achievements under the road development programme 1981-2001 is as follows.

Table 2. Region-wise Status of Road Length - Targets and Achievements

(Length k.m.)

Region	National Highway		State Highway		Major District		Other District		Village Road		Total
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
Rest of Maharashtra	2184	2698	17198	15999	25269	24630	26259	24838	62470	56582	
Marathwada	82	795	8368	8004	11886	13573	9235	8453	25865	21384	
Vidarbha	846	874	10017	9797	11460	11190	15902	12595	42969	24183	
		(103.31%)		(97.80%)		(97.64%)		(79.20%)		(56.28%)	
Total Maharashtra	3112	4367	35583	33800	48615	49393	51396	45886	131304	102149	
		(140.33%)		(94.99%)		(101.60%)		(89.28%)		(77.80%)	
Extra Road length needed to be Built in Vidarbha for equaling the State average (km)		430.11		-		593.63		2320.10		13741.49	17085.33

Source: Vidarbha Development Board, *Annual Report 2008-09*.

Table 3. Region-wise Status of the Village Connectivity Programme, March 2008

Sr. No.	Region	Total No. of Villages	Villages Connected by AWR and their percentage	Villages Connected by Tar Roads and their percentage
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Rest of Maharashtra	18627	18037 (96.83%)	15742 (84.51%)
2.	Marathwada	8146	8009 (98.31%)	6386 (78.79%)
3.	Vidarbha	13639	13060 (95.75%)	9210 (67.53%)
4.	Maharashtra	40412	39106	31338

Source: Vidarbha Development Board, *Annual Report 2008-09*.

There are 334 villages in the State which are not connected by any type of road and out of those 173 (57.80 per cent) villages are in Vidarbha.

(ii) Village Connectivity by All-Weather Roads: District-level Analysis

Table 3, however, conceals the position regarding village connectivity at the district level. The Tables presented in Annexure 1 attempt to

present information at the district level on a number of important parameters, in 1983 from the Dandekar Committee Report and the position in respect of these parameters in 2008-09, as seen from the data available from the *District Social and Economic Reviews* published by the Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Planning Department, Government of Maharashtra for the districts of Vidarbha and other regions of Maharashtra. **While presenting these Tables,**

we have retained the numbering of these Tables as in the Dandekar Committee Report. The corresponding Tables for 2008-09 (or for the recent year for which the data are available) are denoted by the same number with a letter (A).

Tables 6.5 and 6.5 (A) in Annexure 1 present district-wise information on village connectivity by all weather roads in all the districts in the state.

Maharashtra

It can be seen from Tables 6.5 and 6.5(A) that the village connectivity by all weather roads in Maharashtra has greatly improved during this period, and the percentage of inhabited villages connected by all-weather roads has gone up from 50.22 per cent in 1983 to 93.87 per cent in 2008-09.

Vidarbha

The village connectivity by all weather roads in Vidarbha has vastly improved from a very low 40.82 per cent to almost 89 per cent. Whereas only one district, namely, Bhandara, in the Vidarbha region was above the state average in 1983, village connectivity in six districts of Vidarbha, namely, Washim, Amravati, Yavatmal, Nagpur, Bhandara and Chandrapur is above the state average in 2008-09, and is in fact, higher than 98 per cent. In the remaining five districts, it is now less than the state average. Of these, the districts of Wardha and Gondia are fairly close to the state average. But the village connectivity in three districts, namely, Buldhana, Akola and Gadchiroli is even now very poor, being less than 70 per cent. These are truly neglected districts as far as village connectivity is concerned. There must be similar neglected districts in other parts of the state as well.

Marathwada (Aurangabad Division)

In recent years, of the eight districts in Marathwada region, five districts, namely

Aurangabad (86.15 per cent), Latur (84.71 per cent), Parbhani, Nanded and marginally Beed (92.28) had the proportion of total inhabited villages connected by all weather roads lower than the state average of 93.64 per cent. Of these Parbhani (68.96 per cent) and Nanded (55.40 per cent) were markedly below the state average. Only two districts, namely Osmanabad (100.27 per cent) and marginally Jalna (93.67) were above the state average. Data on connectivity by all-weather roads was not reported for Hingoli.

North Maharashtra (Nashik Division)

In North Maharashtra, of the five districts, two districts, namely Nandurbar (76.90 per cent) and Ahmednagar (72.58 per cent) had lower proportion of total inhabited villages (than the state average) which were connected by all weather roads. In Jalgaon (99.33) and Dhule (99.71) districts, almost all villages are connected by all weather roads.

Konkan (Konkan Division)

Excluding Greater Mumbai, there are four districts in this region. Of these, Raigad (75.42 per cent) and Sindhudurg (64.06 per cent) were below the state average. Thane and Ratnagiri had close to 98 per cent road connectivity of villages.

Western Maharashtra (Pune Division)

Of the five districts in this region, Solapur (75.66 per cent) and Satara (84.74 per cent) were below the state average. Kolhapur had 100 per cent of inhabited villages connected by all-weather roads. Surprisingly, data on connected villages was not reported for the two districts of Pune and Sangli.

From the above, it is seen that in each Division there are some districts which are below the state average in road connectivity of villages. Road connectivity is markedly poor in Buldhana,

Akola, and Gadchiroli in Vidarbha, Parbhani and Nanded in Marathwada and Sindhudurg in Konkan.

2. Electrification

(i) Electrification of Villages: District-level Analysis

Maharashtra

Tables 8.1 and 8.1 (A) in Annexure 1 give information on electrified villages in the districts in Maharashtra. There is some over-estimation of the percentage of electrified villages in this table as the number of electrified villages has been compared with the number of inhabited villages in a somewhat earlier year as per Census. The number of inhabited villages has possibly increased after the Census year used for reference. Table 8.1 from Dandekar Committee Report gives the percentage of electrified villages to the inhabited villages in the districts and the state. This percentage for the state was 86.27. The same has increased to 100.71 for the recent year. For most of the districts, this percentage in the recent year was higher than 100 per cent. The higher than 100 per cent electrification of villages seen is probably due to the fact that some of the villages in the state which were uninhabited in 2001 have since been inhabited and electrified. In some of the districts, a similar situation was also observed by Dandekar Committee. For this reason, for the recent year for which we discuss the imbalance in rural electrification below, we have used the percentage of electrified villages to the *total* number of villages.

Vidarbha

Subject to the above-mentioned limitation of the data, it is seen that Vidarbha region has made remarkable progress in the electrification of villages, at least as seen at the district level. Whereas the percentage of electrified villages to inhabited villages in Maharashtra has increased from 1983 to the recent year(s) for which the data are available, from 86.27 to 100.71, that for the Vidarbha region as a whole has, increased from

77.74 to reach almost full coverage of the villages during this period. Whereas the three districts of Akola, Bhandara and Chandrapur were below the state average in respect of the percentage of electrified villages in inhabited villages, now Bhandara, Chandrapur and Gadchiroli still remain substantially below the state average in this regard. The other districts are above the state average or have hundred per cent of the inhabited villages electrified. Considering the percentage of electrified villages to total villages, only Bhandara and Nagpur are now above the state average (94.60).

Marathwada (Aurangabad Division)

In the recent years, all eight districts of Marathwada are above the state average (94.60 per cent) in regard to the proportion of total villages which are electrified.

North Maharashtra (Nashik Division)

In North Maharashtra as well all the five districts are above the state average (94.60 per cent) in regard to the proportion of total villages which are electrified.

Konkan (Konkan Division)

In Konkan region, only Raigad district (80.93 per cent) is below the state average in regard to the proportion of total villages which are electrified but it is markedly below it.

Western Maharashtra (Pune Division)

In Western Maharashtra again all districts are above the state average in regard to the proportion of total villages which are electrified. y

In 1983, 9 out of then 25 districts (excluding Greater Mumbai) had the percentage of electrified villages below the state average of 86.27 per cent. By comparison, 22 out of the present 34 districts (excluding Greater Mumbai) are now below the state average of 100.71 per cent of inhabited villages which are electrified.

However, taking electrified villages as percentage of total number of villages, there were 10 districts which are at present below the state average (94.60 per cent). Nine out of these ten districts, namely, Akola (86.82 per cent) Washiim (88.97 per cent) Amravati (83.87 per cent), Yavatmal (87.14 per cent), Wardha marginally (92.40 per cent), Bhandara (83.22 per cent), Gondia (94.00 per cent), Chandrapur (72.14 per cent and Gadchiroli (86.90 per cent) are in Vidarbha and one district, namely, Raigad (80.93 per cent) is in Konkan.

(ii) *Backlog of Energisation of Pumpsets:*

It was decided, as per the recommendation of the Dandekar Fact Finding Committee, that the districts having better number of energised agricultural pumpsets per thousand hectares of cropped area compared to the state average have no backlog and those having lesser number than the state average have a backlog. The physical backlog was decided as the number of pumpsets required to reach to the state average. The financial backlog was calculated by taking into consideration the then cost of energisation of one pumpset.

Table 4. Backlog of Agricultural Pumpset, 1983 and 2008

Region	Cropped area (hect.) compared to the state total (percentage)	Backlog of agri. Pump sets as on 1-4-1983 compared to the State average (percentage)	Backlog of agri. Pump sets as on 1-4-2008 compared to the state average (percentage)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Konkan	878400 (4.87%)	15545 (10.88%)	74422 (17.67 %)
Western Maharashtra	7320900 (40.53%)	16857 (11.80%)	0 (0%)
Marathwada	4755900 (26.33%)	52502 (36.74%)	107035 (25.41 %)
Vidarbha	5106800 (28.27%)	57981 (40.58%)	239751 (56.92 %)
Maharashtra	18062000 (100%)	142885 (100%)	421207 (100%)

Source: Vidarbha Development Board, Annual Report 2008-09.

The consumption of energy for agriculture of Pune district alone is more than consumption of the 11 districts of Vidarbha (See Table 5). Similarly, due to the subsidised rate of supply of energy for agriculture, subsidy enjoyed is much more in Western Maharashtra and it is the least in Vidarbha.

(iii) *Need for Equitable Distribution of Energy:*

The Vidarbha Development Board, Annual Report for 2008-09 emphasises the need for equitable distribution of energy among the regions and the districts of the State.

The energy generated during the year 2007-08 from Thermal plants in the State was 43,174 MU, out of which 29,127.25 MU, (67.46 per cent of Maharashtra Electricity Generation company's total energy generation) was from Vidarbha. It is unfortunate that although Vidarbha region produces substantial energy, the total consumption of energy in Vidarbha including agriculture is 39.1 per cent.

The main natural resources required for Thermal Power Plants are Land, Water and Coal. Besides generating 30 per cent to 40 per cent of coal ash, there is emission of Carbon Dioxide and Carbon Monoxide gases which causes pollution of the environment, affects health of people and renders nearby land infertile due to deposition of ash etc. If all the proposed plants come up in Vidarbha, the total requirement of land for EHV lines erection shall be about 52,000 to 60,000 hectares - the land, directly under the EHV lines, which becomes unavailable for any other purpose. Decentralisation of the new thermal power plants should be done, keeping their ill effects in view and also the possible load centres so that transmission loss is reduced. New generation plants should be compelled to reserve 10 per cent assured power for local area as compensation for the loss of agriculture land, water and causing environmental problems. This 10 per cent power should be supplied to local area at reasonable rate, so that new industries may also come up.

Table 5. Division-wise Electricity Consumption for Agriculture Pumps in 2006-07

Sr. No.	District	Cropped area (000' hect)	Total Consumption (million units)	Per Hect. Electricity Consumption in unit	Percentage of District Consumption compared to State	Percentage of Division-wise Cropped area
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	Brihan Mumbai	--	--	--	--	
2	Thane	289.80	39.40	135.96	0.42	
3	Raigad	188.60	17.02	90.24	0.18	
4	Ratnagiri	247.00	7.44	28.52	0.08	
5	Sindhudurg	153.00	6.58	43.01	0.07	
Total Konkan Division		878.40	70.44	80.19	0.75	4.87
6	Nashik	896.80	801.91	894.19	8.50	
7	Dhule/Nandurbar	732.90	396.17	540.50	4.20	
8	Jalgaon	852.30	713.77	837.46	7.56	
9	Ahmednagar	1175.90	832.51	707.98	8.82	
Total Nashik Division		3,657.90	2,744.36	750.30	29.08	20.25
10	Pune	981.50	1089.23	1109.98	11.54	
11	Satara	584.60	383.43	655.88	4.06	
12	Sangli	592.80	549.96	927.73	5.83	
13	Solapur	1085.80	877.70	808.34	9.30	
14	Kolhapur	418.30	422.87	1010.93	4.48	
Total Pune Division		3,663.00	3,323.19	907.23	35.21	20.28
Total Western Maharashtra		7320.90	6067.55	828.80	64.29	40.53
Total Rest of Maharashtra		8199.30	6137.99	748.60	65.03	45.40
15	Aurangabad	702.00	437.34	622.99	4.63	
16	Jalna	609.20	236.65	388.46	2.51	
17	Parbhani/Hingoli	849.90	325.42	382.89	3.45	
18	Beed	828.60	358.19	432.28	3.80	
19	Nanded	728.30	338.60	464.92	3.59	
20	Osmanabad	536.10	304.50	567.99	3.23	
21	Latur	501.80	314.31	626.36	3.33	
Total Marathwada Division		4,755.90	2,315.01	486.77	24.54	26.23
22	Buldhana	701.50	186.19	265.41	1.97	
23	Akola/Washim	827.10	164.18	198.50	1.74	
24	Amravati	751.10	183.27	244.00	1.94	
25	Yavatmal	857.90	113.97	132.85	1.21	
Total Amravati Division		3,137.60	647.61	206.40	6.86	17.37
26	Wardha	381.00	85.96	255.62	0.91	
27	Nagpur	554.00	104.02	187.76	1.10	
28	Bhandara/Gondia	371.30	87.98	236.95	0.93	
29	Chandrapur	474.40	34.64	73.02	0.37	
30	Gadchiroli	185.50	25.23	136.01	0.27	
Total Nagpur Division		1,966.20	337.83	171.56	3.58	10.90
Total Vidarbha		5106.80	985.44	192.96	10.44	28.27
Total Maharashtra		18062.00	9438.44	522.55	100	100

Source: Vidarbha Development Board, *Annual Report - 2008-09*.

Installed capacity of Hydel power plants in the State is 2825.83 MW of which only 53.75 M.W. is from Vidarbha. However, hydel power potential of Vidarbha is to the tune of 5000 MW which needs to be realised.

In Rest of Maharashtra (Konkan, Pune and Nashik Division) during 2007-08 for transmission of 50715 MUs, the transmission loss was 4057 MUs (8 per cent) and the distribution loss was 10266 MUs totaling 14323 MUs. During this period, consumption of electricity in Vidarbha was 11365 MUs which is less than the total loss of electricity in Rest of Maharashtra. The transmission losses are charged to all the consumers irrespective of the fact whether they are located near power generation plant or not.

The Vidarbha Development Board, Annual Report for 2008-09 states: "It is demanded that per capita consumption of energy for all types of use except agriculture and railway, should be equal in all districts of the State. Similarly, agricultural consumption of energy should be in proportion to the cropped area of each district. Demand of equitable distribution of electricity should be kept in view while imposing load shading."

The important information at the district level about electrification of villages presented above should be kept in mind when considering the backlog of Vidarbha region in respects of energisation of pumpsets, electricity consumption for agricultural pumps and the demand for equalising per capita consumption of energy in all districts, highlighted by the Vidarbha Statutory Development Board in its Annual Report for 2008-09. For, if electricity has reached almost all villages in the

region, the fact that still there is backlog in the energisation of pumpsets or in consumption of electricity for agricultural pumps means that the problem lies in the farmers in the region not being inclined or able to dig wells and install pumpsets in adequate numbers. While uncertain supply of electricity would be one reason for this, since that is a factor common throughout the state, there must be a number of other reasons for this. It is an important point to examine in which way the state can be held responsible for this state of affairs in Vidarbha. Are the State government's agricultural policies to blame for this? How can the per capita consumption of electricity be equalised across districts through state action when the resulting development, on which it depends, is an outcome of public sector infrastructure as well as private initiatives in development?

3. Irrigation

One factor, which critically influences agricultural development and to some extent overall development through its impact, is development of irrigation by the state.

The Annual Report of the Vidarbha Development Board presents the following data on financial backlog in irrigation development in different regions of the state.

Vidarbha region comprises 11 districts, which have been divided in two revenue Divisions of Nagpur and Amravati. As on 1st April 2009, the irrigation backlog of Amravati Division was Rs. 775.33 crore which is 81.79 per cent of the State backlog and 98.30 per cent of the Vidarbha irrigation backlog.

Table 6. Region-wise Financial Backlog for Irrigation Sector

(Rs. in crore)

Sr. No.	Region	Backlog as per Dandekar Committee 1982	Backlog as on 1.4.2009 decided by Hon'ble Governor
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	Vidarbha	527.31 (38.05 %)	788.76 (83.21 %)
2.	Marathwada	316.71 (22.85 %)	159.20 (16.79 %)
3.	Rest of Maharashtra	541.90 (39.10 %)	0 (0 %)
	Total	1385.92 (100 %)	947.96 (100 %)

Source: Vidarbha Development Board, (2008-09).

As per the directives of Hon'ble Governor dated 15.12.2001, a formula has been derived to allocate Division wise funds for irrigation sector, independent of special funds for backlog or non backlog. In the year 2004-05, Vidarbha and Marathwada received Rs. 795.89 crore and Rs. 161.79 crore less outlay respectively while Rest of Maharashtra got Rs. 957.68 crore excess outlay than what was admissible. Similarly, in the year 2005-06, Vidarbha and Marathwada got Rs. 520.57 crore and Rs. 139.00 crore less outlay respectively while Rest of Maharashtra got Rs. 659.57 crore excess outlay than the admissible amount. The Hon'ble Governor has issued directives to make good the deficiencies of those two years, in the next three years vide his directive dated 6.3.2008 for Vidarbha and Marathwada.

In addition, a separate fund of Rs. 117 crore at Rs. 10,000/- per hectare was proposed by the Indicator and Backlog Committee (1994) for the repair and maintenance of 6869 government owned ex-Malgujari tanks in five districts of Vidarbha, namely, Chandrapur, Gadchiroli, Bhandara, Gondia and Nagpur. However, this fund was not distributed or used. Based on the recommendations of various committees constituted from time to time, the Irrigation Department issued a Resolution on 17th of July 2008, approving a norm of Rs. 21,000/- per hectare for repairing of ex-malgujari tanks. The Vidarbha

Statutory Development, however, claims that this rate is not enough and should be increased to Rs. 100,000/- per hectare.

As regards the neglect of irrigation projects in the Vidarbha region, the Planning Commission Team on Vidarbha has concluded: "The Team felt there was inadequate explanation for this lackadaisical attitude in implementation of projects for Vidarbha and that there was ample reason to suspect collusion and connivance in not sanctioning the funds for the region and later to move for supplementary budgets, mostly for irrigation in Western Maharashtra".

The above discussion is in terms of monetary or financial backlog. In the Report of the Dandekar Committee the backlog in irrigation was computed by estimating the cost of bringing the districts with (the Standard Rabbi equivalent of) irrigation potential created as percentage of net sown area in all the districts below the state average to the level of the state average, assuming the average cost of increasing the irrigation potential by one hectare to be Rs. 10,000/-. This gives the idea about the provision of funds necessary to equalise the irrigation potential created in all districts with state investment. However, as the Committee in its Report, warns: "But there is no implication that provision of funds is all that is needed. This will have to be followed by appropriate programme and action". Discussion of regional backlog unfortunately gets focused on

the question of reducing financial backlog at the regional level without paying a close and continuous attention to the underlying physical backlogs at the district or taluka levels and to the programmes and actions necessary to improve the disparities in physical infrastructure at the district or taluka levels. Concentrating attention on comparing figures of financial backlogs over time also makes one lose track of what is happening to the state average itself. Changes in financial backlogs over time reflect changes in the (assumed) average costs of providing the infrastructure concerned. It does not take into account rising costs. Also, it may not reflect the possible higher costs of providing the required infrastructure in the specific areas lacking in it. (For broad details about the procedure adopted for reduction of irrigation backlog over time, see Annexure 2.)

(i) Irrigation Backlog in Maharashtra - District Level Analysis

In Table 7(i), we have attempted to make a comparison of the physical backlog in irrigation potential created through major, medium and minor irrigation projects (and excluding irrigation by and irrigation potential of wells, since that was viewed by Dandekar Committee as largely being an outcome of private sector initiative) in the districts of Maharashtra and the corresponding state average in 1982 (from the Dandekar Committee Report) and in 2007-2008 from the statistics compiled and supplied by the Department of Water Resources, Government of Maharashtra, for the year 2007-08 and the District Socio-economic Review, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Maharashtra, for the year 2009-10.

Maharashtra

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Net Sown Area

Whereas in 1982, the irrigation potential created for Maharashtra (excluding Greater Mumbai) was 11.83 per cent of the net sown area of the state, now it is 24.84 per cent.

Ultimate Irrigation Potential as Percentage of Net Sown Area

As reported in the Report of Dandekar Committee, the Maharashtra State Irrigation Commission [1962] had assessed the total irrigation through surface water resource at 52.61 lakh hectares (equal to 130 lakh acres, consisting of 96 lakh acres in all except the Konkan districts, possibly 4 lakh acres in Konkan districts once the Master Plans for the Konkan districts are prepared, 15 lakh acres from harnessing 50 per cent instead of 75 per cent dependable water flows and another 15 lakh acres through saving of the wastage of water by means of lining of the canals - see Government of Maharashtra [1962, p. 53]). This ultimate irrigation potential was 29.44 per cent of the Net Sown area in the state in 1960-61. Also as per the Dandekar Committee's Report, based on the appraisal of Maharashtra's irrigation projects, in 1979 the World Bank had assessed the total *ultimate* irrigation potential of Maharashtra through surface water irrigation to be 61.93 lakh hectares, which was about 34 per cent of the Net Sown area in the state in 1978-79. The ultimate irrigation potential of Maharashtra, as reported by the Irrigation Department of the state in 2007-08 was 54.84 lakh hectares, or 31.45 per cent of the Net Sown area in the state in 2007-08. The World Bank estimate of the ultimate irrigation potential, which seems to be somewhat on

Table 7(i). Irrigation Status 1982 and 2007-08

Sr. No.	District	Ultimate Irrigation Potential (000 Hectares) by 30 June 2007	Irrigation Potential Created (000 Hectares) by June 1982	Irrigation Potential Created (000 Hectares) by 30 June 2007	Ultimate Irrigation Potential for 1982 districts (000 Hectares) by 30 June 2007	Irrigation Potential Created as % of Ult. Irr. Potential by June 1982	Irrigation Potential Created as % of Ult. Irr. Potential by 30 June 2007	Net Sown Area (000 Hectares) 1978-79	Net Sown Area (000 Hectares) (2007-08)	Net Sown Area as % of Ult. Irr. Potential by June 1982	Net Sown Area as % of Ult. Irr. Potential by 30 June 2007
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
1	Greater Bombay		..					6.60			
2	Thane	81.18	10.19	45.79	81.18	12.55	56.41	265.10	244.74	30.62	33.17
3	Raigad	39.27	27.86	19.03	39.27	70.94	48.46	195.80	188.76	20.06	20.80
4	Ratnagiri	21.15	12.07	10.91	55.76	57.07	51.58	356.30	244.66	5.94	8.64
5	Sindhudurg	34.61		7.32			21.15		140.15		24.70
Konkan (Excl. G. B.)		176.21	50.12	83.05	176.21	28.44	47.13	817.20	818.30	21.56	21.53
5	Nashik	245.14	125.26	192.88	245.14	51.10	78.68	889.60	883.66	27.56	27.74
7	Dhule	106.78	75.42	89.46	156.60	70.63	83.78	705.00	433.63	15.15	24.62
8	Nandurbar	49.82		52.71			105.80		296.27		16.82
9	Jalgaon	287.92	115.47	193.17	287.92	40.10	67.09	810.50	850.97	35.52	33.83
10	Ahmednagar	355.01	214.49	341.95	355.01	60.42	96.32	1214.90	1116.78	29.22	31.79
North Maharashtra		1044.67	530.64	870.17	1044.67	50.79	83.30	3620.00	3581.30	28.86	29.17
11	Pune	435.60	148.63	370.59	435.60	34.12	85.08	1001.00	935.27	43.52	46.57
12	Satara	264.17	103.83	194.85	264.17	39.30	73.76	585.90	550.20	45.09	48.01
13	Sangli	478.94	83.33	254.24	478.94	17.40	53.08	616.10	609.33	77.74	78.60
14	Solapur	442.22	174.04	361.52	442.22	39.36	81.75	1137.40	1040.02	38.88	42.52
15	Kolhapur	311.33	70.78	291.46	311.33	22.73	93.62	423.70	429.10	73.48	72.55
Western Maharashtra		1932.26	580.61	1472.66	1932.26	30.05	76.21	3764.10	3563.92	51.33	54.22
16	Aurangabad	135.11	121.57	109.23	214.38	89.98	80.85	1214.00	693.55	11.13	19.48
17	Jalna	79.27		77.69			98.01		571.28		13.88
18	Parbhani	180.94	143.86	162.69	232.87	79.51	89.91	1007.30	483.78	17.96	37.40
19	Hingoli	51.93		48.64			93.66		329.06		15.78
20	Beed	172.61	78.09	165.16	172.61	45.24	95.68	809.50	751.51	21.32	22.97
21	Nanded	237.93	91.07	184.45	237.93	38.28	77.52	727.90	704.46	32.69	33.77
22	Osmanabad	139.58	72.56	108.59	261.61	51.98	77.80	1115.00	479.18	12.52	29.13
23	Latur	122.03		97.54			79.93		519.10		23.51
Marathwada		1119.40	507.15	953.99	1119.40	45.31	85.22	4873.70	4531.91	22.97	24.70
24	Buldhana	120.97	37.13	80.75	120.97	30.69	66.75	681.90	669.44	17.74	18.07
25	Akola	57.12	48.83	53.24	97.69	85.49	93.21	820.70	434.40	6.96	13.15
26	Washim	40.57		39.47			97.29		377.50		10.75
27	Amravati	115.76	18.85	97.64	115.76	16.28	84.35	722.90	752.14	16.01	15.39
28	Yavatmal	213.24	43.70	139.36	213.24	20.49	65.35	854.60	847.39	24.95	25.16
29	Wardha	148.24	28.85	84.49	148.24	19.46	57.00	442.00	364.72	33.54	40.65
30	Nagpur	173.57	79.23	161.44	173.57	45.65	93.01	565.50	546.84	30.69	31.74
31	Bhandara	88.60	146.03	79.54	210.95	164.82	89.77	388.30	179.01	22.82	49.49
32	Gondia	122.35		106.35			86.92		183.53		66.66
33	Chandrapur	88.10	86.25	68.77	131.07	97.90	78.06	690.80	453.02	12.75	19.45
34	Gadchiroli	42.97		40.37			93.95		172.92		24.85
Vidarbha		1211.49	488.87	951.42	1211.49	40.35	78.53	5166.70	4980.91	23.45	24.32
Maharashtra State		5484.03	2,157.39	4331.29	5484.03	39.34	78.98	18248.30	17437.03	30.06	31.45

(Contd.)

Table 7(i). Irrigation Status 1983 and 2007-08 (Concl'd.)

Sr. No.	District	Irrigation Potential Created (SRE) (000 Hect.) by June 2007	Irrigation Potential Created (SRE) as % of Net Sown Area (2007-08)	Actual Irrigated Area (SRE) (000 Hect.) (2006-07)	Actual Irrigated Area (SRE) as % of Irrigation Potential Created of (SRE) (2006-07)	Actual Irrigated Area (SRE) as % of Net Sown Area (2006-07)
(1)	(2)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
1	Greater Bombay					
2	Thane	160.20	65.46	55.05	34.36	22.49
3	Raigad	75.34	39.91	53.48	70.98	28.33
4	Ratnagiri	50.48	20.63	2.18	4.32	0.89
5	Sindhudurg	37.06	26.44	3.98	10.74	2.84
Konkan (Excl. G. B.)		323.08	39.48	114.69	36.50	14.02
6	Nashik	304.97	34.51	176.19	57.77	19.94
7	Dhule	155.00	35.74	30.90	19.94	7.13
8	Nandurbar	69.69	23.52	12.24	17.56	4.13
9	Jalgaon	412.28	48.45	167.99	40.75	19.74
10	Ahmednagar	581.37	52.06	453.21	77.96	40.58
North Maharashtra		1523.31	42.54	840.53	55.18	23.47
11	Pune	617.06	65.98	645.83	104.66	69.05
12	Satara	280.86	51.05	241.81	66.10	43.95
13	Sangli	398.68	65.43	183.14	45.94	30.06
14	Solapur	551.45	53.02	614.61	111.45	59.10
15	Kolhapur	679.26	158.30	368.09	54.19	85.78
Western Maharashtra		2527.31	70.91	2053.48	81.25	57.62
16	Aurangabad	165.48	23.86	122.35	73.94	17.64
17	Jalna	134.35	23.52	115.83	86.22	20.28
18	Parbhani	327.11	67.61	196.87	60.18	40.69
19	Hingoli	98.28	29.87	73.45	74.74	22.32
20	Beed	271.42	36.12	177.63	65.44	23.64
21	Nanded	362.27	51.43	257.93	71.20	36.61
22	Osmanabad	120.89	25.23	65.03	53.79	13.57
23	Latur	150.69	29.03	127.84	84.84	24.63
Marathwada		1630.49	36.98	1136.93	69.73	25.09
24	Buldhana	134.16	20.04	50.24	37.45	7.50
25	Akola	91.08	20.97	46.50	51.05	10.70
26	Washim	68.18	18.06	39.59	58.07	10.49
27	Amravati	145.68	19.37	65.36	44.87	8.69
28	Yavatmal	219.63	25.92	106.64	48.55	12.58
29	Wardha	147.86	40.54	69.39	46.93	19.03
30	Nagpur	312.17	57.09	258.39	82.77	47.25
31	Bhandara	137.73	76.94	93.34	67.77	52.14
32	Gondia	170.65	92.98	145.56	85.30	79.31
33	Chandrapur	112.14	24.75	79.08	70.52	17.46
34	Gadchiroli	66.15	38.25	58.57	88.54	33.87
Vidarbha		1605.43	32.23	1012.66	63.08	20.33
Maharashtra State		7609.62	43.64	5158.29	67.79	29.58

SRE - Standard Rabi Equivalent.

Source: Compiled from Annexure Tables 7.3 and 7.3(A).

the higher side, may be considered to be "tentative and subject to revision", as pointed out by the Dandekar Committee. The estimate of the Department of Irrigation is only a little higher than that of the Irrigation Commission and may be used as a reference point for the purposes of the present discussion. As percentage of this figure for the ultimate flow irrigation potential, the net sown area of the state in 1982 was 30.06. This percentage has almost remained unchanged or has increased somewhat in all the districts and regions by 2007.

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential

The estimates of the ultimate irrigation potential are based on the available Master Plans for development of various river basins in the state and the assessment of surface water resources available *on completion of all the Master Plans* and the estimation of the area which can be irrigated from this estimated maximum surface water, assuming some normal cropping pattern. As the information base and the methods of estimation change the estimates of ultimate irrigation potential, made from time to time, vary somewhat. On the other hand, the estimates of Net Sown area are estimates of actual net area sown by farmers and are based on the reports from village *patwaris* of area under different crops sown by farmers each year. The estimates of Net Sown area vary every year depending on farmers' sowing plans for the year, depending upon the weather conditions, various input and output prices, availability of inputs, including credit and seeds of different qualities, advice and information received from various sources and their own expectations of the outcomes.

The process of creating new irrigation potential is a continuous one and every year as various irrigation projects pass through different stages of completion, making more surface irrigation water available for use by farmers in different

reaches of the command areas of the projects, first at the head of the main reservoirs and the main canals and eventually, in fact after a very long lag, even running into one or two decades, as lower distributories are built, to the farmers in the down stream areas of the project.

By June 1982, irrigation potential created in Maharashtra state, according to Dandekar Committee, was 21.57 lakh hectares, or 11.83 per cent of the Net Sown area in 1978-79. It amounted to just over 39 per cent of the ultimate irrigation potential estimated by the Irrigation Department in 2007-08. By June 2007, the total flow irrigation potential created in the state 43.31 lakh hectares. This was nearly 79 per cent of the estimated ultimate irrigation potential of the state. As remarked earlier, the ultimate flow irrigation potential of the state was 31.45 per cent of Net Sown area in 2007-08, and so the flow irrigation potential created in the state was 24.84 per cent of the Net Sown area in 2007-08.

In 1982, of the present five regions of the state, namely, Vidarbha, Marathwada, North Maharashtra, Konkan (excluding Greater Mumbai) and Western Maharashtra, two regions, namely, Konkan (28.44 per cent) and Western Maharashtra (30.05 per cent) were below the state average of 39.34 per cent in respect of flow irrigation development relative to the ultimate potential. Vidarbha (40.35 per cent) and Marathwada (45.31 per cent) were marginally above it. North Maharashtra (50.79 per cent) was substantially above the state average. By comparison, in 2007-08, Vidarbha (78.53 per cent) was only marginally below the state average (78.98 per cent) while Western Maharashtra (76.21 per cent) was slightly below it. Marathwada (85.22 per cent) and North Maharashtra (83.30 per cent) were markedly above the state average. The relative position of Konkan (47.13 per cent) has continued to remain substantially below the state average.

Considering the district level position in respect of the flow irrigation development in relation to the ultimate flow irrigation potential, ten out of the then 26 districts were below the state average in 1982. Of these, Satara (39.30 per cent) and Nanded (38.28 per cent) were only marginally below the state average. However, in 2007-08, as many as 14 out of the present 35 districts were below the state average. Of these, two districts, namely, Nashik (78.68 per cent) and Chandrapur (78.06) were only slightly below the state average. Thus, a larger proportion of the districts are significantly below the state average compared to that in 1982. Of the eight districts which were significantly below the state average in 1982, five districts, namely Thane, Sangli, Buldhana, Yavatmal and Wardha have continued to remain considerably below the state average in respect of flow irrigation development by 2007. The newly created Sindhudurg district happens to show the poorest flow irrigation development in that the irrigation potential created as percentage of the ultimate irrigation potential in that district in 2007-08 (21.15 per cent) is even lower than the state average of 1982.

Actual Net Irrigated Area as Percentage of Net Sown Area

While the irrigation potential created as a percentage of Net Sown area in Maharashtra in 2007-08 was 24.84, actual irrigated area as percentage of Net Sown area for the state was even lower at 10.62. The likely reasons for this are the non-development of the network of canal and distributories and the preponderance of relatively more water consuming crops in the state. The irrigated area can be converted into its Standard Rabi equivalent by computing the area which could be irrigated by the same quantum of water if it was used to irrigate Rabi jowar which requires three rounds of irrigation during one crop cycle. This procedure removes the effect of variations in cropping pattern on the irrigated area, arising

from the different water requirements of individual crops. Expressed in Standard Rabi equivalent, the actual irrigated area as percentage of Net Sown area in the state stands at 29.58. This can be further increased only by further development of network of lower distributories.

Vidarbha

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Net Sown Area

In 1982, of the then eight districts of Vidarbha, five districts, namely, Buldhana (5.45), Akola (5.95), Amravati (2.61), Yavatmal (5.11) and Wardha (6.53) were below the state average of 11.83 per cent for the irrigation potential created as a percentage of Net Sown area. Now, in 2007-08, eight districts out of the present 11 districts of Vidarbha, were below the state average of 24.84 per cent. Of these, Buldhana (12.06), Akola (12.26), Washim (10.46) Amravati (12.98), Yavatmal (16.45) (all districts in the present Amravati Division) and Chandrapur (15.18) were markedly below the state average. The other two districts, namely, Wardha (23.17) and Gadchiroli (23.35) were slightly below the state average. The three districts in Vidarbha which are above the state average are Nagpur (29.52), Bhandara (44.43) and Gondia (57.95).

It is especially noteworthy that the newly created district of Washim (from erstwhile Akola district) of the Vidarbha region is not only much below the current state average in respect of the irrigation potential created as percentage of net sown area, but in fact has remained below the state average for this parameter in 1982. The other three districts, namely, Buldhana, Akola and Amravati are only marginally above the 1982 state average even now.

Ultimate Irrigation Potential as Percentage of Net Sown Area

However, as per the evaluation report of the Planning Commission [2003] some districts do not have enough water resources available even to catch up with the state average. Our data from the Department of Irrigation reveals that in 2007-08, the ultimate irrigation potential as percentage of Net sown area for the Vidarbha region was 24.32, compared to the state average of 31.45, mentioned above. For Amravati Division, the same is as low as 17.78, with three districts in particular, namely, Amravati (15.39), Akola (13.15) and Washim (10.75) being extremely poorly endowed in this respect and Buldhana (18.07) and Yavatmal (25.16) only slightly better. On the other hand, Nagpur Division in Vidarbha is better placed even compared to the state average, with the percentage of ultimate irrigation potential to the net sown area being 34.94. Out of the six districts in Nagpur Division, Nagpur (31.74) is marginally above the state average while Chandrapur (19.45) and Gadchiroli (24.85) are much below it. Wardha (40.65), Bhandara (49.49) and Gondia (66.66) are significantly better endowed compared to the state.

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential

In 1982, out of the eight districts of Vidarbha, four districts, namely, Buldhana (30.69 per cent), Amravati (16.28 per cent), Yavatmal (20.49 per cent) and Wardha (19.46 per cent) were below the state average (39.34 per cent) and that too with a great margin.

In 2007-08, of the ultimate irrigation potential in Vidarbha, 78.53 per cent has already been created, which figure is not much different from the state average of nearly 79 per cent, mentioned above. The same percentage, however, is much lower in the districts of Buldhana (66.75), Yavatmal (65.35) and Wardha (57.0) and only

marginally below in Chandrapur (78.06). In the poorly endowed Amravati, Washim and Akola districts, the potential has been created to the extent of 84.35 per cent, 97.29 per cent and 93.21 per cent, respectively.

Actual Net Irrigated Area as Percentage of Net Sown Area

Even where the irrigation potential has been created, the actual irrigated area as percentage of net sown area was very low in six out of the 11 districts of Vidarbha in 2007-08. The situation is especially serious in Amravati Division. All the five districts in this Division are in the range of 2.64 per cent (Amravati district) and 4.77 per cent (Buldhana). As far as Nagpur Division is concerned, Wardha (6.40) is significantly below while Chandrapur (10.99) is marginally above the state average. These percentages remain lower than the state average even after conversion to Standard Rabi equivalent. Therefore, in all these districts, the necessary irrigation water distributory systems do not seem to have been developed as yet.

Marathwada (Aurangabad Division)

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Net Sown Area

In 1982, average of irrigation potential created as percentage of net sown area for Marathwada (10.41) was lower than the state average (11.83). Of the five districts of Marathwada, only two districts, namely, Parbhani (14.28) and Nanded (12.51) were above the state average. While Aurangabad (10.01) and Beed (9.65) were marginally below, Osmanabad (6.51) was much below, the state average. As far as the situation in 2007-08 is concerned, average for Marathwada for this parameter (21.05) continues to remain below the state average (24.84). Six out of the present eight districts of Marathwada, namely, Aurangabad (15.75), Jalna (13.60), Hingoli (14.78),

Beed (21.98), Osmanabad (22.66) and Latur (18.79) are below the state average. Parbhani (33.63) is substantially above and Nanded (26.18) is marginally above the state average.

Ultimate Irrigation Potential as Percentage of Net Sown Area

Ultimate irrigation potential as a percentage of net sown area in Marathwada region (24.70) in 2007-08 was lower than the state average of 31.45. It was higher in Parbhani (37.40) and Nanded (33.77) than the state average. In almost all other districts of Marathwada, it is much lower than the state average, being as low as 13.88 in Jalna, 15.78 in Hingoli, 19.48 in Aurangabad, 22.97 in Beed, and 23.51 in Latur and somewhat lower than the state average in Osmanabad (29.13). Thus, Marathwada region also suffers from low ultimate irrigation potential.

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential

In 1982, out of the then five districts in Marathwada, only one district, namely Nanded was below the state average and that too marginally. Of the remaining four, Aurangabad (89.98 per cent) and Parbhani (79.51 per cent) were substantially above the state average.

As mentioned above, average of irrigation potential created as percentage of ultimate irrigation potential for Marathwada (85.22) is markedly above the state average in 2007-08. Of the eight districts of Marathwada, two districts, namely, Nanded (77.52) and Osmanabad (77.80) are marginally lower and two districts, namely, Aurangabad (80.85) and Latur (79.93) are only marginally above the state average. Thus, Osmanabad district, which was markedly above the state average in 1982 has dropped below the state average in 2007-08 (though marginally).

Jalna (98.01), Parbhani (89.91), Hingoli (93.66) and Beed (95.68) are markedly above the state average. Thus, there is not much further scope for creating additional irrigation potential in Jalna, Hingoli and Beed.

Actual Net Irrigated Area as Percentage of Net Sown Area

Even though the performance in respect of creation of irrigation potential relative to ultimate irrigation potential has been quite satisfactory in Marathwada, actual net irrigated area as percentage of net sown area remained quite low (5.86) compared to the state average (10.62) in 2007-08. Aurangabad (4.61), Jalna (4.30), Beed (3.92), Osmanabad (3.88) and Latur (4.21) are substantially lower and Hingoli (7.38) and Nanded (8.32) are somewhat lower than the state average. Only Parbhani (11.63) is marginally above it. Unlike in Vidarbha, the cropping pattern seems to be mainly responsible in Marathwada for the lower average of actual net irrigated area as percentage of net sown area. For, after adjusting for the variations in cropping pattern by considering the Standard Rabi Equivalent of net irrigated area, the average for the region (25.09) moves somewhat closer to the state average (29.58). Still, in six out of the eight districts, namely, Aurangabad (17.64), Jalna (20.28), Hingoli (22.32), Beed (23.64), Osmanabad (13.57) and Latur (24.63) are substantially lower than the state average. Thus, in these districts, inadequate development of distributional network for surface water as well as the relatively water intensive cropping pattern are responsible for the low extent of irrigated area. Parbhani (40.69) and Nanded (36.61) are considerably above the state average in respect of net irrigated area as percentage of net sown area, after adjustment for the cropping pattern.

North Maharashtra (Nashik Division)

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Net Sown Area

In 1982, Dandekar Committee had defined the region of Western Maharashtra to comprise what today constitute Nashik and Pune Divisions. Computing separately the average irrigation potential created as percentage of net sown area for the districts in today's Nashik Division together, it works out to 14.66. The then Dhule district was later divided into two districts of Dhule and Nandurbar. Of the then existing four districts of the Division, three, namely Nashik (14.08), Jalgaon (14.25) and Ahmednagar (17.65) were above the state average of 11.83. Dhule (10.70) had a marginally lower percentage. In 2007-08, the Division average (24.30) was only marginally below the state average (24.84). Of the present five districts, three districts of Nashik (21.83), Dhule (20.63) and Jalgaon (22.70) are somewhat below, while Nandurbar (17.79) is markedly below the state average. Only Ahmednagar district (30.62) is above the state average and that too by a significant margin.

Ultimate Irrigation Potential as Percentage of Net Sown Area

The average ultimate irrigation potential as percentage of net sown area in North Maharashtra is 29.17, which is a little lower than the state average. While Jalgaon (33.83) and Ahmednagar (31.79) have a higher ultimate irrigation potential as percentage of net sown area in 2007-08 than the state average, in the other three districts, namely, Nandurbar (16.82), Dhule (24.62) and even Nashik (27.74) it is lower than the state average. Thus, North Maharashtra also is not very much well-endowed in respect of irrigation potential.

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential

In 1982, all the then four districts of the region were above the state average in flow irrigation development. Jalgaon (40.10 per cent) was marginally above the state average.

In 2007-08, as mentioned above, the average Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential for the Nashik Division was 83.3 as against the state average of nearly 79. Of the five districts of the Division, Jalgaon (67.09) has the lowest percentage which is much lower than the state average. Thus the position of Jalgaon district in flow irrigation development has considerably worsened in relation to the state average. Nashik (78.68) was almost on par with the state average. The remaining three districts, namely, Dhule (83.78), Nandurbar (105.80) and Ahmednagar (96.32) were substantially above the state average.

Actual Net Irrigated Area as Percentage of Net Sown Area

The average actual net irrigated area as percentage of net sown area of the Division (8.37) was somewhat below the state average (10.62). Jalgaon (7.14) and Nashik (7.53) were somewhat lower while Dhule (3.70) and Nandurbar (1.65) were greatly lower than the state average. Only Ahmednagar (13.57) district in the Division was above the state average. While irrigation potential created as percentage of ultimate irrigation potential is quite high in these two districts, the extent of actual use of water is extremely poor. Even after adjusting for the variations in cropping pattern by converting these percentages into the corresponding those in Standard Rabi equivalent, the percentages in these two districts do not improve very much and continue to remain much below the state average (29.58), implying neglect of the development of water distribution network.

Similar is the case of Jalgaon and Nashik. Particularly noteworthy is the district of Ahmednagar, in which the percentage after adjustment for the cropping pattern improves substantially, from 13.57 to 40.58. Evidently, this is a reflection of the well-known fact of water intensive sugarcane cultivation in the district.

Konkan (Konkan Division)

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Net Sown Area

The average irrigation potential created as percentage of net sown area for Konkan Division was 6.13 as against the state average of 11.83 in 1982. At that time, the only district of Raigad (14.68) was above the state average. The other two districts, namely, Thane (3.84) and Ratnagiri (3.39) were substantially lower than the state average. In 2007-08, the average for the Division (10.15) continues to remain lower than not only the current but also the 1982-state average. With the splitting of Ratnagiri district between Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg districts, there are four districts in Konkan Division now, excluding Greater Mumbai. All these four districts of Konkan Division continue to remain much below the state average in 2007-08. Of these, the districts of Raigad (10.08), Sindhudurg (5.22) and Ratnagiri (4.46), which are much below the present state average, are also much lower than the state average in 1982.

Ultimate Irrigation Potential as Percentage of Net Sown Area

Even the ultimate irrigation potential as percentage of net sown area for the Konkan Division is quite low (21.53) compared to the state average of 31.45, and is the second lowest in the state, being next higher only to Amravati (17.78). Within the Division, Ratnagiri district (8.64) is the lowest, being, in fact, the lowest in the state.

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential

In 1982, of the then three districts in Konkan, two, namely Raigad (70.94 per cent) and Ratnagiri (57.07 per cent) were markedly above the state average, and Thane was markedly below it.

As stated above, the average for the irrigation potential created as percentage of ultimate irrigation potential in 2007-08 for the Konkan Division (47.13) was way below the state average of nearly 79 per cent. Thus, of the very low ultimate irrigation potential of the region, only less than half has been created. Possibly underlying this may be the factor of very high cost of irrigation development due to extremely difficult terrain. All the four districts were significantly below the state average. Especially low, indeed the lowest in the state in this respect was Sindhudurg (21.15). The second lowest in the state was Raigad (48.46). The lower flow irrigation development in relation to the ultimate potential in Raigad compared to the position in 1982 is difficult to explain. Thane (56.41) and Ratnagiri (51.58) were also considerably lower than the state average. While the district of Ratnagiri shows a lower percentage of flow irrigation development in 2007-08 compared to that in 1982, this is because of the Division of the district.

Actual Net Irrigated Area as Percentage of Net Sown Area

The average of the actual net irrigated area as percentage of net sown area for the Division was only 2.58 compared to the state average of 10.62. While all the four districts of Konkan Division were considerably lower than the state average, the two districts of Sindhudurg (0.53) and Ratnagiri (0.16) were extremely poor in this regard, with the lowest two percentages in the state. Thane (4.09) and Raigad (5.30) are only slightly above these two districts. Of these, the same percentages for the Standard Rabi equivalent

numbers were: Ratnagiri (0.89) and Sindhudurg (2.84), Thane (22.49), Raigad (28.33). The average for the Division (14.02), though improves markedly, continues to be much below the state average. One may infer from this that the problem in Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg districts is that of lack of the development of the distributory network, while that of the other two districts, particularly of Raigad, is primarily one of water intensive cropping pattern.

Western Maharashtra (Pune Division)

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Net Sown Area

In 1982, according to Dandekar Committee, the average irrigation potential created as percentage of net sown area was 15.42, which was higher than the state average of 11.83. All the five districts of the Division were higher than the state average. The situation further greatly improved in favour of the Division in 2007-08. The improved average for the Division stood at 41.32 per cent compared to the state average of 24.84 per cent. The Division average is the highest among all the Divisions of the state. The average for Kolhapur district (67.92) is the highest among all the 34 districts of the state. The irrigation potential created as percentage of net sown area in the other four districts of the Division, namely, Sangli (41.72), Pune (39.62), Satara (35.41) and Solapur (34.76) are all also markedly above the state average.

Ultimate Irrigation Potential as Percentage of Net Sown Area

The ultimate irrigation potential in the Division is very high. The average ultimate irrigation potential as percentage of net sown area in the year 2007-08 stands at 54.22 against the state average of 31.45. The two districts which have an extremely high percentage in the state are Sangli (78.60) and Kolhapur (72.55). The remaining

three districts, namely, Satara (48.01), Pune (46.57) and Solapur (42.52) are also markedly higher than the state average.

Irrigation Potential Created as Percentage of Ultimate Irrigation Potential

In 1982, of the five districts in the region, the three districts, namely, Pune (34.12 per cent), Sangli (17.40 per cent) and Kolhapur (22.73 per cent) were markedly below the state average in flow irrigation development. Solapur (39.36 per cent) was almost on par with the state average and Satara (39.30 per cent) was only marginally below it.

The average irrigation potential created as percentage of ultimate irrigation potential for the Division (76.21) in 2007-08 was, however, marginally lower compared to the state average of nearly 79 per cent in 2007-08. Surprisingly, Sangli (53.08), which, as noted above, has the highest ultimate irrigation potential as percentage of net sown area in the state, has continued to have the lowest irrigation potential created as percentage of ultimate irrigation potential in the Division. Satara (73.76) is also lower, though marginally so, than the state average. Solapur (81.75) is marginally above the state average. The remaining two districts, namely, Kolhapur (93.62) and Pune (85.08) are markedly above the state average, the former almost having reached the full extent of irrigation potential.

Actual Net Irrigated Area as Percentage of Net Sown Area

The average for the actual net irrigated area as percentage of net sown area is remarkably high for the Pune Division (23.08), as is well-known, and was more than twice the average for the state (10.62) in 2007-08. All the five districts of the Division were markedly above the state average. Kolhapur (43.67) is the highest in the state. The other four districts, namely, Pune (26.50), Satara

(19.66), Solapur (17.83) and Sangli (15.37) are also markedly above the state average. This is so in spite of the heavily water consuming crops like sugar cane. The heavy water intensity of cropping pattern in the Division becomes vividly evident as soon as we convert the percentages of net irrigated area to net sown area in the districts in the Division into Standard Rabi equivalent. The average percentage for the Division improves from 23.08 to 57.62, whereas the state average rises from 10.62 to 29.58. The two districts of Kolhapur (85.78) and Pune (69.05) show the steepest jumps, after conversion to the Standard Rabi equivalent. The two districts, namely, Solapur (59.10) and Satara (43.95) are also substantially higher than the state average. Sangli (30.06), however, is only marginally higher than the state average, implying that while the cropping pattern in Sangli is water intensive, it is not very much more water intensive compared to the state as a whole.

(ii) Do the Outcomes in Irrigation Development Indicate Implementation of Dandekar Committee Rule?

As there has been great concern and some debate about the question of injustice to Vidarbha especially in respect of irrigation development and of imbalance in development particularly in this regard, we address these specific questions in this section.

Dandekar Committee had recommended that those districts which showed a backlog in irrigation development as represented by the percentage of the Standard Rabi Equivalent of Irrigation Potential Created to Net Sown Area relative to the state average for the same should be brought up to the state average by devoting larger investment in irrigation development in these districts. The purpose behind prescribing a rule, such as the one recommended by Dandekar Committee, is always to keep discretion in such allocations or policy formulations to the

minimum so as to keep the corresponding political interference to the minimum. If this rule was systematically followed over the years one should expect to find that those districts which showed a backlog in 1982 should have moved above the state average as far as the above indicator is concerned or at least should show a smaller backlog. Since we have attempted to compile the data on the above indicator for 2007, we can try to see whether the changes in this indicator provide any evidence of such movements in this indicator between 1982 and 2007. In order to make valid comparisons, we have to take account of the fact that in the intervening period eight new districts, namely, Sindhudurg, Nandurbar, Jalna, Hingoli, Latur, Washim, Gondia and Gadchiroli have been carved out of the earlier districts of Ratnagiri, Dhule, Aurangabad, Parbhani, Osmanabad, Akola, Bhandara and Chandrapur, respectively. In order to make the values of the above mentioned indicator between the two periods comparable, Table 7(ii) presents the data on it for the 1982-districts and for the corresponding new districts taken together. For example, we compare the indicator values from pooled data for the new districts of Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg together with that for the old district of Ratnagiri, and so on. We also show in the Table the backlogs in areas of irrigation potential created in 1982 and in 2007 for comparable districts, computed by using the corresponding state averages for the said indicator for the respective years.

First of all, it would be fair to note that all the districts show considerable improvement between these two years in the Standard Rabi Equivalent of the Areas of Irrigation Potential Created and the percentage of the Standard Rabi Equivalent of Irrigation Potential Created to Net Sown Area between 1982 and 2007. However, we can see from the Table that of the 14 out of the 25 1982-districts and comparable 2007 pooled districts (excluding districts of Greater Mumbai), which were below the state average in 1982,

Table 7(ii). Irrigation Status and Irrigation Backlogs in 1982 and 2007-08

District	Net Sown Area (000 Hectares) 1978-79	Net Sown Area (000 Hectares) (2007-08)	Irrigation Potential Created (SRE) (000 Hectares) by 30 June 1982	Irrigation Potential Created (SRE) (000 Hectares) by 30 June 2007	Irrigation Potential Created (SRE) as percentage of Net Sown Area by June 1982	Irrigation Potential Created (SRE) as % of Net Sown Area (2007-08)	Excess (+) /Backlog (-) in Irrigation Potential Created (SRE) Using Percentage to Net Sown Area (000 Hectares) by 30 June 1982	Excess (+) /Backlog (-) in Irrigation Potential Created (SRE) Using Percentage to Net Sown Area (000 Hectares) by 30 June 2007	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Greater Bombay	6.60								
2 Thane	265.10	244.74	18.70	160.20	7.05	65.46	-41.09	53.40	
3 Raigad	195.80	188.76	52.39	75.34	26.76	39.91	8.23	-7.04	
4 Ratnagiri+ Sindhudurg	356.30	384.81	15.84	50.48	4.45	22.75	-64.52	-117.45	
Konkan (Excl. G. B.)	817.20	818.30	86.93	323.08	10.64	39.48	-97.38	-71.09	
Konkan (Excl. G.B.)-Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs							-105.61	-124.49	
5 Nashik	889.60	883.66	199.83	304.97	22.46	34.51	-0.81	-80.66	
6 Dhule+Nandurbar	705.00	729.90	129.02	155.00	18.30	30.78	-29.99	-163.53	
7 Jalgaon	810.50	850.97	228.90	412.28	28.24	48.45	46.10	40.91	
8 Ahmednagar	1214.90	1116.78	428.41	581.37	35.26	52.06	154.40	94.00	
North Maharashtra	3620.00	3581.30	986.16	1523.31	27.24	42.54	169.70	-109.28	
North Maharashtra- Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs							-30.80	-244.19	
9 Pune	1001.00	935.27	302.11	617.06	30.18	65.98	76.34	208.90	
10 Satara	585.90	550.20	217.94	280.86	37.20	51.05	85.79	40.75	
11 Sangli	616.10	609.33	203.67	398.68	33.06	65.43	64.71	132.77	
12 Solapur	1137.40	1040.02	347.60	551.45	30.56	53.02	91.07	97.58	
13 Kolhapur	423.70	429.10	257.69	679.26	60.82	158.30	162.13	492.00	
Western Maharashtra	3764.10	3563.92	1329.01	2527.31	61.51	70.91	480.05	971.99	
Western Maharashtra- Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs							0.00	0.00	
14 Aurangabad+Jalna	1214.00	1264.83	203.19	165.48	16.74	23.71	-70.62	-386.50	
15 Parbhani+Hingoli	1007.30	812.84	346.42	327.11	34.39	52.33	119.23	-27.62	
16 Beed	809.50	751.51	129.09	271.42	15.95	36.12	-53.49	-56.54	
17 Nanded	727.90	704.46	184.03	362.27	25.28	51.43	19.86	54.84	
18 Osmanabad+Latur	1115.00	998.28	114.78	120.89	10.29	27.20	-136.70	-314.77	
Marathwada	4873.70	4531.91	977.51	1630.49	20.06	35.98	-121.72	-730.58	
Marathwada-Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs							-260.81	-785.42	
19 Buldhana	681.90	669.44	68.99	134.16	10.12	20.04	-84.81	-157.99	
20 Akola+Washim	820.70	811.90	92.72	91.08	11.30	19.62	-92.38	-263.24	
21 Amravati	722.90	752.14	28.68	145.68	3.97	19.37	-134.36	-182.56	
22 Yavatmal	854.60	847.39	87.30	219.63	10.22	25.92	-105.45	-150.18	
23 Wardha	442.00	364.72	55.78	147.86	12.62	40.54	-43.91	-11.31	
24 Nagpur	565.50	546.84	115.87	312.17	20.49	57.09	-11.67	73.53	
25 Bhandara+Gondia	388.30	362.54	184.45	137.73	47.50	85.06	96.87	-20.49	
26 Chandrapur+ Gadchiroli	690.80	625.94	100.88	112.14	14.60	28.48	-54.92	-161.03	
Vidarbha	5166.70	4980.91	734.67	1605.43	14.22	32.23	-430.64	-873.25	
Vidarbha-Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs							-527.51	-946.77	
Maharashtra State	18248.30								
Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)	18241.70	17437.03	4114.28	7609.62	22.55	43.64	0.00	0.00	
Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)-Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs							-924.73	-2100.88	

(Contd.)

Table 7(ii). Concl.d.)

District	Ultimate Irrigation Potential (000 Hect- ares) by 30 June 2007	Irrigation Potential Created (000 Hect- ares) by 30 June 1982	Irrigation Potential Created (000 Hect- ares) by 30 June 2007	Irrigation Potential Created as % of Ult. Irr. Potential by 30 June 1982	Irrigation Potential Created as % of Ult. Irr. Potential by 30 June 2007	Excess (+) /Backlog(-) in Irrigation Poten- tial Created Using Percentage to Ult. Irr. Poten- tial (000 Hectares) by 30 June 1982	Excess (+) /Backlog(-) in Irrigation Poten- tial Created Using Percentage to Ult. Irr. Poten- tial (000 Hectares) by 30 June 2007	
1	2	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1 Greater Bombay		..						
2 Thane	81.18	10.19	45.79	12.55	56.41	-21.75	-18.33	
3 Raigad	39.27	27.86	19.03	70.94	48.46	12.41	-11.99	
4 Ratnagiri+Sindhudurg	55.76	12.07	18.23	57.07	32.69	-9.87	-25.81	
Konkan (Excl. G. B.)	176.21	50.12	83.05	28.44	47.13	-19.20	-56.12	
Konkan (Excl. G. B.) - Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs						-31.61	-56.12	
5 Nashik	245.14	125.26	192.88	51.10	78.68	28.82	-0.73	
6 Dhule+Nandurbar	156.60	75.42	142.17	70.63	90.79	13.81	18.49	
7 Jalgaon	287.92	115.47	193.17	40.10	67.09	2.20	-34.23	
8 Ahmednagar	355.01	214.49	341.95	60.42	96.32	74.83	61.56	
North Maharashtra	1044.67	530.64	870.17	50.79	83.30	119.67	45.09	
North Maharashtra- Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs						0.00	-34.96	
9 Pune	435.60	148.63	370.59	34.12	85.08	-22.73	26.55	
10 Satara	264.17	103.83	194.85	39.30	73.76	-0.09	-13.79	
11 Sangli	478.94	83.33	254.24	17.40	53.08	-105.08	-124.03	
12 Solapur	442.22	174.04	361.52	39.36	81.75	0.07	12.25	
13 Kolhapur	311.33	70.78	291.46	22.73	93.62	-51.70	45.57	
Western Maharashtra	1932.26	580.61	1472.66	30.05	76.21	-179.53	-53.44	
Western Maharashtra- Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs						-202.34	-137.82	
14 Aurangabad+Jalna	214.38	121.57	186.92	89.98	87.19	37.23	17.60	
15 Parbhani+Hingoli	232.87	143.86	211.33	79.51	90.75	52.25	27.41	
16 Beed	172.61	78.09	165.16	45.24	95.68	10.19	28.83	
17 Nanded	237.93	91.07	184.45	38.28	77.52	-2.53	-3.47	
18 Osmanabad+Latur	261.61	72.56	206.13	51.98	78.79	-30.36	-0.49	
Marathwada	1119.40	507.15	953.99	45.31	85.22	66.78	69.89	
Marathwada-Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs						-32.89	-3.96	
19 Buldhana	120.97	37.13	80.75	30.69	66.75	-10.46	-14.79	
20 Akola+Washim	97.69	48.83	92.71	85.49	94.90	10.40	15.55	
21 Amravati	115.76	18.85	97.64	16.28	84.35	-26.69	6.21	
22 Yavatmal	213.24	43.70	139.36	20.49	65.35	-40.19	-29.06	
23 Wardha	148.24	28.85	84.49	19.46	57.00	-29.47	-32.59	
24 Nagpur	173.57	79.23	161.44	45.65	93.01	10.95	24.35	
25 Bhandara+Gondia	210.95	146.03	185.89	164.82	88.12	63.04	19.28	
26 Chandrapur+Gadchiroli	131.07	86.25	109.14	97.90	83.27	34.69	5.62	
Vidarbha	1211.49	488.87	951.42	40.35	78.53	12.28	-5.42	
Vidarbha-Unconsolidated Sum of Backlogs						-106.80	-81.85	
Maharashtra State								
Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)	5484.03	2157.39	4331.29	39.34	78.98	0.00	0.00	
Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)- Unconsolidated Sum of Backlog						-373.64	-314.71	

SRE - Standard Rabi Equivalent.

Source: Copmiped from Annexure Tables 7.3 and 7.3(A).

in 2007, only two districts, namely, Nagpur from Vidarbha region and Thane from Konkan region were above the state average and one district, namely, Wardha from Vidarbha region showed a decline in the backlog though still remaining below the state average in this respect. On the other hand, eleven out of the backlog districts of 1982 showed an even higher backlog in 2007, of course, in relation to the higher value of the state average of the indicator in 2007. These comprise five of the then eight districts of Vidarbha, three of the five districts of Marathwada, two of the then four districts of North Maharashtra and one of the then three districts of Konkan. The total (unconsolidated) backlog for the state as a whole has increased over the period. Four of these eleven districts, namely, Akola+Washim of Vidarbha region, Aurangabad+Jalna of Marathwada, Nashik and Dhule+Nandurbar of North Maharashtra region show a greater percentage increase in backlog than that for the state as a whole.

All the five districts of Western Maharashtra were above the state average in 1982 and all of them continued to remain above the state average in 2007. Of these, Pune, Sangli, Solapur and Kolhapur districts and Nanded district from Marathwada show a further increase in the excess over the state average, which can be certainly considered to indicate excessively unbalanced irrigation development. While some of this excess investment in irrigation in Pune, Sangli and Solapur districts may have gone in the drought-prone talukas, as recommended by Dandekar Committee (an aspect which we have not taken into account while comparing the positions in 1982 and 2007), there are no drought-prone talukas in Kolhapur and Nanded districts.

If the Dandekar Committee's suggested approach had been followed, the districts above the state average in 1982 would not have shown the rise irrigation potential created to the extent seen in 2007, nor would the backlogs in the

districts below the state average in 1982 have shown the further increase in their backlogs. It is clear that the approach was not followed. The Outcome indicates basically discretionary action by the government rather than following the rule.

Perhaps a better indicator of the extent of flow irrigation development in a district than the percentage of the Standard Rabi Equivalent of Irrigation Potential Created to Net Sown Area is the irrigation potential created as percentage of the ultimate irrigation potential of the district, since this takes into account the differing ultimate irrigation potential of the districts. This indicator was not used by Dandekar Committee because the information about district-wise ultimate irrigation potential was not available to that Committee. Since this information is available to us now, which would be the same for 1982 as for 2007, we also compare the district-wise irrigation development reflected by the irrigation potential created as percentage of the ultimate irrigation potential for the years 1982 and 2007 in Table 7(ii). Ideally, we would have liked to use the indicator after adjusting the numerator and the denominator in the ratio for the inter-district variations in the cropping pattern by using their respective Standard Rabi Equivalents. However, that information is not readily available to us. Hence, we use the said indicator without making the necessary adjustment, with corresponding limitation for our analysis.

The picture is not different at all when we look at the irrigation potential created as percentage of the ultimate irrigation potential of the districts in 1982 and 2007, though the districts showing improvement and deterioration relative to their position in 1982 are not the same as per the indicator used by the Dandekar Committee. Of the 12 districts which had backlogs in respect of irrigation development according to this indicator in 1982, only three districts, namely, Pune, Kolhapur and Amravati have moved above the state

average now. Three more districts, namely, Thane, Osmanabad and Yavatmal show a smaller backlog now compared to that in 1982, though still remaining below the new, higher, state average. The backlog in the remaining six districts, namely, Ratnagiri in Konkan, Sangli and Satara in Western Maharashtra, Nanded in Marathwada and Wardha and Buldhana in Vidarbha has increased. The total (unconsolidated) backlog for the state as a whole, computed on the basis of this criterion, however, has decreased somewhat over the period.

Of the 13 out of the 25 districts which showed the irrigation potential created as percentage of the ultimate irrigation potential above the state average in 1982, only three districts, namely, Raigad in Konkan region and Nashik and Jalgaon in North Maharashtra have moved from being above the state average to being lower than it. The remaining 10 districts still continue to remain above the new, higher, state average. Of these five districts show an increased excess over the state average and five a reduced excess.

Thus, on this criterion, 11 out of 25 districts show changes which are contrary to the spirit of Dandekar Committee's recommendations.

Was injustice done to Vidarbha in respect of irrigation development? Of the seven out of the eight districts in Vidarbha which showed a backlog relative to the state average in the Standard Rabi Equivalent of Irrigation Potential Created as percentage of Net Sown Area in 1982, only one district, namely, Nagpur moved above the state average and only one other, namely, Wardha showed a reduced backlog. Though all districts showed an increase in the Standard Rabi Equivalent of Irrigation Potential Created as percentage of Net Sown Area, it was much less compared to the state average in the remaining six districts. Vidarbha region as a whole also showed a greater backlog. This cannot be considered to be just.

As regards the irrigation potential created as percentage of the ultimate irrigation potential, out of the four districts which showed a backlog relative to the state average in 1982, only one district, namely, Amravati moved above the state average and Yavatmal showed a reduced backlog. And only Nagpur showed a larger excess over the state average. Thus, again, though all the districts in Vidarbha showed an increase in the irrigation potential created as percentage of the ultimate irrigation potential, the increase remained less than that in the state average in all the remaining five 1982- districts.

Vidarbha region as a whole, which was marginally above the state average in the irrigation potential created as percentage of the ultimate irrigation potential in 1982, turns out to be marginally below, almost equal to, the state average in 2007. The unconsolidated aggregate backlog for Vidarbha region as a whole has reduced somewhat from around 107,000 hectares to around 82,000 hectares, from 28.58 per cent of the aggregate (unconsolidated) backlog for the state as a whole to 26 per cent, after taking account of the ultimate irrigation potential of the region. The irrigation backlog of Vidarbha still continues to be huge, and has to be reduced further expeditiously. By comparison, the backlogs of Western Maharashtra and Marathwada have been reduced greatly from around 202,000 hectares (54.15 per cent) to around 1,38,000 hectares (43.79 per cent) and from around 33,000 hectares (8.80 per cent) to around 4,000 hectares (1.26 per cent), over the period, on this criterion. The backlogs for Konkan and North Maharashtra, on the other hand, have increased substantially, from around 32,000 hectares (8.46 per cent) to around 56,000 hectares (17.83 per cent) and from nil (0 per cent) to around 35,000 hectares (11.11 per cent) on this criterion.

Since, as mentioned earlier, the irrigation potential created as percentage of the ultimate irrigation potential is a better indicator of the

outcome of the state's efforts in flow irrigation development than the Standard Rabi Equivalent of Irrigation Potential Created as percentage of Net Sown Area, we may conclude that on the basis of this criterion the evidence on injustice to Vidarbha region as a whole in flow irrigation development is not as strong as suggested by the latter indicator, though within the Vidarbha region five districts out of the then eight districts of the region have achieved inadequate flow irrigation development relative to their ultimate irrigation potential. The imbalance of irrigation development within Vidarbha region may also be a cause of concern.

(iii) Imbalances in Development of Irrigation Potential and Policy Options

The ultimate irrigation potential as percentage of net sown area for Maharashtra state as a whole is relatively low, indicating that the state itself is poorly endowed, as far as surface water irrigation possibilities are concerned. This fact is well-known. Out of the 33 districts in the state (excluding Greater Mumbai), 19, that is, a few more than half of the total number of districts, were lower than the already low state average. In five of these districts, the irrigation potential created is also lower than the state average. Four of these, namely, Buldhana and Yavatmal in Amravati Division and Ratnagiri and Sindhudurg in Konkan Division are lower than the state average in respect of the actual net irrigated area as percentage of net sown area, which does not show sufficient improvement even after adjustment for the cropping pattern. We may conclude from this that in these four districts, lack of irrigation development, both of reservoir and main canal construction as well as the network of distributory system, is responsible for poor exploitation of whatever little ultimate irrigation potential which exists therein. These are clear cases of neglect of irrigation development. Of the remaining seven districts in this category, Raigad seems to suffer from lack of reservoir and canal construction,

development of distributory network and a relatively water intensive cropping pattern, resulting in low utilisation of ultimate irrigation potential.

In the 14 districts, with low ultimate flow irrigation potential but higher than the state average as far as the creation of irrigation potential, 12 districts, namely, Nashik, Dhule and Nandurbar in Nashik Division, Aurangabad, Jalna, Hingoli, Beed, Osmanabad and Latur in Aurangabad Division and Akola, Washim and Amravati in Amravati Division, the percentage of actual net irrigated area to net sown area is lower than the state average, even after adjustment for the cropping pattern. One may surmise that, in these districts, the construction of the main reservoirs and probably the main canals have been completed, but the work of developing the distributory network seems to have been largely neglected. This work needs to be taken up on a priority basis so as to enable these districts to reap the benefits of the irrigation potential created in spite of their low ultimate surface irrigation potential. Of the remaining two districts, with low ultimate potential but high extent of creation of irrigation potential, namely, Chandrapur and Gadchiroli, both in Nagpur Division, while the percentage of the net irrigated area to net sown area is higher than or equal to the state average, both Chandrapur and Gadchiroli seem to suffer from the lack of development of distributory network. This work, again, needs to be taken up on a priority basis to further improve the utilisation of surface water irrigation.

In the case of the above mentioned districts, which are poorly endowed in respect of ultimate surface water irrigation potential, it is necessary to state that the said geographical limitation is bound to be a constraint on the overall possibility of agricultural development. Policy interventions and incentives for promotion of techniques of dry land farming as well as the essential technology development for the same all need to be attended

to urgently. Considering the constraint on agricultural development in these districts, policy also must, of necessity, focus upon exploring avenues of non-agricultural development in these districts. Public investment for this purpose in such districts has to be given a very high priority. The situation in these districts also points to a limitation of the prevailing sectoral approach to removal of regional backlogs in infrastructure development.

In the 14 districts, which have higher percentage of ultimate irrigation potential to net sown area, in four districts, namely, Jalgaon in Nashik Division, Satara and Sangli in Pune Division and Wardha in Nagpur Division have a lower percentage of created irrigation potential to the ultimate irrigation potential compared to the state average. Here, the efforts must be made to create additional irrigation potential by constructing reservoirs and main canals. Of these four districts, the two districts of Jalgaon and Wardha are lacking in the further distributory networks as well. In Satara and Sangli the percentages of actual net irrigated area to net sown area are higher than the state average, because of relatively more water intensive cropping pattern as well as possibly a better developed distributory network.

Of the remaining 10 districts, with a higher percentage of ultimate surface water irrigation potential to net sown area compared to the state average as well as with a higher percentage of irrigation potential created to ultimate surface water irrigation potential compared to the state average, in the two districts, namely, Thane in Konkan Division and Nanded in Aurangabad Division, the actual net irrigated area as percentage of net sown area is lower than the state average. In both these districts, the development of the distributory network warrants attention on a priority basis. However, in the case of Nanded, a relatively more water intensive cropping pattern is also responsible for the low actual utilisation of created irrigation potential.

In the remaining eight districts, namely, Ahmednagar in Nashik Division, Pune, Solapur and Kolhapur in Pune Division, Parbhani in Aurangabad Division and Nagpur, Bhandara and Gondia in Nagpur Division are higher than the state average in respect of all the three aspects of irrigation development, namely, the ultimate surface water irrigation potential, irrigation potential created and the actual use of created potential in terms of the net irrigated area.. Needless to say that there is no backlog in these districts as far as irrigation infrastructure is concerned. Indeed, the benefits of available surface water in these districts may be extended to a larger section of the farming community by resorting to a more rational use of surface water through adoption of a *socially optimal* cropping pattern.

(iv) Irrigation Problems in Amravati Division

The irrigation development in Amravati Division is especially poor, as has been observed above. Still, sufficient efforts to improve the irrigation infrastructure in the districts in this Division are not being made. The ongoing projects in Amravati Division, specially in Akola and Washim districts are not sufficient to remove the backlog. Many projects in these areas, being under forest, are held up for want of permission from the environment and forest departments.

The latest cost estimate of the on-going irrigation projects in Amravati Division is Rs. 11838.99 crore, against which an amount of Rs. 3498.56 crore, or less than 30 per cent was actually expended till March 2007, creating an irrigation potential of 216511 hectares out of the irrigation potential of these on-going projects of 651318 hectares, leaving a balance of expenditure of Rs. 8340.43 crore (presumably at 2007 prices) and an irrigation potential of 443807 hectares still to be created out of the on-going projects. Add to this, the large number of irrigation projects in this Division, at various stages of processing of administrative approvals and examination, and a

large requirement of additional estimated expenditure of Rs. 5088.21 crore (also presumably at 2007 prices) needs further to be incurred to create an additional irrigation potential of 228661 hectares in Amravati Division alone.

4. Social Services

The fact finding committee on Regional Imbalance in Maharashtra under the Chairmanship of Prof. V.M. Dandekar (Dandekar Committee) arrived at the estimation of the backlog (measured both, in physical and monetary terms) in the provision of basic socio-economic amenities in the different regions of the State. In the light of the most recent official published statistics on individual districts (District Socio-Economic Review, March 2009, for each district published by the Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Planning Department, Government of Maharashtra, giving data generally for 2008-09, but for some parameters for some districts for 2007-08 and in some rare cases for 2006-07), an attempt has been made here to understand the extent of change in terms of physical availability of some of the main amenities in the Vidarbha and other regions of Maharashtra that has occurred during the last quarter century or so. It may be clarified here that since the reported figures for the different amenities in some of the districts relate to somewhat earlier years, there is a possibility of under-estimation of the availability of the amenities in the figures for the recent past presented below. (See Tables in Annexure 1 for details.)

(i) Primary Education:

Maharashtra

In 1982-83, the average number of primary schools per lakh of population for Maharashtra, excluding Greater Mumbai was 90.82. Of the then 25 districts (excluding Greater Mumbai), 15 districts were below the state average. As per the

recent statistics, the state average of primary schools per lakh of population is 84.40. Sixteen districts out of 34 were below the state average.

As per the statistics for the recent years, as far as the number of students enrolled in primary schools per lakh of population is concerned, the state average stands at 12940. The same number stood at 13959 in 1982-83. The decline in the state average appears to be a reflection of the declining trend in student enrolment in government primary schools.

As per the recent statistics, as regards the number of primary teachers per lakh of population, the state average is 390. The same number for the state (excluding Greater Mumbai) in 1982-83 was 365.

The student - teacher ratio for the state improved from 38.29 in 1982-83 to 33.34 in recent years.

Vidarbha

It must be noted that the number of primary schools per lakh of population has declined in all the districts of Vidarbha during the last nearly three decades, from 1982-83 to the recent years. The number of primary schools has not kept pace with population growth. In 1982-83, for the two districts of Nagpur and Bhandara the number of primary schools per lakh of population was lower than the average for the state. As per the recent data, the four districts of Buldhana, Akola, Amravati and Nagpur have lower number of primary schools per lakh of population compared to the state average. The two districts of Yavatmal and Gadchiroli have markedly higher number of primary schools per lakh of population compared to the average for the state.

It is worth noting that the average number of students enrolled per lakh of population has declined for all the districts of the Vidarbha region (except Yavatmal) as also for the state as a whole

between the year 1982-83 and the recent past. This fall at the state level is about 13 per cent. While only two districts of Nagpur and Chandrapur then had a lower average number of enrolled students compared to averages for the state, the recent statistics depicts that, the same number now has gone up to five (Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara, Chandrapur and Gadchiroli).

The number of primary teachers per lakh of population in all districts of the Vidarbha region (except Nagpur) has increased from the year 1982-83 to the recent past. In 1982-83, within region, the three districts of Nagpur, Bhandara and Chandrapur had lower number of primary teachers per lakh of population compared to average number of teachers for the state. On the other hand, now there are four (out of 11) districts in Vidarbha, namely Amravati, Wardha, Nagpur and (only marginally) Bhandara wherein the number of primary teachers per lakh of population is lower compared to the average for the state.

In 1982-83, out of the then eight districts in Vidarbha region, three districts, namely, Akola, Amravati and Chandrapur were marginally below the state average. In recent years, seven districts in Vidarbha, namely, Gadchiroli (20.80), Yavatmal (25.88), Chandrapur (26), Wardha (27.75), Bhandara (29), Gondia (29.20) are substantially below and Amravati (32.56) and Akola (33.32) marginally below, the state average. The student-teacher ratio in Buldhana has continued to be higher (that is, worse) than the state average between 1982-83 and the recent years.

Marathwada (Aurangabad Division)

Of the then five districts in Marathwada, in 1982-83, the two districts, namely, Parbhani (83.91) and Osmanabad (81.95) were considerably below the state average as far as the number of primary schools per lakh of population is concerned. As per the recent statistics, of the eight districts in Marathwada, Parbhani (78.01) and

Osmanabad (75.30) are noticeably below the state average and Nanded (82.51) is marginally so. The remaining five districts, namely, Aurangabad, Latur, Beed, Jalna and Hingoli are above the state average, Jalna being only marginally higher than the state average. Latur (108.61) has a remarkably high number of primary schools per lakh of population in Marathwada region.

Out of the five then existing districts, in 1982-83, the only district of Osmanabad (14179) was above the state average in respect of enrolment of students in primary schools per lakh of population. As far as the recent statistics is concerned, all the eight districts in Marathwada have enrolment per lakh of population in primary schools above the state average.

In 1982-83, all the then five districts in Marathwada were below the state average in respect of the number of teachers in primary schools per lakh of population. As per the statistics for the recent years, of the eight districts of Marathwada, two districts, namely Nanded (380) and Jalna (370) have a lower number of primary teachers per lakh of population than the state average. The remaining six districts have a larger number of primary teachers per lakh of population than the state average. Latur (670) has an exceptionally high number of teachers per lakh of population in comparison with the other districts, not only in Marathwada but in the state. The only other district in the state having a comparable figure for this parameter is Yavatmal (690) in Vidarbha.

In 1982-83, all the then five districts in the region were above the state average in respect of the student-teacher ratio. In recent years, of the eight districts in Marathwada, three districts, namely, Latur (29.93), Beed (31) and Aurangabad (32.69) are below the state average as far as the student teacher ratio is concerned. The student-teacher ratios in Parbhani, Nanded, Osmanabad, Jalna and Hingoli have continued to remain

higher (that is, worse) than the state average. Hingoli (52) has the highest student teacher ratio in the state.

North Maharashtra (Nashik Division)

In 1982-83, of the then four districts in this region, three were below the state average as far as the number of primary schools per lakh of population is concerned. As per the statistics for the recent years, the number of primary schools per lakh of population is lower than the state average in three out of five districts in North Maharashtra, the three districts being Nashik (67.96), Dhule (73.83) and Jalgaon (58.43). Ahmednagar (85.20) is just above the state average of 84.40. Nandurbar, the otherwise backward and primarily tribal district has 131.94 primary schools per lakh of population.

In 1982-83, of the then four districts in North Maharashtra, only Dhule (13128) was below the state average in respect of enrolment of students in primary schools per lakh of population. As per the statistics for the recent years, the number of students enrolled per lakh of population in primary schools is below the state average in all the five districts of North Maharashtra region, the lowest being Nandurbar (10820).

In 1982-83, out of the then four districts in the region, the district of Dhule (344) was below the state average, while Nashik was just at the same level as the state average as far as the number of primary teachers per lakh of population is concerned. As the statistics for the recent years reveals, all districts in North Maharashtra are below the state average as far as the number of primary teachers per lakh of population is concerned. Dhule (290) has the lowest primary teachers per lakh of population, not only in the North Maharashtra region but even in the state as whole. The only other district in the state with a similar position is Nagpur (290) in the Vidarbha region.

In 1982-83, out of the then four districts in the region, Dhule and Ahmednagar were below the state average in respect of the student-teacher ratio. In recent years, in North Maharashtra, of the five districts, Nandurbar (28.40) is lower (that is, better) and Ahmednagar (33.33) is marginally lower than the state average. The districts of Nashik, Dhule and Jalgaon are above (that is, worse than) the state average in student-teacher ratio. Thus, the position of these districts has worsened over the years in respect of the student-teacher ratio.

Konkan (Konkan Division)

Of the three districts in Konkan (excluding Greater Mumbai) in the year 1982-83, Thane (72.86) was below the state average, and that too markedly, as far as to the number of primary schools per lakh of population is concerned.. As per the statistics for the recent years, of the four districts in Konkan, Thane district (69.02) continues to be much below the state average in regard to the number of primary schools per lakh of population. The remaining three districts, namely, Raigad (137.55), Ratnagiri (164.70) and Sindhudurg (174.11) are much above the state average of 84.40.

In 1982-83, of the then three districts in this region, Thane (12135) was below the state average in respect of enrolment of students in primary schools per lakh of population. The data for the recent years shows that as regards the number of students enrolled per lakh of population, out of the four districts, three are below the state average. These three districts are Raigad (12270), Ratnagiri (11610) and Sindhudurg (10010). Only Thane district (15380) is above the state average of 12940. In Sindhudurg district, this number is the lowest in the Division.

As far as the number of primary teachers per lakh of population is concerned, Thane was quite below the state average in 1982-83. Even in recent

years, the number of primary teachers per lakh of population continues to be lower than the state average (390) only in Thane (340).

In 1982-83, Raigad and Ratnagiri districts in the region had a lower student-teacher ratio than the state average while Thane was above it. In recent years, Ratnagiri (21.89) and Sindhudurg (17.40) in Konkan are substantially lower (that is, better) than the state average in respect of the student teacher ratio. Sindhudurg has the lowest student teacher ratio in the state. Thane (44.68) continues to be substantially above (that is, worse) than the state average.

Western Maharashtra (Pune Division)

As regards the number of primary schools per lakh of population, only one out of the five districts in the region in 1982-83, namely, Satara was above the state average. As per the data for the recent years, of the five districts in the region, Pune (63.07), Sangli (72.99) and Kolhapur (62.02) had a smaller number of primary schools per lakh of population than the state average (84.40). Satara (102.14) and Solapur (103.43) were considerably above the state average.

In 1982-83, only Solapur district was below the state average as regards the enrolment of primary students per lakh of population. In recent years, the districts of Pune (10520), Kolhapur (10640) and Sangli (11380) were somewhat lower than the state average in this respect. Satara (9400) was markedly lower. Only Solapur district (16,000) was above the state average (13540).

Only Pune district had a lower number of primary teachers per lakh of population in the region compared to the state average in 1982-83. On the other hand, in recent years, in four out of the five districts, the number of primary teachers per lakh of population was lower than the state average (390). Solapur (440) was the only district

in Western Maharashtra which had a higher number of teachers per lakh of population than the state average.

In 1982-83, out of the five districts in the region, three districts, namely, Satara, Sangli and Solapur were below the state average. In recent years, in Western Maharashtra, of the five districts, three districts, namely, Kolhapur (31.25), Sangli (32.67) and Pune (33.09) are marginally and Satara (24) significantly below the state average. Solapur (36.24) is above (that is, worse) the state average. Thus its position has been reversed over the years.

(ii) Secondary Education:

Maharashtra

There were 9.92 secondary schools per lakh of population in 1982-83. Of the then 25 districts (excluding Mumbai) 13 were below the state average in this respect. As far as the data for the recent years is concerned, the average number of secondary schools per lakh of population for the state has improved markedly to 22.57. Of the 34 districts (excluding Mumbai) in the state, 14 are below the state average in this respect.

The average enrolment of students per lakh of population in secondary schools in 1982-83 stood at 5551.98. Thirteen out of then existing 25 districts (excluding Mumbai) in the state were below the state average in this regard. The average enrolment in secondary schools per lakh of population in recent years has also markedly increased to 10210 for the state. Eighteen of the 34 districts (excluding Mumbai) are below the state average.

There were 183 teachers in secondary schools per lakh of population in 1982-83. Of the 25 districts, 13 were below the state average in this respect. The number of teachers in secondary

schools per lakh of population in the state improved to 270 in recent years. Ten out of 34 districts are below the state average.

The average student-teacher ratio for the state worked out to 30.34 in secondary schools in 1982-83. Fifteen of the 25 districts were below (that is, better than) the state average, which means that 10 districts had student-teacher ratio worse than the state average. The average student-teacher ratio in secondary schools worsened to 37.84 over the years. Twenty six of the 34 districts had student-teacher ratio lower than the state average.

Vidarbha

The number of secondary schools per lakh of population has substantially increased in all the districts of the Vidarbha region from 1982-83 up to the recent past. In 1982-83, among the then existing eight districts of Vidarbha, only two districts of Bhandara and Chandrapur had a lower number of secondary schools per lakh of population compared to the average for the state. As per the current statistics, Washim and, marginally, Nagpur are the two districts which have a lower number of secondary schools per lakh of population compared to the average for the state.

As far as the number of enrolled students in secondary schools per lakh of population is concerned, the same has increased substantially, in all the districts of the Vidarbha region as well as for the average for the state during the last three decades, but in percentage terms, the increase in no district of Vidarbha is larger than that in the state average. Also, as per the current statistics, there is not even a single district with enrolment higher than the state average. In 1982-83, there were four such districts, namely, Akola, Amravati, Wardha and Nagpur having enrolment

higher than the state average with the district of Akola having an enrolment figure only marginally higher than the state average.

As regards the number of secondary teachers per lakh of population, the same has increased substantially in all the districts of the Vidarbha region as well as for the state as a whole. In 1982-83, the four districts of Buldhana, Yavatmal, Bhandara and Chandrapur had a lower number of secondary teachers per lakh of population compared to the average number for the state. The same number, as per the recent data, has gone up to six. These districts are Bhandara, Akola, Washim, Amravati, Chandrapur and Gadchiroli. In most of these districts, particularly in Washim and Chandrapur, the number of secondary teachers per lakh of population is substantially lower than the state average.

In 1982-83, of the then eight districts in Vidarbha, only one district, namely, Buldhana (29.75) had the student-teacher ratio below the state average. Akola (30.45) and Yavatmal (30.80) had student-teacher ratio which was marginally above the state average. As per the statistics for the recent years, Yavatmal (47.33) was markedly, while Buldhana (38.00) was only marginally above (that is, worse than) the state average in respect of the student-teacher ratio. The remaining nine out of 11 districts of the Vidarbha Division region had student-teacher ratio below the state average.

Marathwada (Aurangabad Division):

Of the then five districts of Marathwada, three districts, namely, Parbhani, Beed and Nanded were below the state average in 1982-83 in respect of the number of government and government-aided secondary schools per lakh of population. The district of Aurangabad was only marginally above the state average. For the recent years, out of the eight districts of the Aurangabad Division, five districts had a lower number of government

and government aided secondary and higher secondary schools per lakh of population than the state average. Of these, the two districts of Aurangabad (20.81) and Hingoli (20.97) were marginally lower. However, the remaining three districts of Parbhani (17.28), Nanded (16.27) and Jalna (13.39) were significantly below the state average. In fact, Jalna has the lowest number of secondary schools per lakh of population not only within the Division but in the entire state. Latur (26.06), Beed (28.18) and Osmanabad (28.33) are the three districts that are above the state average in this respect.

In 1982-83, four of the five districts in Marathwada had average enrolment of students in the government and government aided secondary schools lower than the state average. As far as the number of students enrolled in the government and government aided secondary as well as higher secondary schools in recent years is concerned, it is remarkable to note here that none of the eight districts in Marathwada region had enrollment above the state average. While the three districts of Latur (9,420), Beed (8,750) and Hingoli (9,730) were somewhat lower than the state average, the remaining five districts of Aurangabad (5,280), Parbhani (7,020), Nanded (3,620), Osmanabad (6,390) and Jalna (7,380) were markedly below the state average. In particular, district of Nanded had the lowest enrollment not only in the region but in the state.

In 1982-83, four out of the then five districts in Marathwada had lower than the average number of teachers in the government and government aided secondary as also and higher secondary schools for the state as a whole. It may be noted that Parbhani was substantially below the state average in 1982-83. In recent years, out of the eight districts of Marathwada region, the three districts of Parbhani (140), Nanded (140) and Jalna (190) were significantly below while the district of Hingoli (240) was just below the state average. The district of Osmanabad (270) had

exactly the same number of average teachers as that of for the state. Out of the remaining three, the two districts of Aurangabad (280), Latur (290) were marginally higher than the state average. The only district of Beed (320) had an average enrollment number of teachers per lakh of population that was substantially more than the state average.

In 1982-83, all the then five districts of Marathwada had a lower student - teacher ratio compared to the state average. In recent years, out of the eight districts of this region, Parbhani (50.52) was significantly above (that is, worse than) the state average. The district of Hingoli (40.00) was only marginally above the state average. The remaining six districts had student-teacher ratio below state average. Parbhani (50.52) was significantly above the state average. The other district of Hingoli (40.00) was only marginally above the state average.

North Maharashtra (Nashik Division):

Three out of the then existing four districts in the region, the average number of secondary schools per lakh of population was below the state average in 1982-83. As the data for the recent years shows, two of the five districts in this Division, namely, Nashik (20.57) and Jalgaon (22.56) had marginally lower number of government and government aided secondary as well as and higher secondary schools per lakh of population as compared to the state average (22.57). The other two districts of Dhule (23.83) and Ahmednagar (25.27) were slightly above the state average in this respect. The only district of Nandurbar (33.00) was significantly above the state average.

In 1982-83, only Dhule district of the region had a lower enrolment of students per lakh of population in secondary schools compared to the state average. In recent years also, out of the total five districts, only one district, namely, Nashik

(9,730) has the average enrollment of students in government and government aided secondary as well as and higher secondary schools below that of the state average (10,210). The three districts of Dhule (13,350), Jalgaon (11,050) and Nandurbar (11,510) were reasonably, while; the district of Ahmednagar (10,760) was only marginally above the state average in this respect.

As regards the number of teachers in the government and government aided secondary schools per lakh of population in 1982-83, only Dhule district in the region was below the state average. As far as the number of teachers in the government and government aided secondary as also and higher secondary schools per lakh of population in recent years is concerned, only Nashik district (260) appears to be slightly lower than the state average (270). Rest all the four districts of Dhule (410), Jalgaon (300), Nandurbar (300) and Ahmednagar (310) were noticeably above the state average.

As regards the student-teacher ratio, in 1982-83, only Ahmednagar district in the region was above (that is, worse than) the state average. In recent years, all the five districts of Nashik Division, although marginally, were below (that is, better than) the state average, in this respect.

Konkan (Konkan Division):

In 1982-83, of the then existing three districts (excluding Mumbai) of Konkan region, only Ratnagiri was above the state average as far as the number of government and government aided secondary schools is concerned. In recent years, of the four districts of this Division, two districts of Thane (20.97) and Ratnagiri (22.39) had a marginally lower number of government and government aided secondary as well as and higher secondary schools per lakh of population when compared to the state average (22.57). The other

two districts of Raigad (25.41) and Sindhudurg (24.05) were slightly above the state average in this respect.

In 1982-83, all the three districts in the region were below the state average in respect of the number of students enrolled in the government and government aided secondary schools per lakh of population. In recent years, as far as the number of students enrolled in the government and government aided secondary and higher secondary schools per lakh of population is concerned, the two districts of Ratnagiri (8,840) and Sindhudurg (8,860) were markedly, while, the third district of Raigad (10,140) was marginally below the state average (10,210). Only Thane district (13,920) had a markedly higher enrollment as compared to the state average.

In 1982-83, only Ratnagiri had a higher number of teachers in the government and government aided secondary schools per lakh of population compared to the state average. In recent years, when one looks at the number of teachers in the government and government aided secondary as also and higher secondary schools per lakh of population, the two districts of Thane (210) and Ratnagiri (240) are below the state average (270). The district of Raigad has exactly equal number of teachers per lakh of population as that of the state average. Only Sindhudurg district (350) has markedly higher number of teachers per lakh of population as compared to the state average.

In 1982-83, only Thane had a student-teacher ratio higher (that is, worse than) the state average. In recent years, out of the four districts of Konkan Division, only Thane (66.59) had a significantly higher student-teacher ratio compared with the state average. The two districts of Raigad (37.33) and Ratnagiri (37.50) were just below the state average, while; the other district of Sindhudurg (25.67) was markedly below the state average.

Only Thane (66.59) had a significantly higher student-teacher ratio when compared with the state average.

Western Maharashtra (Pune Division):

The number of government and government-aided secondary schools per lakh of population was lower than the state average in three out of five districts of the region in 1982-83. In recent years, out of the five districts of this Division, the district of Pune (15.19) was markedly below, while, the other district of Sangli (22.06) was only marginally below than the average number of government and government aided secondary as also and higher secondary schools per lakh of population at the state level (22.57). is concerned. Other two districts of Solapur (22.96) and Kolhapur (23.33) were marginally above the state average. Only Satara district (28.33) was quite above the state average in this Division.

Out of the five districts of the region in 1982-83, the enrolment of students in government and government aided secondary schools per lakh of population was lower than the state average in two districts, namely, Solapur and Kolhapur. In recent years, as far as enrolment of students in government and government aided secondary as well as and higher secondary schools per lakh of population is concerned, the two districts of Sangli (9,670) and Kolhapur (9,480) were noticeably below the state average (10,210). The other two districts of Satara (10,430) and Solapur (10,470) were only marginally above the state average. Pune district (13,350) had the highest enrolment in this Division.

The number of teachers in government and government aided secondary schools per lakh of population was lower than the state average again in the two districts of Solapur and Kolhapur in 1982-83. In recent years, when it comes to the number of teachers in government and government aided secondary as well as and higher

secondary schools per lakh of population, the district of Pune (190) had a markedly lesser number of teachers compared to the state average (270). While the three districts of Satara (360), Sangli (310) and Solapur (340) had a significantly higher number of teachers per lakh of population, the only the district of Kolhapur (280) was marginally above the state average.

As far as the student-teacher ratio is concerned, in 1982-83 only Pune district in the region was marginally above (that is, worse than) the state average. In recent years, among the five districts of Pune Division, the district of Pune (69.43) had the remarkably highest student-teacher ratio not only in the Division but in fact in the entire state. The remaining four districts of Satara, Sangli, Solapur and Kolhapur had student-teacher ratio somewhat below the state average. District of Pune (69.43) had remarkably the highest (that is, the worst) student-teacher ratio not only in the Division but in fact in the entire state.

(iii) Technical Education:

Industrial Training Institutes

Maharashtra

As far as the facility of Industrial Training Institutes provided by the government is concerned, the sanctioned strength in government Industrial Training Institutes (ITIs) per lakh of population stood at 49.17 as on 31 March 1983. 12 out of 25 districts in the state were below the state average. In the recent years, the average sanctioned strength in the government Industrial Training Institutes for the state stood at 87.12. While calculating this average for Maharashtra (excluding Greater Mumbai), the three districts namely, Solapur, Hingoli and Washim had to be excluded further on account of the fact that statistics pertaining to the sanctioned strength in government Industrial Training Institutes was not

reported in respect of these three districts. With this, 17 out of the 30 reporting districts of the state were below the state average in recent years.

Vidarbha

Five out of the then eight districts of Vidarbha were below the state average as far as the sanctioned strength in government Industrial Training Institutes in 1983 is concerned. As the data for recent years indicates, three out of the four reporting districts of the Amravati Division of Vidarbha were above the state average. The only district of Buldhana (80.11) continued to remain below the state average in this respect. As far as Nagpur Division of Vidarbha is concerned, as revealed by the data for recent years, five out of the six districts were above the state average as far as sanctioned strength per lakh of population in government Industrial Training Institutes is concerned. What is noteworthy is the case of Nagpur. The district of Nagpur which was above the state average in this respect in the year 1983 has now slipped below the state average in recent years. Further, the district of Gadchiroli (263) had the highest sanctioned strength not only within the Division but in the entire state.

Marathwada (Aurangabad Division)

Four out of the then five districts of Marathwada, were below the state average in 1983 as far as the number of sanctioned strength per lakh of population in government Industrial Training Institutes is concerned. The only district of Osmanabad (49.67) was only marginally above the state average. As per the data for recent years, all the seven reporting districts of the eight districts of Marathwada were below the state average.

North Maharashtra (Nashik Division)

Two out of the then four districts of Nashik Division were below the state average in 1983 in

respect of sanctioned strength per lakh of population in government Industrial Training Institutes. These were Jalgaon (38.80) and Ahmednagar (31.90). Statistics for the recent years indicates that, five out of the four districts lie below the state average in this respect. The only district above the state average was the newly created district of Nandurbar (117) and that was much above the state average.

Konkan (Konkan Division)

As far as the sanctioned strength per lakh of population in government Industrial Training Institutes is concerned, two of the then three districts of Konkan Division (excluding Greater Mumbai) were above the state average in 1983. While, Raigad (60) was notably above the state average, the other district of Thane (49.17) was on par with the state average in this respect. Statistics for the recent years indicates that, three out of the four districts of this Division, the only district of Thane (86.08), which was on par with the state average earlier, was only marginally below the state average.

Western Maharashtra (Pune Division)

Four of the five districts of Pune Division were above the state average as far as the sanctioned strength per lakh of population in government Industrial Training Institutes is concerned in 1983. The only district of Solapur (28.19) in this Division was much below the state average. As the data for recent years for four out of the five reporting districts of the Division indicates, three of them were below the state average in respect of sanctioned strength per lakh of population in government Industrial Training Institutes. The only district of Satara (131) appeared to be much above the state average.

(iv) Public Health:**(a) Government and Government-aided Hospitals****Maharashtra**

There were 7.14 Government and Government-aided hospitals per million population in urban and rural areas of Maharashtra in recent years. In 1982-83, there were 8.32 hospitals per million population in urban and rural areas of the state. Thus, the overall situation in respect of provision of hospital facilities by the government seems to have somewhat deteriorated.

Vidarbha

As far as Hospitals are concerned, the state average (excluding Greater Mumbai) is 7.14 as per the latest available statistics. This average for the State stood at 4.94 in 1961. Akola was the only district from the Vidarbha region which was lying below the state average then. The number of districts below the State average increased to two in 1981. At that time, the state average was 8.32 hospitals per million of population. In the prevailing situation, Akola (6.13) and Bhandara (7.04) are the two districts of the Vidarbha region which are below the state average of 7.14 hospitals per million of population. Gadchiroli has the highest rank with 13.40 hospitals per million of population.

Marathwada (Aurangabad Division)

Out of the then five districts in this region, only Aurangabad (8.63) was somewhat above the state average in that year. The remaining four districts of the region namely, Nanded (4.57), Osmanabad (4.48), Beed (3.36) and Parbhani (2.73) were below the state average. As the situation stands in the recent years, five districts out of eight, namely, Latur (6.25), Beed (6.94) Nanded (6.26), Osmanabad (6.73) and Hingoli (5.07) were below

the state average. Two districts, namely, Parbhani (7.20) and Jalna (7.44) were only marginally above the state average. While, Aurangabad (11.5) had the highest number of hospitals per million of population in the Division, the other three districts of Beed, Nanded and Osmanabad have continued to remain below the state average in respect of this facility.

North Maharashtra (Nashik Division)

Out of the then four districts in this region, the only district of Nashik (8.36) was only slightly above the state average in 1983. The remaining three districts namely Ahmednagar (7.38), Dhule (7.32) and Jalgaon (5.73) were below the state average. As far as the position in recent years is concerned, out of the five districts in this Division, three districts of Dhule (7.03), Jalgaon (6.24) and Ahmednagar (6.43) have continued to remain below the state average. Nashik (7.41) was marginally above. Nandurbar (14.48) had the highest number of hospitals per million of population in the Division.

Konkan (Konkan Division)

As far as the situation in the year 1983 is concerned, out of the then three districts in this region (excluding Greater Mumbai), the only district of Raigad (8.75) was marginally above the state average. In recent years, out of four districts, Raigad (6.79) was marginally and Thane (3.69) was substantially below the state average. Ratnagiri (8.25) was only marginally above. Sindhudurg (12.66) had the highest number of hospitals per million of population in the Division.

Western Maharashtra (Pune Division)

In the year 1983, the district of Pune (11.29) was markedly while the other district of Solapur (8.43) was somewhat above the state average. In recent years, four out of five districts in the

Division are below the state average. They are: Pune (6.64), Satara (6.41), Solapur (4.42) and Kolhapur (7.10). Sangli (7.74) was marginally above the state average.

Considering the state as a whole, Parbhani (2.73), Beed (3.36), Osmanabad (4.48) and Nanded (5.44) were at a great disadvantage as far as the facility of Government and Government aided hospitals are concerned in the year 1983. As far as the situation in recent years is concerned, Thane (3.69), Solapur (4.42) and Hingoli (5.07) were markedly at a disadvantaged position in respect of Government and Government-aided hospitals.

(b) Government and Government-aided Dispensaries

Maharashtra

There were 2.44 government and government aided dispensaries per lakh of population in urban and rural areas of Maharashtra in recent years. The same number stood at 2.85 in the year 1982-83.

Vidarbha

The number of Government dispensaries per lakh of population stood at 1.53 for the Vidarbha region in the year 1961. This number went up to 4.52 in the year 1981. However, the state average declined to 2.44 as per the recent available statistics. The number of Government dispensaries per lakh of population has also declined for all the districts of the Vidarbha region, except for Nagpur. The districts of Yavatmal, Wardha and Bhandara were markedly lagging behind in this respect in the year 1961. Districts of Buldhana and Amravati were in a relatively good position in this respect in the year 1981. Bhandara too joined their rank in 1981. However, the recent statistics provides quite a changed picture. Out of the total eleven districts of the Vidarbha region,

Akola and particularly Yavatmal and Chandrapur and the newly created districts of Washim and Gadchiroli seem to be at a disadvantageous position as far as this facility is concerned. Amravati, Buldhana, Wardha, Nagpur, Bhandara and Gondia are today's better off districts. However, a special mention must be made of Chandrapur. The district of Chandrapur occupied the top most rank in 1961 not only within the Vidarbha region but in the entire State with 2.42 dispensaries per lakh of population. Now the same district lies at the bottom third position.

Marathwada (Aurangabad Division)

In Marathwada region, out of the then five districts, only district namely Nanded (4.17) was noticeably above the state average. The remaining four districts of Aurangabad, Parbhani, Beed and Osmanabad were below the state average. As far as the picture in the recent years is concerned, all the eight districts were below the state average in this respect. Especially Parbhani (0.72) and Jalna (0.74) were the most disadvantaged ones.

North Maharashtra (Nashik Division)

Out of the then four districts of this region, the two districts namely Dhule (3.32) and Jalgaon (2.94) were somewhat above the state average. As far as the statistics for recent years is concerned, all the five districts of this Division were below the state average (2.44) in respect of the number of dispensaries per lakh of population. Markedly disadvantaged district in this respect in this Division is Ahmednagar (0.22).

Konkan (Konkan Division)

Of the three districts in this region (excluding Greater Mumbai), the two districts of Raigad (3.50) and Ratnagiri (3.60) were above the state average. As far as the situation in recent years is concerned, all the four districts namely Thane

(0.55), Raigad (0.91), Ratnagiri (0.41) and Sindhudurg (1.38) were far below the state average.

Western Maharashtra (Pune Division)

Out of the five districts of the region, two districts namely Satara (2.99) and Sangli (3.88) were above the state average in the year 1983. In the recent years, all the five districts of the region have slipped much below the state average.

As far as state as a whole is concerned, 11 out of 25 districts (excluding Greater Mumbai) were above the state average in the year 1983. Statistics for the recent years shows that, only six districts out of 34 are above the state average in respect of the facility of Government dispensaries is concerned.

(c) Primary Health Centres

Maharashtra

There were 15.24 primary health centres per million of population in the rural as well as urban areas of the state in the year 1982-83. In recent years, this number has increased up to 22.17.

Vidarbha

The situation looks much soothing in respect of the availability of Primary Health Centres (PHCs). The number of PHCs per million of population stood at 8.11 for the entire State in the year 1961. This number went up to 15.24 in the year 1981. As per the recent statistics, the number of PHCs per million of population stood at 22.17 at the State level. Seven out of the eight districts of the Vidarbha region were below the state average in the year 1961. In 1981, five out of eight districts of the Vidarbha region had average number of PHCs per million of population below the state average. As the current statistics indicate, four districts, namely, Akola (20.25), Amravati

(21.48), Wardha (21.83) and Nagpur (12.06) have a lower number of PHCs per million of population than the state average. The district of Gadchiroli records the highest figure of 46.39 PHCs per million of population.

Marathwada (Aurangabad Division)

All the five districts those existed in this region in the year 1983 were above the state average. As far as the situation in recent years is concerned, except the two districts of Parbhani (20.29) and Latur (22.12) remaining six districts are above the state average. However, the district of Aurangabad (22.78) is only marginally above the state average.

North Maharashtra (Nashik Division)

Out of the then four districts in this region, the only district of Dhule (16.58) was somewhat above the state average in the year 1985. The other three districts namely Nashik, Jalgaon and Ahmednagar were below the state average. As far as recent position is concerned, out of the five districts of this region, Nashik (20.62) and Jalgaon (20.91) continue to remain below the state average.

Konkan (Konkan Division)

Out of the then three districts in this region (excluding Greater Mumbai), the two districts namely Raigad (22.20) and Ratnagiri (20.84) were above the state average. The remaining district of Thane (8.95) was much below the state average. As the data for recent years indicates, the district of Thane (15) continues to remain below the state average markedly. The other three districts are now above the state average.

Western Maharashtra (Pune Division)

Out of the five districts of this region, the three districts namely Pune (17.29), Kolhapur (15.56)

and Sangli (15.29) were above the state average in 1983. As per the statistics for recent years, the two districts of Satara (25.28) and Sangli (22.83) are above the state average while the remaining three districts are below the state average.

As far as state as a whole is concerned, 14 out of 25 districts (excluding Greater Mumbai) were above the state average in the year 1983. As the statistics for recent years reveals, 21 out of 34 districts in the state are above the state average.

5. State Budget for 2009-10 and Regional Backlog

On the other hand, the Finance Minister of Maharashtra, in the State Budget for 2009-10 states:

"8. Backlog.

The State Government has provided from time to time required funds to eliminate the backlog of Rs. 14,006 crore as assessed by the Indicators and Backlog Committee in 1994. Since 2004, Democratic Front Government has provided significantly large amount to eliminate the backlog. In the Legislative Session of December 2008 at Nagpur, I had announced that the entire backlog would be removed during the year 2009-10. Accordingly, I feel pleasure in announcing that the entire backlog for the Irrigation sector has been removed. The backlog for Irrigation sector as assessed on 1st April, 2009 is Rs. 947.76 crore and in 2009-10 complete provision has been made to remove the backlog. Besides this, out of the remaining 8 sectors, the backlog for Roads, General Education, Water Supply, Soil and Water Conservation, Crop Husbandry and Energisation of Agricultural Pump-sets has been eliminated. Of the remaining three sectors, for the remaining backlog as assessed on 1st April, 2009 of Public Health (Rs. 807.51 crore), Technical Education (Rs. 40.49 crore) and Animal Husbandry (0.36 crore) necessary amount has been provided in the current year as per the directives of the Hon'ble Governor.

8.1. An outlay of Rs. 8,170.71 crore has been made available for the Water Resources Department for 2009-10. Taking into account, the amount allocated to Hydel Projects, Kharlands, Flood Control, World Bank assisted projects, a sum of Rs. 1,607.42 crore for Vidarbha, Rs. 1,083.38 crore for Marathwada and Rs. 3,064.21 crore for rest of Maharashtra including Kokan and Tapi so in total Rs. 5,755 crore has been made available for ongoing projects."

6. Other Issues of Regional Development

(i) Agricultural Development with Special Reference to Cotton Growing

The Planning Commission Team on Vidarbha reported: "At the village level where meetings were often held on any open space next to the roadside due to lack of any other place, people were generally of the opinion that they needed irrigation, power to electrify their pump sets and needed more sanctions for wells to be constructed. They felt that the Government had 'deserted' them by withdrawing Monopoly Procurement [of cotton]. Another oft repeated complaint was that the input dealers have provided seeds for cotton with the information that this would grow best in irrigated conditions written in very small letters so they felt cheated at not having been able to protect themselves. According to the farmers they got much less yield than earlier and felt that 3 quintals an acre was too little to meet the cost of inputs which included pesticides after the initial 90 days of protection from Bollworm was over. With prices at only Rs. 1700/- a quintal after the removal of the Monopoly Procurement of cotton by the State Government, they could hardly survive was their sentiment. (The MSP fixed by the CACP for 2005-06 in respect of Short Staple (J-34) cotton is Rs. 1760/- per quintal and for Long Staple (H-4) is Rs. 1980/- per quintal).

On being asked whether they should shift from cotton there was strong resentment. They did not wish to get into supplementary farm activities as even the price of milk was not enough for them to make a profit".

The Report further states: "Regarding distress in rural areas, the *official versions* [Emphasis added] at Divisional and State level amongst officers and politicians was that cotton is no longer remunerative due to heavy export subsidy by United States; similar subsidies by European producers leading to depression of international prices. Low international prices have a dampening effect on domestic cotton prices. They further feel that Monopoly Procurement Scheme has been correctly withdrawn as the Maharashtra Cotton Federation has been running into over Rs. 5000/- crore losses".

(ii) Employment under State Government, Local Bodies and Main Public Undertaking Institutions

As per the Evaluation Report of the Joint

Committee of the Development Boards, constituted by the Governor, which submitted its Report in 1998, the representation of employees in service of the state government, Zilla Parishads and MSRTC and MSEB in the three regions at that time were fairly in proportion with the population of the respective Development Boards. A similar position obtained in respect of employment in the service of the state government in Grade A, Grade B, Grade C, Grade D and work-charged categories as well as Zilla Parishads and MSRTC and MSEB, except that the percentage of employees in MSRTC in Vidarbha was less than the percentage of population in Vidarbha. The position in regard to total employment in the service of the state government, local bodies and the main public undertakings was as shown in the Table 8 below.

Table 8. Development Board Area-wise Representation in Employment under State Government, Local Bodies and Main Public Undertaking Institutions in 1998

(In percentage)					
Particulars	Type	Rest of Maharashtra	Marathwada	Vidarbha	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Population percentages	Total	61.74	16.22	22.04	100.00
Service of State Government	Total	55.69	17.04	27.27	100.00
	Grade-A	47.53	18.43	34.04	100.00
	Grade-B	43.54	16.67	36.79	100.00
	Grade-C	58.39	15.57	26.04	100.00
	Grade-D	55.37	18.28	26.35	100.00
	Work-Charged	42.88	22.25	34.87	100.00
					(6, 12,848)
Zilla Parishad	Rural Population	54.24	20.66	25.10	100.00
	Total Employment	45.36	22.77	31.87	100
MSRTC	Total Employment	63.68	17.21	19.11	100.00
MSEB	Total Employment	53.64	17.12	29.24	100.00
					(1.10 lakhs)
					(93,000)

Source: Bulletin, Rest of Maharashtra Board publication, quoted in Government of India (2003)

(iii) Reservations

Employment opportunities for persons in Vidarbha and Marathwada areas, particularly for those under reservations, are at present available in other parts of the State. If Vidarbha is made a

separate state, reservations in employment and admissions to educational institutions for persons from SC/ST communities domiciled in there, will no longer remain available in the rest of Maharashtra. While employment opportunities in Vidarbha may improve somewhat compared to

now, if it is made a separate state, the loss of employment opportunities and admissions in educational institutions, under reservations, in other parts of Maharashtra will be a major problem for people living in Vidarbha region, although the reservations for SC/ST candidates can be increased in proportion to their higher proportions in population in that region in that eventuality.

(iv) Employment in the Private sector

What information is available about regional distribution of employment in the private sector? An important point is: Since jobs are available for the people from Vidarbha largely in other parts of Maharashtra, this has been greatly disturbing family life in Vidarbha due to large scale migration of younger population away from home. Of course, the same is happening everywhere due to the forces of globalisation as well.

(v) Forest Lands and Environment

As per the Forest Survey of India, 2009, Vidarbha has 27.71 per cent of its land area under forest, whereas Maharashtra State as a whole has only 16.46 per cent of its total land under forest cover, and 19.54 per cent under forest and tree cover which is much lower than the norm of 33 per cent forest and tree cover for the country, insisted upon by the environmentalists and prescribed under the National Forest Policy, 1988, of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India. Vidarbha has 32 per cent of Maharashtra's geographical area but over 53 per cent of its forest cover and 95 per cent of its very dense forest (See Table 9). This geographical fact has vital implications for the possibility of

development of Vidarbha region within Maharashtra. If all the projects of irrigation and industrial development in Vidarbha are immediately implemented, the forest cover for Maharashtra State as a whole would substantially further go down whereas that for Vidarbha considered separately would go down only by 1 percentage point. (Prakash Ambedkar, in Loksatta, 14 February 2010). For this reason alone, if not for other political and economic reasons, these projects in Vidarbha have languished for lack of approval from the Forest and Environment Department of the State. While this problem would get resolved for Vidarbha if it were to become a separate State, this also highlights how important it is for the politicians and the public from the other regions of Maharashtra to understand how critically they are dependent on Vidarbha for their development, and how costly the neglect of and injustice in the development of Vidarbha is going to be for them. If nothing else, it seems essential that the problem of the development of Vidarbha should immediately be de-linked from the question of retaining adequate forest cover for the State as a whole, by insisting on the State Government and the other Statutory Development Boards in the State to build in plans for forestation along with the development projects in regions other than Vidarbha.

After the July 10, 2009 Supreme Court Order on utilisation of funds amounting to about Rs. 9,900 crore of principal amount and Rs. 1,300 crore of interest so far frozen with the Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority (CAMPA), there is enhanced opportunity for all states to obtain additional grants for conservation, protection, regeneration and management of existing forests and wildlife,

Table 9. District-wise Forest Cover in 2007
Number of Districts: 35

(area in sq. kms.)

District	Geographic al Area	Very dense forest	Moderately dense forest	Open forest	Total	% of GA	Change*	Scrub
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Ahmednagar	17048	0	69	217	286	1.68	0	555
Akola	5390	11	96	215	322	5.97	0	8
Amravati	12210	655	1455	1077	3187	26.10	0	116
Aurangabad	10107	19	101	437	557	5.51	0	193
Bhandara	3588	130	546	215	891	24.83	0	21
Bid	10693	0	13	162	175	1.64	0	357
Buldhana	9661	23	137	429	589	6.10	0	163
Chandrapur	11443	1342	1592	1140	4074	35.60	-9	56
Dhule	7189	0	70	251	321	4.47	0	103
Gadchiroli	14412	4733	3396	1966	10095	70.05	1	20
Gondia	5733	884	824	303	2011	35.08	0	37
Hingoli	4686	0	10	104	114	2.43	0	47
Jalgaon	11765	52	363	770	1185	10.07	0	69
Jalna	7718	1	16	48	65	0.84	0	55
Kolhapur	7685	65	1038	672	1775	23.10	0	88
Latur	7157	0	0	5	5	0.07	0	25
Mumbai City	157	0	0	2	2	1.27	0	0
Mumbai Suburban	446	0	62	58	120	26.91	0	0
Nagpur	9892	372	953	698	2023	20.45	2	77
Nanded	10528	60	434	420	914	8.68	0	128
Nandurbar	5961	0	418	796	1214	20.37	0	30
Nashik	15530	0	351	738	1089	7.01	0	319
Osmanabad	7569	0	3	40	43	0.57	0	49
Parbhani	6355	0	4	46	50	0.79	0	49
Pune	15643	0	757	975	1732	11.07	0	493
Raigad	7152	13	1248	1603	2864	40.04	0	70
Ratnagiri	8208	33	1911	2255	4199	51.16	-1	2
Sangli	8572	0	95	49	144	1.68	0	156
Satara	10480	119	569	588	1276	12.18	0	365
Sholapur	14895	0	8	39	47	0.32	0	50
Sindhudurg	5207	89	1372	1112	2573	49.41	-3	47
Thane	9558	0	1281	1631	2912	30.47	0	222
Wardha	6309	10	419	430	859	13.62	-1	62
Washim	5184	5	113	214	332	6.40	0	28
Yavatmal	13582	123	1110	1372	2605	19.18	0	97
Maharashtra	307,713	8,739	20,834	21,077	50,650	16.46	-11	4157
Vidarbha	97404	8288	10641	8059	26988	27.71	-7	685
	31.65	94.84	51.08	38.24	53.28			

* Change compared to 2005 assessment (revised).

Source: *India State of Forest Report, Forest Survey of India, 2009.*

compensatory afforestation, infrastructure development and environmental services including provision of goods such as non-timber forest products, fuel, fodder and water. The Supreme Court has ruled that 10 per cent of the accumulated principal amount will be released per year (for the next five years) by the Ad-Hoc CAMPA Authority set up by the Supreme Court Order of May 2006 under the chairmanship of DG-Forests to State CAMPAs. This money will be used for projects identified by the State CAMPA. In addition to the above, out of the interest received / accrued so far with the Ad hoc CAMPA, a suitable amount, with the permission of the Supreme Court, will be retained by the Ad hoc CAMPA and will be utilised for setting up of institutes, societies, centres of excellence in the field of forest and wildlife, pilot schemes, standardisation of codes/ guidelines, etc., for the sector.

The question is how keen will the States of Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh be for utilising such opportunities to address the questions of appropriate development of forest rich regions like Vidarbha and Telangana?

(vi) Economic Viability and Inter-dependence

On the other hand, it should also be pointed out that if Vidarbha were to be considered as a separate State, the development of its power and irrigation sectors and industrial development may require large amounts of capital. Some of the districts of Vidarbha region are also affected by Naxalite problems. While development of agriculture and forestry sectors and honest efforts for tribal welfare is the main answer to the Naxalite movements in these areas, immediate requirement of expenditure on Police and Central Reserve Police Force for maintenance of law and order cannot be overlooked. Thus, we have to give a serious thought as to whether separating Vidarbha from Maharashtra may not result in creating two States, one heavily dependent

financially on Central assistance and the other on the city of Mumbai. The economies of Greater Mumbai, Vidarbha, and other regions of Maharashtra are complementary to one another and inter-dependent, and neglect or separation of anyone of them from the others is likely to be detrimental to the development of all of them.

As far as the powers of mobilising resources are concerned, in respect of raising additional tax resources, the states would have relatively less autonomy after the proposal for Goods and Services Tax (GST) is implemented, to the extent that the rates of taxation of goods and services are expected to be made uniform among all the States, though it should be emphasised that this proposal is certainly desirable as being a step towards making the country a common market. After GST is introduced, the mobilisation of tax revenue by the states will depend more on the resource base, level and the nature of economic activity and the effort at improving tax compliance within the State. If an economy of a region is largely dominated by agriculture and forestry, for example in Vidarbha, it may find it relatively difficult to raise own tax revenue. As far as the non-tax revenues are concerned, however, the new states may be able to garner resources obtained from return on investments made by the state, royalties on their mineral resources, forestry and wildlife, commercial operations undertaken by the states, and user charges from irrigation and other services, for the development of their own regions. On the other hand, as in the case of Bihar after Jharkhand was separated this could leave the economies of the States without such possibilities relatively weakened.

(vii) Regional Development Boards

Independently of the size and the character of any State, the problem of balanced regional (and social) development will remain a concern in the context of every State; and it is necessary to consider how to improve the mechanisms and

arrangements to monitor and ensure satisfactory progress of development within each State from the point of view of balanced development.

Even though the Constitutional Amendment providing for setting up the Regional Development Boards was passed at the time of the re-organisation of States in 1956 and although the Report of the Dandekar Committee had brought out serious problems of regional imbalances in regional development in 1984, it was only in 1994 that the Statutory Regional Developments for Vidarbha, Marathwada and the Rest of Maharashtra were set up in Maharashtra.

In order to make the plan formulation more participatory by the regional development boards for their respective areas, the Chairmen of the Development Boards are appointed as a members of the State Planning Board. The members of the Development Boards are also appointed as member of the district planning committees in all the districts of the region. The Executive Chairman of the State Planning Board is also appointed as a member of the three Development Boards. At the State level also, the regional development boards have been associated in the formulation of State Level Plan.

A Report of the Planning Commission evaluating the working of the Statutory Development Boards in Maharashtra in 2003 concluded:

Keeping in view the possibility of its replicability, it would be useful to bring together the following lessons of Maharashtra Model for wider dissemination and ready reference.

Decentralisation of the planning process helps in articulation and prioritisation of the local development needs as also in the assessment of local resources and development potential.

Establishment of decentralised institutions, however, is only a necessary condition for accommodating regional needs and aspirations in the planning process, but not a sufficient one.

One important responsibility of the Boards was to ensure equitable allocation of development funds for balanced development across regions. However, instead of focusing on substantive development issues, the functions of the Boards got oriented towards computing the relative levels of availability in socio-economic infrastructure across regions...

Each region has a different natural endowment and hence different material growth potential. Undue focus on attaining balanced infrastructure growth without reference to the regional potentials and needs can lead to both inappropriate development strategies and inefficient use of development resources. In fact, the regional Boards have sometimes recommended for investment in some sectors without properly analysing the development potentials and economic implications of public investment decisions. Such a trend has to be arrested and the issue of sectoral infrastructure backlog removal should not be stretched beyond 2006, as desired by the Governor.

The Boards have been concerned with computation of infrastructure backlogs in the (government) public sector and want backlogs to be removed by public investment alone. ...The government need not be assumed to be the only provider of facilities or services. A broader approach to include the facilities available with other development partners and the role that they could play in development would be more appropriate.

Undue pre-occupation of the Boards with computation of disparities in infrastructure has often led them to look for methodological twists that would give their regions a larger share of the Backlog Fund...".

However, the Planning Commission Team, which conducted an in-depth study of the problems of Vidarbha region in 2006, concluded differently:

"The team strongly recommends considered measures be explored for ensuring that the commitment of funds in the Budget see the light of actual implementation. In the first instance the team feels that a strong monitoring mechanism under the Chief Minister be put into place.

The State Government may consider positioning an Administrator of the seniority of the Chief Secretary of the State to oversee the functioning of these delegated powers.

The Development Board of Vidarbha should be strengthened".

The Vidarbha Statutory Development Board, whose term was due to expire on April 30, 2010, has sought extension of its term. The State Government has sought and has now been given an extension for the Statutory Development Boards for a period of five years.

Some of the issues raised in the above evaluation by the Planning Commission may need to be fully examined to see if the functioning of the Statutory Regional Development Boards needs to be changed.

(viii) Empowerment of the Local Bodies

One answer to the question of balanced development of all the regions of the State of Maharashtra as probably that of the different

regions of all the States in India is greater empowerment of the third tiers of government, through a better compliance by the States of the 73rd and 74th Amendments of the Constitution, with a much fuller devolution of functions, funds and functionaries to the third tiers of government. This would also answer the criticism that the present arrangement of Regional Statutory Development Boards focus attention only on imbalances in development only at the level of the regions, and does not address the question of imbalances in development at the district (or lower) levels (Ratnakar Mahajan, *People's Politics*, July 2010). This is likely to answer, to some extent, not only the question of balanced development of the regions but, in fact, that of the balanced development within each region with necessary attention to local needs. Even here, it is an open question as to whether newer States are more likely to be inclined to legislate such changes than the existing ones, or not.

It must also be added that where large-scale projects such as major and medium irrigation projects or projects for development of hydel power and laying of transmission and distribution networks are concerned, these are likely to extend beyond one or a few districts, and policy and planning at the State level are going to be relevant and merely devolution of powers to the third tier will not suffice. When the existing state governments and legislatures are not sensitive to the requirements and just demands of some of its regions, this would give rise to demands for statehood by the neglected regions. Irrigation development of river basins within states has to provide for water distribution across regions within the states at least as fairly as the likely distribution which may result from inter-state awards of similar kind in such situations.

III.2. Telangana

(A) Regional Issues in Development

(i) Revenues from Telangana used for other regions

'The revenue from Telangana region (excluding Hyderabad) has formed more than half of Andhra Pradesh's total income in recent years (2003-04 to 2006-07). Seventy five per cent of total sales tax revenues and 66 per cent of total excise revenue come from Telangana and at least 44 per cent of income from forest resources comes from the region. Thus, it is evident that Telangana contributes a higher share of revenue to Andhra Pradesh, but the expenditure on the region and its people is far less [Rao and Shastry, 2009]" [Melkote et al., 2010]

(ii) Influx of migrants

After the reorganisation of the Andhra Pradesh State in 1956, the influx of migrants from the Andhra region into the Telangana region gathered a much greater momentum, with the migrants securing civil service posts because of the better facilities for English education and experience in British administrative procedures, and also acquiring lands from the local farmers on a large scale for residential purposes and for non-agricultural development, including for developing Special Economic Zones in recent years.

(iii) Neglect of irrigation development of Telangana region

Melkote et al., [2010] and K. Kannabiran et al., [EPW, 2010] also bring out the neglect of irrigation development of Telangana region. A large number of irrigation projects in Telangana are incomplete or have been abandoned. Of the 806 thousand million cubic (TMC) feet of Krishna water, Telangana projects have been allotted 266.83 TMC of water, against its due

share of 552 TMC, which is decided according to the proportion of river flow area and cultivable land in the region, but in fact receives much less. "Mahboobnagar, known for its very high levels of distress, migration and perennial drought, should have got 187 TMC of water, but has received nothing till now". Coastal Andhra districts receive 388.44 TMC, several times more than its due share of 99 TMC. Similarly, while 78 per cent of the catchments area of Godavari is in Telangana, the utilisation of Godavari water in Telangana is minimal [Kannabiran et al., 2010].

The highly evolved traditional system of tank irrigation, connecting streams, tanks, and open wells to farmers' fields which was historically important for the chronically drought-prone Telangana region and contributed 62.5 per cent of the area under irrigation in 1960, which plummeted to 18.6 per cent in 2000 due to complete neglect by successive governments of maintenance and upkeep of tanks, which depends on public investment. On the other hand, the canal irrigation system of Godavari and Krishna rivers, which is the main source of irrigation in coastal Andhra, is constructed and maintained through public investment. Therefore, unlike coastal Andhra, in large parts of Telangana, bulk of irrigation now is through ground water and deep tube wells. Lack of adequate irrigation has made farming risky in Telangana. Telangana accounts for two-thirds of the total number of suicides reported in the state between 1998 and 2006.

Even though Telangana has been allocated a larger share of the expenditure on irrigation compared to its share in the State's population in recent years, this is not adequate since "compared to coastal Andhra, the unit cost of irrigation is higher in Telangana (as it is situated on the Deccan plateau) as lifting of water requires huge investments in pumping machinery and power" [Melkote et al., p. 10].

At the same time, paradoxically, state agriculture policies gave preference to water-intensive crops, with the result that cropping pattern in Telangana underwent a drastic change from food crops like jowar, bajra, pulses, oilseeds suitable to semi-arid regions like Telangana and crops which produced staple foods and fodder for animals to water-intensive cash crops like cotton, castor, sunflower, sugarcane, and chillies. Rice that used to be cultivated under tanks and open wells is now cultivated with bore wells, which are dug at huge private costs, are operated with extremely uncertain and expensive electric power, and often go dry [Kannabiran et al., 2010].

(iv) Neglect of handloom weavers

The traditional weavers in Telangana (Pad-mashalis) had to shut down their looms because of withdrawal of subsidies and schemes for weavers from Telangana. Their profession became unviable because they have now to compete with power-loomed cloth, which is priced lower. They say that "the situation for weavers in Andhra is different, they get some support, some loans, some programmes..." They believe that when Telangana comes, it will have programmes and schemes to sustain their occupation so that once again they can produce cloth for their people [Kannabiran et al., 2010]. Whether all this would happen, if Telangana becomes a separate state, is a moot question.

(v) Neglect of Tribal Development

According to the account presented by K. Kannabiran et al., [2010], the tribals in Telangana also support the demand for a separate state. They quote various Adivasi leaders and activists: "Our demand has been ...[our village our rule] and ...[water, forest, land are ours]... Our concerns are around the rights to our resources, the right to self-rule, according to our customs, traditions and the constitution. Our rights are constantly under threat. Adivasis of Telangana first have to contend

with Lambadas who migrated to Telangana from Maharashtra, and then there are traders and sahu-kars from Andhra, as also the non-tribal of Telangana. The Andhra Pradesh Scheduled Areas Land Transfer Regulation Act 1 of 1970 has not been implemented effectively, and the government failed to prevent the occupation of our lands. Similarly, our rights to forests have not yet been recognised, though we have fought for the Forest Rights Act (The Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights Act, 2006(2/2007)). We support Telangana because it is just a demand for self-rule. The demand for self-rule in Telangana now has been our slogan, and our demand all along". "The Gram Sabhas as per the Forest Rights Act and the Panchayati raj Extension to Scheduled Areas Act were not carried out". "The new Telangana state should draw upon the recommendations of Haimendorf, which resulted in the creation of a Chenchu Reserve in 1942 covering 100,000 acres in Amrabad area of erstwhile Hyderabad State. If such a reserve is re-established, only then will we be liberated. Otherwise whether we are in Andhra Pradesh or Telangana, makes no difference if the rulers persist in their policies and legislations to relocate us from our homelands". "We support Telangana completely, as this will mean the end of Polavaram dam! It means the survival of the Koya tribe. The majority of the villages getting displaced lie in Khammam, Telangana". Will all this happen if a separate Telangana state is created? Will the question of tribal development be handled more sensitively in a separate Telangana state, or for that matter, more generally, in any new states which may be created?

A general question, which is relevant in this context, is whether the whole question of development of local resources will be handled sensitively and effectively for the benefit of the local population in the new states, if they are created?

(B) Issues relating to cultural/ethnic/linguistic/regional identities

While the main grievance in Vidarbha is its neglect in Maharashtra in respect of development, especially in the fields of irrigation, power and coal and a need for more sensitive agricultural and forest development policies with the consequent demand for greater autonomy in policy making through statehood, the problems of Telangana voiced through intense movements for statehood over a long period go much beyond the question of development per se. "This is a struggle for life, resources, language, culture. ...Regional disparities, political cultural domination, and the development of underdevelopment in Telangana region over several decades have fuelled unrest and widespread anger. At the present moment, however, there has been a marked shift in the articulation of the demand from the 'facts and figures' of underdevelopment (part of the Telangana common sense today) to more deeply political questions of self-respect" [Kannabiran, 2010, p. 70].

Telangana at the time of its merger with Andhra State in 1956 had a multi-lingual cosmopolitan culture, with a distinct identity of its own, different from that in the Andhra region of the State. It is claimed [Jadhav, 2010] that "the coastal elites ... imagine that their Telugu is the 'real Telugu' and have treated Telangana 'as their colony'.

Public backing for the demands for statehood:

It is undeniable that the pro-Telangana sentiment among the electorate in Telangana region is very intense. In the by-elections in Telangana to Andhra Pradesh Assembly, held as recently as during July 2010, out of 12 seats, the Telangana Rashtra Samiti (TRS) won 11 seats and the 12th seat went to the BJP candidate supported by TRS, even though in the Lok Sabha elections in 2009, the Congress Party had swept the elections with

33 out of 42 seats and the TRS was not able to make much impact in that election. Neither the Congress Party's attempt at buying time by appointing a committee to look into the question of a separate state for Telangana nor that of the Telugu Desam Party to divert the attention of the electorate to the water issue through the Babbli dam agitation seem to have dampened the sentiment of the electorate in the Telangana region for the demand for a separate state of Telangana.

It has been argued that today's leadership of the movement consists of those who have enjoyed power positions too long within the framework of Maharashtra but while in power they never raised the issue of a separate 'Vidarbha State'. Now out of power, they have suddenly turned 'protagonists' of Vidarbha. One wonders whether their claims are convincing and their political credibility being at the lowest ebb, they are likely to get support from the rank and file in Vidarbha. Contrast can be seen in Telangana. How does one answer the view that Telangana is likely to be a reality soon whereas Vidarbha appears to be a distant dream? [Dhanagare, 2010]. Is it necessary to test the public will on the question of separate statehood for Vidarbha through the electoral process?

IV. DEVOLUTIONS IN THE LIGHT OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE THIRTEENTH FINANCE COMMISSION

The Thirteenth Finance Commission has laid down the following four criteria for sharing of Union Tax revenues:

Table: Criteria and Weights for Tax Devolution
(per cent)

Criteria		Weight
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	Population (1971)	25.0
2.	Area	10.0
3.	Fiscal Capacity Distance	47.5
4.	Fiscal Discipline	17.5

If a region such as Vidarbha is made into a separate State, and if these criteria prescribed by the Thirteenth Finance Commission are applied, if the transfer of resources to Vidarbha at present is not in proportion of population (in 1971) and area, then Vidarbha would get a larger share of Union taxes compared to at present. The criterion of Fiscal Capacity Distance is intended "to ensure that all states have the fiscal potential to provide comparable levels of public services to their residents, at reasonably comparable levels of taxation. As the average per capita gross domestic product of Vidarbha region is less than that of Maharashtra State, the share of Union taxes to Vidarbha would be higher than what Maharashtra State would get under the Thirteenth finance Commission's recommendations, on this criterion. And a very large weight attaches to the criterion of Fiscal capacity Distance. The criterion of Fiscal Discipline is quantified by considering the growth of the ratio of own revenue to revenue expenditure from 2001-04 to 2005-08 relative to that of the same ratio for the 28 states of the country taken together. It is difficult to see immediately how this criterion would be applied to new states. According to the data available in the Report of the Thirteenth Finance Commission (Table - Annex 8.6), the *change* in the above-mentioned Index of Fiscal Discipline in small old States has been 1.76 in Arunachal Pradesh, 1.44 in Himachal Pradesh, 1.36 in Mizoram, 1.26 in Manipur, 1.15 in Orissa, 1.11 in Nagaland, 1.05 in Assam, 1.04 in Karnataka, 1.03 in Gujarat, 0.98 in Punjab, 0.96 in Haryana, 0.93 in Meghalaya, 0.91 in West Bengal, 0.90 in Goa, 0.89 in Kerala, 0.89 in Sikkim, 0.86 in Jammu and Kashmir, 0.86 in Tripura, while in the relatively large old States it has been 1.07 in Uttar Pradesh, 1.05 in Maharashtra, 1.03 in Rajasthan, 0.99 in Madhya Pradesh, 0.96 in Andhra Pradesh. In the small new States, it has been 1.03 in Chhattisgarh, 1.00 in Uttarakhand, and 0.75 in Jharkhand. In large but now new State of Bihar it is 0.77.

A little over 18 per cent of the devolution of resources to the States as per the recommendations of the Thirteenth Finance Commission, amounting to a total of Rs. 318581 crore, is in the form of Grants in Aid to the States. Of these, Rs. 87519 crore is for Grants to Local Bodies, Rs. 51800 crore is for covering Post-devolution non-Plan Revenue Deficit, Rs. 50000 crore for Implementation of model GST, Rs. 27945 crore is for State-specific Grants, Rs. 26373 crore for Disaster Relief (including capacity building), Rs. 24068 crore for Elementary Education, Rs. 19930 crore for Maintenance of Roads and Bridges Rs. 5000 crore each for Protection of Forests, Renewable Resources and Water Sector Management, and Rs. 1500 crore for Performance Incentive.

The Finance Commission has recommended that in order that the local bodies are able to benefit from the buoyancy of the central taxes, a stipulated percentage (1.5 per cent) of the previous year's divisible pool be transferred to the local bodies as General Basic Grant and Total Special Area Grant and another small percentage (0.5 per cent in the second year and 1.0 percent in the following three years) of the previous year's divisible pool be transferred to the local bodies as General Performance Grants. In addition, the Finance Commission has recommended a Special Areas Basic Grant at the rate of Rs. 20 per capita and a Special Areas Performance Grant at the rate of Rs. 10 per capita to the local bodies in the areas covered by the V (Scheduled Areas and Scheduled Tribes (other than in Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura and Mizoram) and VI (Tribal Areas in the States of Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura and Mizoram) Schedules and the areas exempted from the purview of Part IX and IXA of the Constitution. Of the estimated Rs. 66.96 crore of Special Area Grant allocated to Maharashtra for the 2010-2015 period, a substantial part should go to the Vidarbha region. The General Basic Grants to local bodies (Rs. 56335 crore) are to be divided among the States on the basis of the following

criteria, as per the weights mentioned with them: Population (50 per cent), Area (10 per cent), Distance from highest per capita sectoral income (10 per cent for PRIs and 20 per cent for ULBs), Index of devolution (15 per cent), Proportion of SC/ST in population (5 per cent for PRIs) and Finance Commission local grants utilisation index (5 per cent). The total General Basic Grants are divided between the PRIs and the ULBs in the ratio of rural and urban population of the country in 2001. For computing Distance from the highest per capita sectoral income, the average per capita comparable GSDP from the primary sector for the years 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07 was used for the rural sector, and that excluding the primary sector for the urban sector. The Index of devolution was computed by the Commission by first computing the ratio of (three years' average of) the amounts devolved to the local bodies from the State Government's own resources, (i.e., excluding the grants for the local bodies released under the Twelfth Finance Commission's recommendations) to (three years' average of) the State's non-Plan revenue expenditure (NPRE) (also excluding the grants released for the period under the Twelfth Finance Commission's recommendations) and then weighting each State's ratio by the State's population. It is worth noting that the percentage of modulated transfers to local bodies to NPRE was the highest at 23.54 for Karnataka, followed by 11.41 for Andhra Pradesh, 9.98 for Maharashtra and 9.51 for Kerala, 6.92 for Tamil Nadu, 5.58 for Madhya Pradesh, 5.50 for Chhattisgarh, 5.02 for Uttar Pradesh, 4.31 for Uttarakhand, 2.57 for West Bengal, 2.55 for Orissa, 1.63 for Punjab, 1.60 for Haryana, 1.53 for Bihar, 1.02 for Jammu and Kashmir, 0.16 for Jharkhand, 0.13 for Goa and 0.13 for Sikkim and 0 for the rest of the States, namely, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, and Tripura. The percentage of SCs and STs for the rural population is used in place of the deprivation index used by the Twelfth Finance Commission. In order to incentivise timely releases of grants to local

bodies by the States under the Finance Commission awards, Finance Commission local body grants utilisation index figures as one of the criteria for further grants to local bodies. With lower levels of primary and non-primary GSDP and a higher percentage of SC/ST population compared to the rest of the existing states to which they belong, regions like Vidarbha and Telangana are likely to be eligible for larger grants for local bodies under the Finance Commission award. It should be pointed out at the same time that the new States like Chhattisgarh, Uttarakhand, and Jharkhand and small States like Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Himachal Pradesh and Goa have not particularly performed well in devolution of funds to local bodies.

Coming to the other components of Grants-in-Aid to States recommended by the Thirteenth Finance Commission, the six North Eastern States of Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland and Tripura, Jammu and Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh showed normatively assessed post-devolution non-plan revenue deficit, implying that these States showed vertical imbalance, which needed to be corrected by additional grants. Uttarakhand, which had to be given a similar grant by the Twelfth Finance Commission as a newly created State at that time and Assam and Sikkim (from 1975 when it became a State of the Indian Union), which had required a similar grants all along till now, have now emerged as post-devolution non-plan revenue surplus States, and have been provided with a performance grant of Rs. 1500 crore for that reason. As regards the grants-in aid for elementary education, since an accurate estimate of the required expenditure to meet the obligation under the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, was not available, the Thirteenth Finance Commission has provided grants equal to 15 per cent of the estimated expenditure on the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan to all States to fill in the gap in meeting the requirement of matching Central assistance for this Scheme to

the extent of 50 per cent of the expenditure on this Scheme, except that for the North Eastern States the matching requirement is only 10 per cent and the Finance Commission has provided grants to these States to meet the gap in meeting this matching requirement. The grant-in aid under this head to Maharashtra is Rs. 744 crore, while that for the new States of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, and Uttarakhand are Rs. 857 crore, Rs. 1528 crore and Rs. 197 crore, respectively.

The grants-in-aid for forest protection are allocated among the States, on the basis of a formula which takes into account the proportion of the total forest area of the country falling into a State, enhanced for those States where the forest area as a proportion of total area in the State exceeds the national average, and further enhanced by the proportion of dense forest area in the total area of the State and by twice the proportion of high dense forest area in the total area of the State. The enhancement factors are built in to provide extra compensations to States with a larger forest cover and with better quality forest covers for the economic disability involved in sparing land for the purposes of development and as an incentive to protecting the existing forest cover and its quality. Forest rich States such as Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand are eligible to receive relatively large grants-in-aid for forest protection amounting to Rs. 727.84 crore, Rs. 411.12 crore and Rs. 205.44 crore, respectively, in comparison with Rs. 309.60 crore for Maharashtra and Rs. 268.64 crore for Andhra Pradesh. Clearly, regions such as Vidarbha and Telangana could have received proportionately much larger grants for forest protection, if they were separate states than what they would receive as parts of larger States with relatively smaller proportion of overall forest cover. Of the total forest grant released 75 per cent can be used for general development purpose while 25 per cent can be used specifically for preservation of forest wealth and in addition to

the state's budget for forest and wildlife development. The release of the forest grants from the second year of the award and onwards is linked to the number of approved working plans for all the forest Divisions in the state. Again, one can expect that a state with a larger proportion of forest area is likely to be relatively much keener in preparing the working plans and securing their approval by the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

The total incentive grant of Rs. 5000 crore for all states for the five year period for the water sector is meant for setting up Water Regulatory Authority in each State for recovery of water charges and are conditional on a minimum of 50 per cent recovery at the normative water rates laid down by the Thirteenth Finance Commission. Grants-in-aid to individual States under this head will be in proportion to the share of each State's expenditure on irrigation in its total non-plan revenue expenditure and its share in all-states irrigation potential utilised at the end of the Tenth Plan. The grant for Maharashtra under this head will be Rs. 368 crore for the award period. The recovery rate for Maharashtra for the year as per 2009-10 (BE) has been 92.67 per cent (the all-States average being 23.94 per cent) and the required recovery rate for the award period is 93 per cent each year.

The State-specific grants recommended by the Thirteenth Finance Commission give an idea of the special requirements of the new States and other States. Grants sought and recommended by the Finance Commission for some of the relevant items, illustrative of the kinds of likely special requirements of new states, indicated earlier in this Note, are:

- (i) New capital: Naya Raipur in Chhattisgarh: Rs. 550 crore, in addition to Rs. 200 crore provided by the Twelfth Finance Commission; Dehradun in Uttarakhand: Rs. 150 crore to cover the whole city by the sewerage system; Jammu and Kashmir: Rs.

- 50 crore for a new modern legislative complex at Jammu and Rs. 15 crore for a Public Service Commission at Srinagar.
- (ii) Police Training in Naxalite-affected Areas: Andhra Pradesh: Rs. 13 crore; Rs. 100 crore for Police Training Colleges; Bihar: Rs. 206 crore for setting up a police academy because, as a consequence of the bifurcation of the state, it no longer has a police academy; Chhattisgarh: Rs. 42 crore, Rs. 150 crore for Strengthening Prison Infrastructure and Rs. 250 crore for Police Housing; Jharkhand: Rs. 73 crore for establishment of a Police Academy, upgradation of Jungle Warfare School and for enhancing capacity of the Constable Training School. (It should, however, be added that most states have asked for grants for police housing, police training and upgradation of prisons.)
- (iii) Road Net-work in Remote Areas: Arunachal Pradesh: Rs. 75 crore for improving the reach of administration in remote areas and Rs. 70 crore for strengthening of law enforcement and public security in remote areas; Maharashtra: Rs. 200 crore for construction of roads in remote areas in districts which are not being covered by the Border Roads Organisation; Rajasthan: Rs. 150 crore for upgrading and improvement of state highways and minor district roads which are not being taken up by other programmes; Uttar Pradesh: Rs. 150 crore for improving road connectivity between tehsils and district head quarters in Bundelkhand region and Rs. 150 crore for connectivity between the block head quarters, tehsil head quarters and district head quarters in Poorvanchal region.
- (iv) Restoration of Tanks and Tube wells: Uttar Pradesh: Rs. 200 crore to strengthen and restore tanks, build check dams and refurbish tube wells in Bundelkhand region.

- (v) Infrastructure Development in Tribal Areas: Assam: Rs. 130 crore for infrastructure development in Karbi Anglong District, N. C. Hills District and for Bodoland Territorial Council.

V. RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES OF STATES AFTER THE RECENT RE-ORGANISATION IN 2000: AN OVERVIEW

One needs to look at the fiscal implications of the reorganisation of States for two reasons. Firstly, creation of a new State entails alterations in the fiscal position of the mother State. Secondly, an analysis of the receipts and expenditure pattern of the newly created State provides pointers on the issues pertaining to the efficacy of fiscal management which is of vital importance from the point of view of a new State in its infancy.

Hence, an attempt has been made here to look at the receipts and expenditure patterns of the newly created States of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand *vis-à-vis* their mother States (See Annexures III and IV). The following analysis is based on the scrutiny of the statistics pertaining to the time period between 1991-92 and 2009-10. The Reserve Bank of India brings out every year a publication in respect of the finances of the State Governments which provides salient features of the fiscal situation of the respective States.

V.1. Revenue Receipts

The moment we look at the composition of the revenue receipts of the States of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand, the fact that becomes strikingly visible is their financial dependence on the Central Government. This is reflected in a relatively larger share of the two sources, viz. Share in Central Taxes and Grants from the Centre in the revenue composition of the Revenue Receipts of these three States. All these three States came into being in November 2000. Hence, the data pertaining to their revenue receipts is

available only for the period between 2000-01 and 2009-10. A glance at this statistics shows that, these two sources together accounted for an average value of about 57 per cent of the total revenue receipts of Uttarakhand and Jharkhand for the period between 2000-01 and 2009-10. In the case of the third State of Chhattisgarh, their share appears to be around 43 per cent. It implies that, among the three newly created States, the State of Chhattisgarh is dependent on the Centre Government financially to a much lesser extent compared to Uttarakhand and Jharkhand. Chhattisgarh seems to have done relatively better in this respect.

If we look at the revenue position of the two States of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh we realise that their dependence on the Centre Government too has increased between the period between 2000-01 and 2009-10 as compared to the period between 1991-92 and 1999-2000. As it is Bihar has been dependent on Central transfers from the earlier days. The share of Central transfers in the form of both, i.e., share in Central taxes and Grants from the Centre accounted for about 60 per cent of the revenue receipts of the State on an average during the period between 1991-92 and 1999-2000. This share seems to have gone up to the average of 77 per cent during the period between 2000-01 and 2009-10. In the case of Uttar Pradesh, the share of transfers from the Centre was of the order of 50 per cent on an average between 1991-92 and 1999-2000. The same share seems to have gone up slightly to the average level of 53 per cent during 2000-01 and 2009-10. Madhya Pradesh, too, presents a similar picture. The share of Central transfers stood at an average value of 40 per cent during the period between 1991-92 and 1999-2000. The same share went up to the average level of 46 per cent during the period between 2000-01 and 2009-10.

In the case of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh, the relative share of the own sources of revenue in the total revenue receipts of the

respective States seem to have gone down between the two time phases of 1991-92 to 1999-2000 and 2000-01 to 2009-10 primarily on account of a marked decline in the relative contribution of the Non Tax Revenue sources enjoyed by the respective State. During the period between 1991-92 and 1999-2000, the share of Non Tax Revenue in the total revenue receipts of Bihar stood at an average value of 12 per cent. The same share fell drastically to the average level of 3 per cent for the time span between 2000-01 and 2009-10. In the case of Madhya Pradesh, the two shares stood at the levels of 19.48 per cent and 11.89 per cent, respectively. In the case of Uttar Pradesh, this fall appears to be of a moderate size with the average share of 11.20 per cent of Non Tax Revenue in the total revenue receipts for the period between the years 1991-92 and 1999-2000 going down to the average level of 7.68 per cent for the period between the years 2000-01 and 2009-10. It is quite likely that this decline in the relative share of the Non Tax Revenue experienced by Bihar and Madhya Pradesh in the post 2000 era is on account of the fact that those regions of these two States which were rich in terms of natural endowments, viz., minerals and forests were now awarded a separate statehood (Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh, respectively).

Among the three states of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand, the relative share of Grants from the Centre in the total revenue receipts is the highest in the case of Uttarakhand. The relative share of this source of revenue receipts stood at an average value of about 42 per cent for the period between 2000-01 and 2009-10 as against 26.58 per cent in the case of Jharkhand and 15.71 per cent in the case of Chhattisgarh. It is quite possible that, unlike Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh, Uttarakhand being primarily a hilly terrain, is devoid of natural endowments such as forests and/or minerals.

V.2. Capital Receipts

Among the three newly created States of Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand, as far as the composition of the capital receipts is concerned; the relative share of Internal Debts is the highest in the case of Jharkhand. The relative share of Internal Debt to the capital receipts of Jharkhand stood at an average value of 49.34 per cent for the period between 2000-01 and 2009-10 as against that of Chhattisgarh (27.40 per cent) and Uttarakhand (13.92 per cent). Scrutiny of the relevant statistics reveals that the relative share of this item of the Capital Receipts of the States, on an average, seems to have risen significantly almost for all States during the period between 2000-01 and 2003-04. This is, most likely on the account of award of the benefits of the Fifth Pay Commission to the State employees as the States had to take recourse to this alternative of mobilising necessary resources to implement the recommendations of the Pay Commission from the open market. A similar phenomenon is visible towards the end of the second time phase of between 2000-01 and 2009-10 when the States were obliged to honour the recommendations of the Sixth Pay Commission.

V.3 Revenue Expenditure

Creation of a new State warrants creation of an entire administrative set up and machinery afresh. Hence, it is pertinent to look at the share of expenditure on the Administrative Services (consisting of expenditure on revenue account on Secretariat for General Services, District Administration, Police, Public Works, Public Service Commission, Treasury and Accounts, Administration, Jails, Supplies and Disposal, Stationery and Printing, Other Administrative Services, etc) in the total revenue expenditure of the State Governments. The relevant data shows that, on an average, the share of expenses on Administrative Services for the period between 2000-01 and 2009-10 stood between the range of

7.29 per cent (Chhattisgarh) and 12.10 (Jharkhand). Uttarakhand was in between the two at 9.25 per cent. The same shares were somewhat comparable with the relative shares for the three mother States of Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Uttarakhand.

Share of revenue expenditure on payment of Interests and debt servicing, too, seems to be quite moderate in the case of three States of Chhattisgarh (13.52 per cent), Jharkhand (10.47 per cent) and Uttarakhand (15.85 per cent) compared to their mother States. In the case of both Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh, the relative share of this item of Revenue Expenditure seems to have gone up during the period between 2000-01 and 2009-10 compared to the earlier time phase of the period between 1991-92 and 1999-2000.

V.4. Capital Expenditure

Capital Disbursements consist of Total Capital Outlay, Discharge of Internal Debt, Repayment of Loans to the Centre and Loans and Advances by State Govt. As far as the main items of Capital Disbursements are concerned, capital outlay as percentage of total Capital Disbursements for Bihar averaged 39.85 per cent during 1991-2000, prior to separation of Jharkhand, but declined after the separation of Jharkhand to 29.24 per cent during 2000-2010. On the other hand, it was higher at 39.39 per cent during 2000-2010 in Jharkhand. Similarly, in Madhya Pradesh, it came down from 59.46 per cent during 1991-2000, prior to separation of Chhattisgarh from Madhya Pradesh, to 22.57 per cent during 2000-2010. But average of the percentage share of capital outlay in total Capital Disbursements was not very high in Chhattisgarh, being 14.45 per cent during 2000-2010. So, the separation seems to have affected capital outlays in both the States. Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand also present picture similar to that of Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh. Prior to the separation of Uttarakhand from

Uttar Pradesh, capital outlay averaged 33.98 per cent during 1991-2000, but fell drastically to 20.41 per cent during 2000-2010.

Similar trends are observed in respect of developmental expenditure, (i.e., on economic and social services) on capital account and loans and advances by these States for developmental purposes as well.

As per Reserve Bank of India's publication, *State Finances: A Study of Budgets of 2009-10*, prior to the separation of Jharkhand from Bihar, the average per capita capital outlay of Bihar was Rs. 66.8 in 1990-95 and Rs. 92.6 in 1995-2000, and increased to Rs. 161.2 in 2000-05 and further to Rs. 696.6 in 2005-10. By comparison, that for Jharkhand was much higher at Rs. 458.5 in 2000-05 and Rs. 1067.5 in 2005-10. The same figures for Madhya Pradesh were Rs. 156.9 and Rs. 194.6, respectively, whereas those for Chhattisgarh were Rs. 349.9 and Rs. 1184.4, respectively. The averages for Uttar Pradesh during the above mentioned periods were Rs. 75.4 and Rs. 112.8 prior to the separation of Uttarakhand from it and Rs. 293.7 and Rs. 919.8, respectively for the quinquenniums after the separation. Again, by comparison the same figures for Uttarakhand during the two quinquenniums after its formation were Rs. 538.1 and a very high Rs. 2064.7, respectively. Average per capita social sector expenditure (on capital and revenue account together) shows similar trends. Clearly the newer and smaller States appear to have benefited in these respects after separation.

VI. POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS

VI.1. Disparity in the Size of the Federating States

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar raised the question: "Must there be one state for one language? What does a linguistic state mean? It can mean one of two things. It can mean that all people speaking one language must be brought under the jurisdiction

of one State. It can also mean that people speaking one language may be grouped under many States provided each State has under its jurisdiction people who are speaking one language. Which is the correct interpretation?" [Ambedkar, 1955].

Ambedkar cautioned against the disparity in the size of the federating states, particularly between the northern States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan and the other States like the Punjab and Bengal and especially the southern States, saying: "It will be impossible for the small States to bear the weight of the big States". He quoted Mr. Pannikar from his dissenting minute to the Report:

"I consider it essential for the successful working of a federation that the units should be fairly evenly balanced. Too great a disparity is likely to create not only suspicion and resentment but generate forces likely to undermine the federal structure itself and thereby be a danger to the unity of the country. This is clearly recognised everywhere. In most federal constitutions, though wide variation exists in respect of the population and resources of the unit, care is taken to limit the influence and authority of the larger States. Thus in the United States of America, for example, though the States are of varying population and resources and the State of New York has many times the population, say of Nevada, the constitution provides for equal representation of every State in the Senate." Ambedkar further argued: "In our Constitution the two Houses are not co-equal in authority. But the position in the Constitution of the United States is quite different. In the U.S.A. the two Houses are co-equal in authority. Even for money bills the consent of the Senate is necessary. This is not so in India. This makes a great difference to the disparity in the population. This disparity in the population and power between the States is sure to plague the country. To provide a remedy against it is most essential".

While the predominance of the politics of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar in India's national politics, which led to a great strengthening of the Congress Party's rule at the Centre in the earlier decades after Independence, has somewhat diminished in the last decade or so because of diminished power base of the Congress Party in these States, it has undergone a transformation in the present day coalition politics in the form of the influence wielded by the stronger (regional) political parties in these as well as other States.

VI.2. Large States and the Tyranny of the Large Majority against a Small Minority

Ambedkar also urged creating smaller states as a safeguard against the tyranny of a large majority against a small minority. He argued: "No doubt some safeguards against this communal tyranny are essential. The question is: What can they be? The first safeguard is not to have too large a State. The consequences of too large a State on the minority living within it are not understood by many. The larger the State the smaller the proportion of the minority to the majority. To give one illustration - If Mahavidarbha remained separate, the proportion of Hindus to Muslims would be four to one. In the United Maharashtra the proportion will be fourteen to one. The same would be the case of the Untouchables. A small stone of a consolidated majority placed on the chest of the minority may be borne. But the weight of a huge mountain it cannot bear. It will crush the minorities. Therefore creation of smaller States is a safeguard to the minorities".

REFERENCES

- Ambedkar, B.R., 1955; *Thoughts on Linguistic States*, Anand Sahitya Sadan, Chhawani Aligarh.
- Ambedkar, Prakash, 2010; in *Loksatta*, 14 February.
- Dhanagare, D.N., 2010; Note Submitted for the Seminar on Re-organisation of States.
- Government of India, 1955, *Report of the States Reorganisation Commission* (SRC), Ministry of Home Affairs, New Delhi.
- Government of India, *Recommendations of the Thirteenth Finance Commission*, New Delhi.
- Government of India, *Report of the Planning Commission Team on Vidarbha*, New Delhi.
- Government of India, 2003; Planning Commission, Programme Evaluation Organisation, *Performance Evaluation of Statutory Development Boards (SDBs) in Maharashtra*, New Delhi.
- Government of Maharashtra, (Various years) *Economic Survey of Maharashtra*, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Planning Department, Mumbai, 2006-07 and 2009-10.
- Government of Maharashtra, 1962, *Maharashtra State Irrigation Commission Report*, Planning Department, Mumbai.
- Government of Maharashtra, 1984, *Report of the Fact Finding Committee on Regional Imbalance in Maharashtra*, Planning Department, (Chairman: V.M. Dandekar).
- Jadhav, Keshv Rao, 2010; 'Backwardisation' of Telangana, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 45, No. 13, March 27.
- K. Kannabiran et al, 2010; 'On the Telangana Trail', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 45, No. 13, March 27.
- Mahajan, Ratnakar, 2010; 'People's Politics', July
- Melkote, Ram, E. Revathi, K. Lalitha, K. Sayaya, A. Suneetha, 2010; The Movement for Telangana: Myth and Reality, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Jan. 9
- Phadke, Y.D., 1979; *Politics and Language*, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai.
- Rao, Hanumantha and Shastry, 2009; *State Finances: A Study of Budgets of 2009-10*, Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai.
- Rattanani, Lekha, 1996; 'Divided They Stand', Outlook India.com, October 23.
- Vidarbha Statutory Development Board, 2008-09; *Annual Report* (Varshik Ahwal), Nagpur, (Internet Download).

ANNEXURE I

Table 6.5. District Backlog in the 'Other Road System' Connecting Villages as on 31-3-1983

Sr. No.	District	No. of Villages 1971	Percentage of Villages Connected	Percentage of Population Connected	Additional No. of Villages Required to be Connected	Cost of Col. (5) (Rs. in Crore)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	Greater Bombay
2	Thane	1,588	75.38	86.61
3	Raigad	1,699	52.91	62.31	128	12.8
4	Ratnagiri	1,514	58.06	66.09	42	4.2
Konkan (Excl. G.B.)		4,801	61.96	71.94	170	17
5	Nashik	1,628	40.42	59.77	207	20.7
6	Dhule	1,379	81.44	94.52
7	Jalgaon	1,423	79.69	87.98
8	Ahmednagar	1,312	63.87	75.14
9	Pune	1,481	34.98	56.22	267	26.7
10	Satara	1,142	49.82	75.56
11	Sangli	539	66.05	78.23
12	Solapur	948	62.24	72.2
13	Kolhapur	1,083	57.06	75.16
Western Maharashtra		10,935	58.56	74.19	474	7.4
14	Aurangabad	1,866	60.13	72.53
15	Parbhani	1,505	29.77	44.08	459	45.9
16	Beed	1,028	60.41	69.4
17	Nanded	1,324	54.15	66.69	30	3
18	Osmanabad	1,387	60.85	72.64
Marathwada		7,110	52.77	65.81	489	48.9
19	Buldhana	1,232	38.96	64.16	88	8.8
20	Akola	1,489	41.97	62.03	144	14.4
	Washim					
21	Amravati	1,637	32.56	61.76	190	19
22	Yavatmal	1,647	39.41	56.18	277	27.7
23	Wardha	962	43.24	63.17	77	0.34027
24	Nagpur	1,625	35.82	52.83	343	34.3
25	Bhandara	1,500	66.27	71.23
	Gondia					
26	Chandrapur	2,840	23.56	43.62	953	95.3
Vidarbha		12,932	40.82	59.00	2,072	207.20
Maharashtra State		-	-	-	-	-
Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)		35,778	50.22	68.35	3,205	320.50

Source: Government of Maharashtra (1984) (Dandekar Committee).

Table 6.5(A).

Sr. No.	District	Year of Publication of the Socio-economic Review of the District	No of Villages Connected by all weather roads	Inhabited Villages 2001	Uninhabited Villages 2001	Total No of Villages 2001	Percentage of Inhabited Villages Connected	Percentage of Total Villages Connected
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1	Thane	2008	1703	1748	0	1748	97.43	97.43
2	Raigad	2008	1402	1859	60	1919	75.42	73.06
3	Ratnagiri	2008	1502	1539	4	1543	97.60	97.34
4	Sindhudurg	2009	476	743	0	743	64.06	64.06
5	Nashik	-	-	1921	10	1931	-	
6	Dhule	2009	676	678	3	681	99.71	99.27
7	Jalgaon	2008	1481	1491	28	1519	99.33	97.50
8	Nandurbar	2008	719	935	12	947	76.90	75.92
9	Ahmednagar	-	1146	1579	2	1581	72.58	72.49
10	Pune	2008	-	1848	18	1866	-	
11	Satara	2008-09	1455	1717	22	1739	84.74	83.67
12	Sangli	-	-	721	3	724	-	
13	Solapur	-	864	1142	8	1150	75.66	75.13
14	Kolhapur	-	1196	1196	21	1217	100.00	98.27
15	Aurangabad	2008	1120	1300	44	1344	86.15	83.33
16	Latur	-	781	922	23	945	84.71	82.65
17	Parbhani	-	562	815	13	828	68.96	67.87
18	Beed	2008-09	1232	1335	19	1354	92.28	90.99
19	Nanded	2008-09	851	1536	75	1611	55.40	52.82
20	Osmanabad	-	731	729	6	735	100.27	99.46
21	Jalana	2008	902	963	8	971	93.67	92.89
22	Hingoli	2008	-	630	38	668	-	
23	Buldhana	2009	766	1297	136	1433	59.06	53.45
24	Akola	2009	574	850	136	986	67.53	58.22
25	Washim	2009	699	702	87	789	99.57	88.59
26	Amravati	2009	1679	1679	323	2002	100.00	83.87
27	Yavatmal	2009	1821	1856	274	2130	98.11	85.49
28	Wardha	2009	924	1004	378	1382	92.03	66.86
29	Nagpur	2009	1627	1628	241	1869	99.94	87.05
30	Bhandara	2009	772	778	92	870	99.23	88.74
31	Gondia	2009	821	893	57	950	91.94	86.42
32	Chandrapur	2009	1455	1442	349	1791	100.90	81.24
33	Gadchiroli	2009	1009	1522	157	1679	66.29	60.10
	Vidarbha		12147	13651	2230	15881	88.98	76.49
	Maharashtra State							
	Maharashtra State							
	Excl. Mumbai		38483	40998	2647	43645	93.87	88.17

Note: Eight New Districts of

New -> Sindhudurg, Nadurbar, Jalna, Hingoli, Latur, Washim, Gondia, Gadchiroli
Old -> Ratnagiri, Dhule, Aurangabad, Parbhani, Osmanabad, Akola, Bhandara, Chandrapur,

Source: Socio-economic Review of the Districts, Government of Maharashtra.

Table 7.3. Irrigation Potential Created, June 1960 and June 1982

Sr. No.	District	Nat Sown Area, 1960-61 (000 hectares)	Irrigation Potential Created by June 1960	Percentage of Col. (3) to Col. (2)	Net Sown Area, 1978-79 (000 hectares)	Irrigation Potential Created by June 1982	Percentage of Col. (6) to Col. (5)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	Greater Bombay	8.70	6.60
2	Thane	290.20	265.10	10.19	3.84
3	Raigad	215.10	1.80	0.84	195.80	27.86	14.68
4	Ratnagiri	357.50	356.30	12.07	3.39
Konkan (Excl. G.B.)		862.80	1.80	0.21	817.20	50.12	6.13
5	Nashik	906.50	35.16	3.88	889.60	125.26	14.08
6	Dhule	669.60	22.58	3.37	705.00	75.42	10.70
7	Jalgaon	805.90	14.41	1.79	810.50	115.47	14.25
8	Ahmednagar	1,258.60	59.63	4.74	1,214.90	214.49	17.65
9	Pune	985.20	70.07	7.11	1,001.00	148.63	14.85
10	Satara	680.30	25.55	3.75	585.90	103.83	17.72
11	Sangli	641.90	5.32	0.83	616.10	83.33	13.53
12	Solapur	1,206.00	66.13	5.48	1,137.40	174.04	15.30
13	Kolhapur	413.00	10.15	2.46	423.70	70.78	16.71
Western Maharashtra		7,567.00	309.00	4.08	7,384.10	1,111.25	15.05
14	Aurangabad	1,254.10	1.05	0.08	1,214.00	121.57	10.01
15	Parbhani	913.30	1,007.30	143.86	14.28
16	Beed	748.80	7.03	0.94	809.50	78.09	9.65
17	Nanded	691.00	727.90	91.07	12.51
18	Osmanabad	1,037.30	3.56	0.34	1,115.00	72.56	6.51
Marathwada		4,644.50	11.64	0.25	4,873.70	507.15	10.41
19	Buldhana	680.30	681.90	37.13	5.45
20	Akola	763.90	820.70	48.83	5.95
21	Amravati	682.90	0.60	0.09	722.90	18.85	2.61
22	Yavatmal	736.00	0.32	0.04	854.60	43.70	5.11
23	Wardha	407.40	442.00	28.85	6.53
24	Nagpur	530.60	6.47	1.22	565.50	79.23	14.01
25	Bhandara	381.30	37.21	9.76	388.30	146.03	37.61
26	Chandrapur	612.60	19.16	3.13	690.80	86.25	12.49
Vidarbha		4,795.00	63.76	1.33	5,166.70	488.87	9.46
Maharashtra State		17,878.00	386.2	2.16	18,248.30	2,157.39	11.82
Maharashtra State (Excluding G.B.)		17,869.30	386.2	2.16	18,241.70	2,157.39	11.83

Source: Government of Maharashtra (1984).

Table 7.3(A). Irrigation Potential Created, in June 2008-2009

District	Geographical Area (000 Hect.) 2001	Net Sown Area as % of Total Geographical Area (2007-08)	Net Sown Area (000 Hect.) (2007-08)	Irrigation Potential Created (000 Hect.) by June 2007	Irrigation Potential Created as % of Net Sown Area (2007-08)	Irrigation Potential Created by June 2007	Ultimate Irrigation Potential (000 Hect.) (2007-08)	Irrigation Potential Created as % of Ultimate Irrigation Potential (2007-08)	Irrigation Potential Created by June 2007	Actual Irrigated Area (000 Hect.) (2006-07)	Actual Irrigated Area as % of Irrigation Potential Created (2006-07)	Actual Irrigated Area (000 Hect.) (2007-08)	Actual Irrigated Area as % of Net Sown Area (2007-08)	Actual Irrigated Area (000 Hect.) (2006-07)	Actual Irrigated Area as % of Net Sown Area (2006-07)	Ultimate Irrigation Potential (000 Hect.) (2007-08)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
16. Aurangabad	1011	68.60	693.55	109.23	15.75	165.48	23.86	135.11	80.85	31.96	122.35	29.26	73.94	4.61	17.64	19.48
17. Jalna	772	74.00	571.28	77.69	13.60	134.35	23.52	79.27	98.01	24.58	115.83	31.64	86.22	4.30	20.28	13.88
18. Parbhani	652	74.20	483.78	162.69	33.63	327.11	67.61	180.94	89.91	56.25	196.87	34.57	60.18	11.63	40.69	37.40
19. Hingoli	452	72.80	329.06	48.64	14.78	98.28	29.87	51.93	93.66	24.28	73.45	49.92	74.74	7.38	22.32	15.78
20. Beed	1069	70.30	751.51	165.16	21.98	271.42	36.12	172.61	95.68	29.49	177.63	17.86	65.44	3.92	23.64	22.97
21. Nanded	1053	66.90	704.46	184.45	26.18	362.27	51.43	237.93	77.52	58.59	257.93	31.76	71.20	8.32	36.61	33.77
22. Osmanabad	757	63.30	479.18	108.59	22.66	120.89	25.23	139.58	77.80	18.57	65.03	17.10	53.79	3.88	13.57	29.13
23. Latur	716	72.50	519.10	97.54	18.79	150.69	29.03	122.03	79.93	21.84	127.84	22.39	84.84	4.21	24.63	23.51
Marathwada			4531.91	953.99	21.05	1630.49	35.98	1119.40	85.22	265.56	1136.93	27.84	69.73	5.86	25.09	24.70
24. Buldhana	966	69.30	669.44	80.75	12.06	134.16	20.04	120.97	66.75	31.91	50.24	39.52	37.45	4.77	7.50	18.07
25. Akola	543	80.00	434.40	53.24	12.26	91.08	20.97	57.12	93.21	17.59	46.50	33.04	51.05	4.05	10.70	13.15
26. Washim	515	73.30	377.50	39.47	10.46	68.18	18.06	40.57	97.29	17.47	39.59	44.26	58.07	4.63	10.49	10.75
27. Amravati	1221	61.60	752.14	97.64	12.98	145.68	19.37	115.76	84.35	19.86	65.36	20.34	44.87	2.64	8.69	15.39
28. Yavatmal	1358	62.40	847.39	139.36	16.45	219.63	25.92	213.24	65.35	31.82	106.64	22.83	48.55	3.76	12.58	25.16
29. Wardha	631	57.80	364.72	84.49	23.17	147.86	40.54	148.24	57.00	23.36	69.39	27.65	46.93	6.40	19.03	40.65
30. Nagpur	980	55.80	546.84	161.44	29.52	312.17	57.09	173.57	93.01	103.54	238.39	64.14	82.77	18.93	47.25	31.74
31. Bhandara	390	45.90	179.01	79.54	44.43	137.73	76.94	88.60	89.77	45.43	93.34	57.12	67.77	25.38	52.14	49.49
32. Gondia	543	33.80	183.53	106.35	57.95	170.65	92.98	122.35	86.92	74.26	145.56	69.83	85.30	40.46	79.31	66.66
33. Chandrapur	1144	39.60	453.02	68.77	15.18	112.14	24.75	88.10	78.06	49.78	79.08	72.39	70.52	10.99	17.46	19.45
34. Gadchiroli	1441	12.00	172.92	40.37	23.35	66.15	38.25	42.97	93.95	27.88	58.57	69.06	88.54	16.12	33.87	24.85
Vidarbha			4980.91	951.42	19.10	1605.43	32.23	1211.49	78.53	442.90	1012.66	46.55	63.08	8.89	20.33	24.32
Maharashtra	30759	56.80	17437.03	4331.29	24.84	7609.62	43.64	5484.03	78.98	1851.76	5158.29	42.75	67.79	10.62	29.58	31.45
Maharashtra (Excl. G.B.)	30699															

Source: (i) *Economic Survey of Maharashtra, 2009-10*, Part C, Table on Districtwise selected socio-economic Indicators in the State.

(ii) District Socio-Economic Review Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Maharashtra for the year 2009-10.

(iii) Project-wise and Season-wise Statistics of Irrigation Potential Created as of 30th June 2007, obtained from Department of Water Resources, Statistical Wing of Irrigation Management Section, Government of Maharashtra, Mumbai.

Table 8.1. Rural Electrification

District	Number of villages as per 1971 Census		Villages Electrified upto 31-Mar-83		Col. (4) as percentage of Col. (2)	Col. (5) as percentage of Col. (3)	Number of Villages as per 1971 Census Total	Total No. of Electrified Villages	Col (9) as percentage of Col.(8) Percentage of Electrified Villages
	Tribal	Non-Tribal	Tribal	Non-Tribal					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Greater Bombay			
2 Thane	1023	565	755	498	73.8	88.14	1588	1253	78.90
3 Raigad	43	1,656	42	1,327	97.67	80.13	1699	1369	80.58
4 Ratnagiri	..	1,514	..	1,229	..	81.18	1,514	1,229	81.18
Konkan (Excl. G.B.)	1,066	3,735	797	3,054	74.77	81.77	4801	3851	80.21
5 Nashik	775	853	585	873	75.48	102.34	1628	1458	89.56
6 Dhule	865	514	580	515	67.05	100.19	1379	1095	79.41
7 Jalgaon	39	1,384	39	1,399	100	101.08	1423	1438	101.05
8 Ahmednagar	106	1,206	97	1,159	91.51	96.1	1312	1256	95.73
9 Pune	142	1,339	103	1,123	72.54	83.87	1481	1226	82.78
10 Satara	..	1,142	..	1,075	..	94.13	1,142	1,075	94.13
11 Sangli	..	539	..	526	..	97.59	539	526	97.59
12 Solapur	..	948	..	951	..	100.32	948	951	100.32
13 Kolhapur	..	1,083	..	1,014	..	93.63	1,083	1,014	93.63
Western Maharashtra	1,927	9,008	1,404	8,635	72.86	95.86	10935	10039	91.81
14 Aurangabad	..	1,866	..	1820	..	97.53	1,866	1,820	97.53
15 Parbhani	135	1,370	135	1200	100	87.59	1505	1335	88.70
16 Beed	..	1,028	..	1363	..	132.59	1,028	1,363	132.59
17 Nanded	..	1,324	..	1024	..	77.34	1,324	1,024	77.34
18 Osmanabad	..	1,387	..	1380	..	99.5	1,387	1,380	99.50
Marathwada	135	6,975	135	6,787	100	97.3?	7110	6922	97.36
19 Buldhana	..	1,232	..	1,066	..	86.53	1,232	1,066	86.53
20 Akola	..	1,489	..	1,249	..	83.88	1,489	1,249	83.88
21 Amravati	309	1,328	197	1,255	63.75	94.5	1,637	1,452	88.70
22 Yavatmal	436	1,211	360	1,140	82.57	94.14	1,647	1,500	91.07
23 Wardha	..	962	..	850	..	88.36	962	850	88.36
24 Nagpur	92	1,533	91	1,343	98.91	87.61	1,625	1,434	88.25
25 Bhandara	258	1,242	155	999	60.08	80.43	1,500	1,154	76.93
26 Chandrapur	1,820	1,020	602	746	33.08	73.14	2,840	1,348	47.46
Vidarbha	2,915	10,017	1,405	8,648	48.2	86.33	12,932	10,053	77.74
Maharashtra State				
Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)	6,043	29,735	3,741	27,124	61.91	91.22	35,778	30,865	86.27

Source: Government of Maharashtra (1984).

Table 8.1(A). Rural Electrification

District		No of Villages 2001	Year for the Electrification data	No of Electrified Villages	Electrified villages as Percentage of Total Villages	Inhabited Villages 2001	Uninhabited Villages 2009	Total No of Villages 2009	Electrified villages as Percentage of Inhabited Villages
(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1	Thane	1748	2007-08	1748	100.00	1748	0	1748	100.00
2	Raigad	1919	2007-08	1553	80.93	1859	60	1919	83.54
3	Ratnagiri	1543	2007-08	1538	99.68	1539	4	1543	99.94
4	Sindhudurg	743	2008-09	736	99.06	743	0	743	99.06
5	Nashik	1931	-	1921	99.48	1921	10	1931	100.00
6	Dhule	681	2008-09	681	100.00	678	3	681	100.44
7	Jalgaon	1519	2007-08	1491	98.16	1491	28	1519	100.00
8	Nandurbar	947	31/3/08	935	98.73	935	12	947	100.00
9	Ahmednagar	1581	-	1578	99.81	1579	2	1581	99.94
10	Pune	1866	2008-09	1844	98.82	1848	18	1866	99.78
11	Satara	1739	2008-09	1732	99.60	1717	22	1739	100.87
12	Sangli	724	2008-09	724	100.00	721	3	724	100.42
13	Solapur	1150	-	1149	99.91	1142	8	1150	100.61
14	Kolhapur	1217	2008-09	1196	98.27	1196	21	1217	100.00
15	Aurangabad	1344	-	1300	96.73	1300	44	1344	100.00
16	Latur	945	-	935	98.94	922	23	945	101.41
17	Parbhani	828	-	841	101.57	815	13	828	103.19
18	Beed	1354	-	1360	100.44	1335	19	1354	101.87
19	Nanded	1611	2008-09	1611	100.00	1536	75	1611	104.88
20	Osmanabad	735	-	729	99.18	729	6	735	100.00
21	Jalna	971	2007-08	971	100.00	963	8	971	100.83
22	Hingoli	668	-	710	106.29	630	38	668	112.70
23	Buldhana	1433		1398	97.56	1297	136	1433	107.79
24	Akola	986	2008-09	856	86.82	850	136	986	100.71
25	Washim	789		702	88.97	702	87	789	100.00
26	Amravati	2002	2008-09	1679	83.87	1679	323	2002	100.00
27	Yavatmal	2130		1856	87.14	1856	274	2130	100.00
28	Wardha	1382		1277	92.40	1004	378	1382	127.19
29	Nagpur	1869		1869	100.00	1628	241	1869	114.80
30	Bhandara	870	2007-08	724	83.22	778	92	870	93.06
31	Gondia	950	2007-08	893	94.00	893	57	950	100.00
32	Chandrapur	1791		1292	72.14	1442	349	1791	89.60
33	Gadchiroli	1679	2007-08	1459	86.90	1522	157	1679	95.86
Vidarbha		15881		14005		13651	2230	15881	102.59
Maharashtra State									
Maharashtra State (Excl.Mumbai)		43645		41288	94.60	40998	2647	43645	100.71

Source: Socio-economic Review of the Districts, Government of Maharashtra.

Table 9.3. Primary Schools (1982-83)

District	Number of Primary Schools Per lakh of population	Enrolment of Students in Primary Schools per lakh of population	Total Teachers In Primary Schools Per lakh of population	Percentage Of Trained Teachers To Total Teachers In Primary Schools	Percentage of Single Teacher Schools to Total Primary Schools	Percentage of Enrolment in Single Teacher Schools to Total Primary Schools	Student-Teacher Ratio
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1 Greater Bombay	19.85	10,194.49	275.88	98.90			36.95
2 Thane	72.86	12,135.09	292.76	88.89	42.59	10.72	41.45
3 Raigad	155.47	17,045.22	470.31	89.06	40.68	13.24	36.24
4 Ratnagiri	172.07	18,186.47	592.43	94.50	25.85	7.58	30.70
Konkan (Excl. G.B.)	120.67	15,023.86	420.88	91.32	34.81	10.15	35.70
5 Nashik	87.17	14,315.85	364.67	95.22	36.23	8.75	39.26
6 Dhule	89.35	13,127.83	343.90	95.45	41.05	11.45	38.17
7 Jalgaon	68.4	15,149.98	392.78	96.04	14.57	2.89	38.57
8 Ahmednagar	91.05	14,497.90	393.46	95.23	30.78	6.98	36.85
9 Pune	78.4	14,703.17	359.42	92.09	33.60	6.38	40.91
10 Satara	106.74	16,872.41	472.46	97.37	32.44	7.36	35.71
11 Sangli	70.5	15,908.81	443.20	94.71	13.25	2.19	35.90
12 Solapur	71.64	13,939.38	375.46	94.32	21.34	4.20	37.13
13 Kolhapur	75.53	15,486.07	395.20	95.92	29.69	5.00	39.19
Western Maharashtra	81.6	14,823.24	388.28	94.90	29.45	6.10	38.18
14 Aurangabad	99.82	12,769.89	326.21	85.27	41.09	12.30	39.15
15 Parbhani	83.91	9,639.72	228.71	83.44	50.55	18.22	42.15
16 Beed	104.24	11,534.69	280.41	87.26	53.26	17.81	41.14
17 Nanded	97.92	11,324.71	285.54	84.42	45.07	13.73	39.66
18 Osmanabad	81.95	14,178.75	357.79	92.29	25.11	5.97	39.63
Marathwada	93.06	12,055.80	300.81	87.06	42.30	12.53	40.08
19 Buldhana	90.27	13,559.53	345.84	97.16	31.28	7.28	39.21
20 Akola	90.2	13,552.79	357.81	97.51	31.86	6.57	37.88
21 Amravati	83.16	14,059.02	379.98	96.14	25.45	4.80	37.00
22 Yavatmal	106.65	13,829.39	357.02	94.23	36.37	9.74	38.74
23 Wardha	101.88	14,082.50	366.82	96.68	26.48	5.71	38.39
24 Nagpur	70.34	12,486.89	311.73	98.19	29.21	5.92	40.06
25 Bhandara	81.19	13,593.55	319.93	92.07	25.07	5.21	42.49
26 Chandrapur	108.58	12,281.95	321.02	83.00	42.16	11.17	38.26
Vidarbha	89.94	13,317.63	341.47	94.31	31.91	7.06	39.00
Maharashtra State	81.50	13,464.91	352.88	93.67	32.28	7.10	38.16
Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)	90.82	13,959.21	364.52	93.07	33.35	7.89	38.29

Source: Government of Maharashtra (1984).

Table 9.3(A). Primary Schools

District		Year	Population 2001	Number of Primary Schools	Enrolment of Students in Primary Schools (000)	Total Teachers In Primary Schools (000)	Number of Primary Schools Per lakh of population	Enrolment of Students in Primary Schools per lakh of population	Total Teachers In Primary Schools Per lakh of population (000)	Student- Teacher ratio
1	Thane	2008-09	8132000	5613	1251	28	69.02	15.38	0.34	44.68
2	Raigad	2007-08	2208000	3037	271	10	137.55	12.27	0.45	27.10
3	Ratnagiri	2008-09	1697000	2795	197	9	164.70	11.61	0.53	21.89
4	Sindhudurg	2007-08	869000	1513	87	5	174.11	10.01	0.58	17.40
5	Nashik	2008-09	4994000	3394	603	17	67.96	12.07	0.34	35.47
6	Dhule	2008-09	1708000	1261	186	5	73.83	10.89	0.29	37.20
7	Jalgaon	2008-09	3683000	2152	436	12	58.43	11.84	0.33	36.33
8	Nandurbar	2007-08	1312000	1731	142	5	131.94	10.82	0.38	28.40
9	Ahmednagar	2007-08	4041000	3443	450	13.5	85.20	11.14	0.33	33.33
10	Pune	2008-09	7233000	4562	761	23	63.07	10.52	0.32	33.09
11	Satara	2008-09	2809000	2869	264	11	102.14	9.40	0.39	24.00
12	Sangli	2006-07	2584000	1886	294	9	72.99	11.38	0.35	32.67
13	Solapur	2006-07	3850000	3982	616	17	103.43	16.00	0.44	36.24
14	Kolhapur	2006-07	3523000	2185	375	12	62.02	10.64	0.34	31.25
15	Aurangabad	2007-08	2897000	2755	425	13	95.10	14.67	0.45	32.69
16	Latur	..	2080000	2259	419	14	108.61	20.14	0.67	29.93
17	Parbhani	2007-08	1528000	1192	269.52	7	78.01	17.64	0.46	38.50
18	Beed	..	2161000	2153	310	10	99.63	14.35	0.46	31.00
19	Nanded	2008-09	2876000	2373	454	11	82.51	15.79	0.38	41.27
20	Osmanabad	2007-08	1486000	1119	235	6	75.30	15.81	0.40	39.17
21	Jalna	2007-08	1613000	1396	263	6	86.55	16.31	0.37	43.83
22	Hingoli	..	987000	888	208	4	89.97	21.07	0.41	52.00
23	Buldhana	2005-06	2232000	1574.01	286.00	8.15	70.52	12.81	0.37	35.09
24	Akola	2006-07	1630000	1176.05	197.56	5.93	72.15	12.12	0.36	33.32
25	Washim	2007-08	1020000	910.96	171.39	4.00	89.31	16.80	0.39	42.85
26	Amravati	2007-08	2607000	1923.97	292.98	9.00	73.80	11.24	0.35	32.56
27	Yavatmal		2458000	2561.97	440.00	17.00	104.23	17.90	0.69	25.88
28	Wardha	2008-09	1237000	1097.96	111.00	4.00	88.76	8.97	0.32	27.75
29	Nagpur		4068000	2511.99	400.00	12.00	61.75	9.83	0.29	33.33
30	Bhandara	2008-09	1136000	900.05	116.00	4.00	79.23	10.21	0.35	29.00
31	Gondia	2007-08	1201000	1005.00	146.00	5.00	83.68	12.16	0.42	29.20
32	Chandrapur	2008-09	2071000	1817.10	208.00	8.00	87.74	10.04	0.39	26.00
33	Gadchiroli	2007-08	970000	1617.96	104.00	5.00	166.80	10.72	0.52	20.80
Maharashtra State										
(Excl. G.B.)			84901000	71655.01	10989.45	329.58	84.40	12.94	0.39	33.34

Source: Socio-economic Review of the Districts, Government of Maharashtra.

TABLE 9.4. Government and Government Aided Secondary Schools (1982-83)

	District	Number of Secondary Schools per lakh of Population	Enrolment of Students in Secondary Schools per lakh of Population	Total Teachers in Secondary Schools per lakh of Population	Percentage of Trained Teachers to Total Teachers in Secondary Schools	Student-Teacher Ratio
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	Greater Bombay	7.55	6,796.88	218.84	96.09	31.06
2	Thane	7.25	5,303.50	165.92	95.63	31.96
3	Raigad	9.49	4,963.97	173.57	91.59	28.60
4	Ratnagiri	13.26	5,219.88	192.49	90.31	27.12
	Konkan (Excl. G.B.)	9.55	5,205.47	175.63	93	29.64
5	Nashik	9.53	5,684.49	190.62	97.44	29.82
6	Dhule	10.19	5,255.00	177	97.08	29.69
7	Jalgaon	9.51	5,585.09	193.14	97.11	28.92
8	Ahmednagar	9.75	6,085.31	188.97	97.54	32.20
9	Pune	8.4	6,444.76	196.81	96.38	32.75
10	Satara	12.21	6,666.63	221.91	96.66	30.04
11	Sangli	12.78	6,106.39	212.32	97.09	28.76
12	Solapur	8.85	4,615.49	154.51	97.69	29.87
13	Kolhapur	9.3	5,145.93	173.24	97.65	29.70
	Western Maharashtra	9.8	5,758.71	189.16	97.12	30.44
14	Aurangabad	9.99	4,191.26	152.87	98.66	27.42
15	Parbhani	6.4	3,723.23	124.25	92.39	29.97
16	Beed	9.82	4,083.77	149.32	96.44	27.35
17	Nanded	9.26	4,316.96	152.34	94.11	28.34
18	Osmanabad	12.15	5,922.57	213.08	96.28	27.80
	Marathwada	9.99	4,506.39	160.66	95.4	28.05
19	Buldhana	10.27	4,956.46	166.63	96.66	29.75
20	Akola	10.24	5,735.01	188.35	95.18	30.45
21	Amravati	12.36	6,590.06	208.12	95.69	31.66
22	Yavatmal	10.3	4,686.71	154.25	92.16	30.38
23	Wardha	13.06	7,754.87	242.6	95.95	31.97
24	Nagpur	11.78	8,655.48	267.57	95.06	32.35
25	Bhandara	9.36	5,579.90	166.96	93.19	33.42
26	Chandrapur	7.59	4,349.74	132.37	92.76	32.86
	Vidarbha	10.48	6,090.07	191.54	94.66	31.80
	Maharashtra State	9.61	5,715.43	187.69	95.74	30.45
	Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)	9.92	5,551.98	182.98	95.67	30.34

Source: Government of Maharashtra (1984).

Table 9.4(A). Government and Government Aided Secondary Schools

District	Year	Population 2001	Number of Secondary Schools	Enrolment of Students in Secondary Schools (000)	Total Teachers In Secondary Schools (000)	Number of Secondary Schools Per lakh of population	Enrolment of Students in Secondary Schools per lakh of population (000)	Total Teachers In Secondary Schools Per lakh of population (000)	Student Teacher Ratio
(1)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
1 Thane	2008-09	8132000	1705	1132	17	20.97	13.92	0.21	66.59
2 Raigad	2007-08	2208000	561	224	6	25.41	10.14	0.27	37.33
3 Ratnagiri	2008-09	1697000	380	150	4	22.39	8.84	0.24	37.50
4 Sindhudurg	2007-08	869000	209	77	3	24.05	8.86	0.35	25.67
5 Nashik	2008-09	4994000	1034	486	13	20.70	9.73	0.26	37.38
6 Dhule	2008-09	1708000	407	228	7	23.83	13.35	0.41	32.57
7 Jalgaon	2008-09	3683000	831	407	11	22.56	11.05	0.30	37.00
8 Nandurbar	2007-08	1312000	433	151	4	33.00	11.51	0.30	37.75
9 Ahmednagar	2007-08	4041000	1021	435	12.7	25.27	10.76	0.31	34.25
10 Pune	2008-09	7233000	1099	972	14	15.19	13.44	0.19	69.43
11 Satara	2008-09	2809000	793	293	10	28.23	10.43	0.36	29.30
12 Sangli	2006-07	2584000	570	250	8	22.06	9.67	0.31	31.25
13 Solapur	2006-07	3850000	884	403	13	22.96	10.47	0.34	31.00
14 Kolhapur	2006-07	3523000	822	334	10	23.33	9.48	0.28	33.40
15 Aurangabad	2007-08	2897000	603	153	8	20.81	5.28	0.28	19.13
16 Latur	-	2080000	542	196	6	26.06	9.42	0.29	32.67
17 Parbhani	2007-08	1528000	264	107	2	17.28	7.02	0.14	50.52
18 Beed	-	2161000	609	189	7	28.18	8.75	0.32	27.00
19 Nanded	2008-09	2876000	468	104	4	16.27	3.62	0.14	26.00
20 Osmanabad	2007-08	1486000	421	95	4	28.33	6.39	0.27	23.75
21 Jalna	2007-08	1613000	216	119	3	13.39	7.38	0.19	39.67
22 Hingoli	-	987000	207	96	2	20.97	9.73	0.24	40.00
23 Buldhana	2005-06	2232000	426	228	6	19.09	10.22	0.27	38.00
24 Akola	2006-07	1630000	382	175	5	23.44	10.72	0.30	35.57
25 Washim	2007-08	1020000	194	53	2	19.02	5.18	0.19	27.24
26 Amravati	2007-08	2607000	661	284	6	25.35	10.89	0.23	47.33
27 Yavatmal		2458000	809	236	8	32.91	9.60	0.33	29.50
28 Wardha	2008-09	1237000	271	141	4	21.91	11.40	0.32	35.25
29 Nagpur		4068000	826	439	13	20.3	10.79	0.32	33.77
30 Bhandara	2008-09	1136000	260	102	4	22.89	8.98	0.35	25.50
31 Gondia	2007-08	1201000	390	127	4	32.47	10.57	0.33	31.75
32 Chandrapur	2008-09	2071000	543	175	5	26.2	8.45	0.24	35.00
33 Gadchiroli	2007-08	970000	321	107	3	33.09	11.03	0.31	35.67
Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)		84901000	19161	8668	229	22.57	10.21	0.27	37.84

Source: Socio-economic Review of the Districts, Government of Maharashtra.

Table 10.1. Industrial Training Institutes

as on March 31, 1983

District	Number of ITIs		Sanctioned Strength		Sanctioned Strength per lakh of 1981 Population in Government ITIs	Backlog of Students
	Government	Non-Government	Government	Non-Government		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1 Greater Bombay	3	10	1608	1212	19.51	1645
2 Thane	4	3	1648	272	49.17	..
3 Raigad	2	1	892	60	60	..
4 Ratnagiri	3	..	1000	..	47.36	..
Konkan (Excl. G.B.)	9	4	3540	332	50.94	..
5 Nashik	2	2	1500	156	50.14	..
6 Dhule	2	..	1316	..	64.18	..
7 Jalgaon	2	1	1016	32	38.8	271
8 Ahmednagar	2	2	864	144	31.9	468
9 Pune	7	6	2456	656	58.97	..
10 Satara	2	..	1936	..	94.96	..
11 Sangli	1	2	944	136	51.55	..
12 Solapur	1	..	736	..	28.19	547
13 Kolhapur	1	2	1500	96	59.85	..
Western Maharashtra	20	15	12268	1220	52.16	1286
14 Aurangabad	2	1	1088	56	44.71	109
15 Parbhani	1	..	472	..	25.8	427
16 Beed	2	..	600	..	40.37	131
17 Nanded	2	1	796	16	45.5	64
18 Osmanabad	4	1	1108	32	49.67	..
Marathwada	11	3	4064	104	41.77	731
19 Buldhana	2	..	676	..	44.8	66
20 Akola	2	..	804	..	43.19	101
21 Amravati	2	..	1172	..	62.96	..
22 Yavatmal	2	..	564	..	32.46	290
23 Wardha	2	..	596	..	64.32	..
24 Nagpur	2	3	1532	248	59.18	..
25 Bhandara	2	..	820	..	44.62	84
26 Chandrapur	2	..	784	..	38.14	236
Vidarbha	16	3	6948	248	48.44	777
Maharashtra State	59	35	28428	3116	45.28	4439
Maharashtra State (Excl. G.B.)	56	25	26820	1904	49.17	2794

Source: Government of Maharashtra (1984).

Table 10.1(A). Industrial Training Institutes

District		Year to which the Data relates	No of Government- ITIs	Approued Strength	Approued Strength per Lakh Population
(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	Greater Bombay				
2	Thane	2008-09	19	7000	86.08
3	Raigad	2008-09	16	2729	123.60
4	Ratnagiri	2008-09	10	1948	114.79
5	Sindhudurg	-	8	1332	153.28
Konkan (Excl. G.B.)			53	13009	100.80
6	Nashik	2008-09	15	3866	77.41
7	Dhule	2008-09	6	1355	81.24
8	Jalgaon	2008-09	17	2992	79.33
9	Nandurbar	2008-09	6	1535	117.00
10	Ahmednagar	2008-09	16	2592	64.14
North Maharashtra			60	12340	78.41
11	Pune	2008-09	16	3704	51.21
12	Satara	2008-09	11	3680	131.01
13	Sangli	2008-09	10	1836	71.05
14	Solapur	2006-07	13	N.A.	N.A.
15	Kolhapur	-	12	2856	81.07
Western Maharashtra			62
16	Aurangabad	2008-09	10	1557	53.75
17	Latur	-	8	1724	82.88
18	Parbhani	2007-08	8	945	61.85
19	Beed	-	11	1567	72.51
20	Nanded	2008-09	9	1628	56.61
21	Osmanabad	2007-08	8	1001	67.36
22	Jalna	2007-08	8	1133	70.24
23	Hingoli	2008-09	-	N.A.	N.A.
Marathwada		
24	Buldhana	2005-06	13	1788	80.11
25	Akola	2006-07	8	1484	91.04
26	Washim	2007-08	6	N.A.	N.A.
27	Amravati	2007-08	17	2833	108.66
28	Yavatmal		18	3339	135.84
29	Wardha	2008-09	8	1140	92.16
30	Nagpur		15	2896	71.19
31	Bhandara	2008-09	8	1752	154.23
32	Gondia	2007-08	9	1428	118.90
33	Chandrapur	2008-09	23	2672	129.02
34	Gadchiroli	2007-08	16	2552	263.09
Vidarbha			141
Maharashtra State (Excl. G. B., Solapur, Hingoli and Washim)			378	68864	87.12

Source: Socio-economic Review of the Districts, Government of Maharashtra.

TABLE 11.1. Government Dispensaries and S.M.P. Centres

District		Dispensaries		S.M.P. Centres		Dispensaries/S.M.P. Centres per Lakh of Population	
		1961	1981	1961	1981	1961	1981
(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	Greater Bombay
2	Thane	22	25		3	1.33	0.84
3	Raigad	16	18	15	34	2.93	3.5
4	Ratnagiri	14	27	36	49	2.74	3.6
Konkan (Excl. G.B.)		52	70	51	86	2.27	2.24
5	Nashik	48	32		22	2.59	1.8
6	Dhule	32	38	25	30	4.22	3.32
7	Jalgaon	50	50	21	27	4.02	2.94
8	Ahmednagar	13	12	20	23	1.86	1.29
9	Pune	23	24	24	54	1.91	1.87
10	Satara	28	28	21	33	3.43	2.99
11	Sangli	21	71	9		2.44	3.88
12	Solapur	33	17	15	19	2.58	1.38
13	Kolhapur	21	63		2	1.32	2.59
Western Maharashtra		269	335	135	210	2.64	2.32
14	Aurangabad	26	26			1.7	1.07
15	Parbhani	27	27		5	2.24	1.75
16	Beed	20	21			2	1.41
17	Nanded	27	61		12	2.5	4.17
18	Osmanabad	29	28		27	1.96	2.47
Marathwada		129	163		44	2.05	2.13
19	Buldhana	16	89			1.51	5.9
20	Akola	24	75			2.02	4.1
21	Amravati	23	126			1.87	6.77
22	Yavatmal	7	46		2	0.64	2.76
23	Wardha	4	42			0.63	4.53
24	Nagpur	25	82		1	1.65	3.21
25	Bhandara	12	112			0.95	6.09
26	Chandrapur	30	74			2.42	3.6
Vidarbha		141	646		3	1.53	4.52
Maharashtra State							
Maharashtra State (Excl. G. B.)		591	1214	186	343	2.19	2.85

Source: Government of Maharashtra (1984).

**Table 11.1(A). Government and Government-aided Hospitals,
Government Dispensaries and Primary Health. Centres**

District	Year to which the Data relates	No of Hospitals	Hospitals per Million Population	No of Dispensaries	Dispensaries per Lakh Population	No of PHCs	PHCs per Million Pop- ulation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1 Greater Bombay							
2 Thane	2008-09	30	3.69	45	0.55	122	15.00
3 Raigad	2007	15	6.79	20	0.91	53	24.00
4 Ratnagiri	2009	14	8.25	7	0.41	67	39.48
5 Sindhudurg	2009	11	12.66	12	1.38	38	43.73
6 Nashik	2008-09	37	7.41	28	0.56	103	20.62
7 Dhule	2009	12	7.03	25	1.46	41	24.00
8 Jalgaon	2008-09	23	6.24	32	0.87	77	20.91
9 Nandurbar	2007	19	14.48	24	1.83	58	44.21
10 Ahmednagar	2008-09	26	6.43	9	0.22	96	23.76
11 Pune	2008-09	48	6.64	85	1.18	96	13.27
12 Satara	2008	18	6.41	17	0.61	71	25.28
13 Sangli	2008-09	20	7.74	8	0.31	59	22.83
14 Solapur	2007	17	4.42	23	0.60	77	20.00
15 Kolhapur	2008-09	25	7.10	63	1.79	72	20.44
16 Aurangabad	2007	32	11.05	26	0.90	66	22.78
17 Latur	-	13	6.25	27	1.30	46	22.12
18 Parbhani	-	11	7.20	11	0.72	31	20.29
19 Beed	-	15	6.94	28	1.30	50	23.14
20 Nanded	2008-09	18	6.26	46	1.60	74	25.73
21 Osmanabad		10	6.73	14	0.94	42	28.26
22 Jalna	2007	12	7.44	12	0.74	39	24.18
23 Hingoli	-	5	5.07	9	0.91	24	24.32
24 Buldhana	-	20	8.96	75	3.36	52	23.30
25 Akola	2008	10	6.13	32	1.96	33	20.25
26 Washim	2008-09	8	7.84	11	1.08	25	24.51
27 Amravati	2007	19	7.29	117	4.49	56	21.48
28 Yavatmal		21	7.84	20	0.81	63	25.63
29 Wardha	2009	11	8.89	44	3.56	27	21.83
30 Nagpur		37	9.10	162	3.98	49	12.06
31 Bhandara	2007	8	7.04	41	3.61	33	29.05
32 Gondia	2007	12	9.99	39	3.25	39	32.47
33 Chandrapur	2007	16	7.73	19	0.92	58	28.01
34 Gadchiroli		13	13.40	5	0.52	45	46.39
Maharashtra State (Excl. G. B.)		606	7.14	2072	2.44	1882	22.17
Population -Maharashtra							
(Excl. Greater Mumbai)			84901000				

Source: Socio-economic Review of the Districts, Government of Maharashtra.

ANNEXURE II

BACKLOG REMOVAL

Although the Government had not formally accepted the recommendations in the Report of the Dandekar Committee, from the year 1985 onwards small allocations used to be made for removal of backlog ranging from Rs.200 crore in 1985 to Rs. 500 crore in 1993-94. After the constitution of the Boards in 1994, this amount for backlog removal was increased from Rs.500 crore to Rs. 900 crore in 1996-97 and to Rs. 1100 crore per year during 1997-98 to 2000-01. This allocation was further increased to Rs. 1720 crore during 2001-02.

The backlog however, continued to increase for Vidarbha and Marathwada regions despite special allocations for backlog removal after it was first identified in 1983 by the Dandekar Committee. In order to assess the correct extent of backlog, a committee of experts called Indicators and Backlog Committee was appointed by the Governor in 1995 for identifying appropriate indicators for assessing relative levels of development and for assessing the backlog in different regions on the basis of the indicators.

The Backlog and Indicators Committee assessed the backlog as of 1st April 1994 in the same nine sectors which were identified by the Dandekar Committee and used broadly the same methodology as that Committee, that is, worked out the financial backlog in these sectors as the cost of bringing the districts on par with the state average in these nine sectors using the (assumed) average costs in April 1994. Unlike the Dandekar Committee Report, which had considered the backlog in irrigation at the Taluka level in relation to the state average in Drought Prone areas, the Backlog and Indicators Committee used district level backlog for all districts since all the districts which included the Drought Prone areas had the Irrigation Potential Created as percentage of Net Sown Area as of April 1, 1994, above the state average.

The report of the Indicators and Backlog Committee was sent to the State Government for its comments. The State Government had communicated that some departments, especially Irrigation Department had expressed different views regarding assessment of backlog. Thereafter, the Governor had appointed the reconstituted Indicators and Backlog Committee to go into the details about the views of these departments. The Reconstituted Indicators and Backlog Committee added 15 more indicators to those considered by the earlier Indicators and Backlog Committee. These sectors are energy, agriculture, social welfare, women welfare, welfare of SC/ST, urban development, transport, anti poverty employment and public services, labour welfare, cooperation and credit, agro-industries including agricultural marketing, dairying, fisheries, forest and mining. But the main difference it made was to the assessment of the backlog in the irrigation sector by considering the expenditure on-going irrigation projects and in the estimation of net sown area and its conversion into standard rabi equivalent.

Procedure for Irrigation Backlog Removal (Extract of the Directives of the Governor, dated: 27 May 2009)

The backlog in the Irrigation sector was assessed in 1994 by the Indicators & Backlog Committee by using the then prevailing cost-norm of Rs. 50,000 per hectare. However, while finalising the region-wise backlog at the end of FY 1999-00 the Irrigation Department took into consideration the remaining cost of projects identified for backlog removal instead of uniform cost of Rs. 50,000 per hectare. This financial backlog has been taken as base while removing of backlog in subsequent years. The financial backlog in the subsequent years therefore has been calculated by deducting the expenditure incurred on backlog removal from the financial backlog as on 1 April 2000. Since the distinction between backlog and non backlog funds was removed in the directives of 15 December 2001

and the funds for irrigation sector as a whole were distributed among the three regions, the expenditure for backlog removal in subsequent years has been estimated by multiplying the assigned weightage attached to backlog removal in the respective year to the expenditure incurred in the districts having backlog in irrigation. After deducting this estimated expenditure for removal of backlog, the remaining backlog has been worked out at the end of the respective years.

While the basic cost norms as on 1st April 2000 have been taken into consideration for assessing the backlog, the financial backlog removed over the years have not been adjusted for inflation to arrive at quantum of the remaining backlog in the subsequent years.

Earlier there had been significant shortfalls and excess expenditures compared to allocations prescribed by the directives among the regions during the FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06. The corrections on account of these distortions are being made in a phased manner over the period of 3 years as per the directives of 1 March 2007.

The backlog as on 01/04/2009 is concentrated only in Buldhana, Akola (including Washim) and Gadchiroli districts of Vidarbha and Jalna and Osmanabad districts in Marathwada. While Vidarbha has spent less than its allocation, rest of Maharashtra and Marathwada regions have spent substantially more than their respective allocations during FY 2007-08.

The directives of 6 March 2006 stipulated a working calendar for the region-wise allocation of outlay with respective weightage to backlog, population, net sown area and on-going projects as given below. Although, the weightage to these factors are assigned in a phased manner in order to stagger the impact of high weightage to backlog over a period of four years, the weightages to these factors averages at 40, 25, 20, and 15 percent, respectively.

Further, the shortfalls/excess expenditures during FY 2006-07, FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09 are also required to be made good. The Governor has, however, noted that it may not be desirable to make all these corrections at one go in the current financial year itself because this would adversely affect the ongoing projects in the rest of Maharashtra region and it would also be difficult for the state to safeguard its interests before the Krishna Water Disputes Tribunal. The Governor has therefore directed that the corrections on account of excess expenditure of the financial year 2007-08 and 2008-09 and unspent balances as on 31/03/09 should be deferred and adjusted in the next 2 years equally.

Principle of allocation of funds in future

After liquidation of the current financial backlog as estimated in 1994, there may be an option of assessing the backlog created after 1st April 1994 till date by using the same indicators suggested by the Indicators and Backlog Committee. The drawback of this arrangement is that the issue of backlog remains open-ended and dynamic. The reason being after liquidation of existing financial backlog the state average is bound to increase and some districts are bound to remain below the state average. Thus, the process of removal of backlog based on the concept of state average becomes a never ending process not necessarily need based.

Considering the fact that the backlog of 1994 is expected to be liquidated by the year 2010, i.e., almost after 16 years, it would be difficult to envisage a fixed time frame for liquidation of backlog created after 1994. The cost and time overruns involved in the process might complicate the matter further.

The Indicators & Backlog committee had taken into account only the public investments ignoring the private sector from its analysis. But, under the emerging new economic scenario, the

role of the private sector in sectors such as infrastructure (roads and irrigation) cannot be ignored. Now it is imperative to revisit issue of assessment of backlog in the light of the new developments in the socio economic fields.

The present methodology focusing on backlog estimation which stipulates that all the regions are to be brought to the same level of development

does not take into account the needs and development opportunities of the regions in order to achieve balanced regional development.

There has not been any impact assessment study of the efforts to liquidate the irrigation backlog in terms of better returns to the farmers, improved quality of life and inclusive growth.

ANNEXURE III

Table III.1. Revenue Receipts - Ten year Averages

Andhra Pradesh: Total Revenue Receipts

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	71.06	72.67
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	48.59	54.29
	1 Taxes on income	0.57	1.59
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital (I to iii)	3.98	5.00
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (I to vii)	44.04	47.69
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	22.47	18.38
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	28.94	27.33
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	15.09	13.69
	1 Interest Receipts	8.14	6.36
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.03	0.07
	3 General Services	0.78	2.06
	4 Social Services	0.78	0.62
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (I to xvii)	5.35	4.58
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	13.84	13.64

Bihar: Total Revenue Receipts

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	70.71	78.66
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	27.40	21.02
	1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	3.30	3.02
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (I to vii)	24.10	18.00
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	43.31	57.64
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	29.29	21.34
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	12.04	2.89
	1 Interest Receipts	0.80	0.59
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.20	0.00
	3 General Services	0.62	0.64
	4 Social Services	0.56	0.40
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (I to xvii)	9.95	1.26
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	17.25	18.45

Chhattisgarh: Total Revenue Receipts

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	0.00	69.20
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	0.00	41.80
	1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.52
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	0.00	3.57
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (i to vii)	0.00	37.71
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	0.00	27.41
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	0.00	30.80
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	0.00	15.09
	1 Interest Receipts	0.00	1.20
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.00	0.11
	3 General Services	0.00	0.95
	4 Social Services	0.00	0.34
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (i to xvii)	0.00	12.49
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	0.00	15.71

Haryana: Total Revenue Receipts

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	56.56	71.32
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	48.15	64.23
	1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	4.52	7.78
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	43.63	56.44
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	8.41	7.10
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	43.44	28.68
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	36.76	21.33
	1 Interest Receipts	4.62	3.83
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.06	0.03
	3 General Services	22.02	4.27
	4 Social Services	1.55	6.40
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (I to xvii)	8.51	6.81
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	6.68	7.35

Himachal Pradesh: Total Revenue Receipts

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	46.00	33.41
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	20.49	23.81
	1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	0.93	1.29
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	19.56	22.52
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	25.51	9.60
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	54.00	66.59
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	10.43	11.54
	1 Interest Receipts	1.10	0.68
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.02	0.06
	3 General Services	1.31	1.03
	4 Social Services	1.13	1.07
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (I to xvii)	6.87	8.70
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	43.57	55.05

Jharkhand: Total Revenue Receipts

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	0.00	66.19
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	0.00	32.24
	1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	0.00	1.73
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (i to vii)	0.00	30.51
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	0.00	33.95
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	0.00	33.81
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	0.00	15.17
	1 Interest Receipts	0.00	0.79
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.00	0.03
	3 General Services	0.00	0.31
	4 Social Services	0.00	0.58
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (i to xvii)	0.00	13.46
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	0.00	18.64

Madhya Pradesh: Total Revenue Receipts

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	65.59	71.97
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	40.25	41.68
	1 Taxes on income	0.52	0.94
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	3.42	4.67
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (i to vii)	36.30	36.08
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	25.34	30.28
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	34.41	28.03
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	19.48	11.89
	1 Interest Receipts	2.41	0.91
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.02	0.09
	3 General Services	1.24	1.44
	4 Social Services	0.68	0.61
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (I to xvii)	15.13	8.84
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	14.92	16.15

Maharashtra: Total Revenue Receipts

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	74.94	75.87
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	63.51	66.61
	1 Taxes on income	2.21	2.48
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	7.03	10.53
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (I to vii)	54.26	53.60
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	11.43	9.27
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	25.06	24.11
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	17.77	14.25
	1 Interest Receipts	7.96	3.48
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.04	0.04
	3 General Services	1.71	4.90
	4 Social Services	1.11	1.00
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (i to xvii)	6.95	4.82
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	7.29	9.87

Punjab: Total Revenue Receipts

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	62.67	60.25
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	53.00	52.22
	1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	4.35	7.41
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (i to vii)	48.65	44.81
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	9.68	8.03
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	37.33	39.75
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	30.07	30.47
	1 Interest Receipts	10.85	5.70
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.09	0.07
	3 General Services	13.36	21.14
	4 Social Services	0.98	0.94
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (i to xvii)	4.78	2.61
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	7.25	9.29

Uttarakhand: Total Revenue Receipts

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	0.00	48.38
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	0.00	33.75
	1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.07
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	0.00	5.08
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (i to vii)	0.00	28.60
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	0.00	14.63
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	0.00	51.62
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	0.00	9.67
	1 Interest Receipts	0.00	0.45
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.00	0.00
	3 General Services	0.00	1.72
	4 Social Services	0.00	0.76
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (i to xvii)	0.00	6.74
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	0.00	41.96

Uttar Pradesh: Total Revenue Receipts

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	Total Revenue Receipts		
I	Tax Revenues (A+B)	71.10	79.70
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	38.25	39.76
	1 Taxes on income	0.03	0.03
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	5.44	6.65
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (i to vii)	32.79	64.69
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	32.85	39.95
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	28.90	20.30
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	11.20	7.68
	1 Interest Receipts	2.78	1.67
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.04	0.02
	3 General Services	4.35	1.82
	4 Social Services	0.95	1.37
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00
	6 Economic Services (i to xvii)	3.08	2.80
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	17.69	12.62

Table III.2. Capital Receipts of Selected States - Ten Year Averages**Andhra Pradesh**

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	402763.56	7905294.30
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	14.94
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	23.85	30.50
III.	Loans and Advs. from the Centre (1 to 6)	45.23	10.18
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	15.99	2.38
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	-0.01	0.01
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	6.58	2.88
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.60	0.75
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	8.50	15.74
X.	Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	-0.28	31.71
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00
XII.	Mesc. Capital Receipts	0.00	1.85
XIII.	Remittances (net)	-0.45	4.00

Bihar

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	212201.78	3747628.80
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	14.52
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	22.80	33.46
III.	Loans and Advs. from the Centre (1 to 6)	45.20	11.26
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	1.39	0.34
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.28
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	12.62	7.76
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	-0.08	0.45
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	2.64	10.79
X.	Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	-0.55	33.80
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	-0.27	0.00
XII.	Mesc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00
XIII.	Remittances (net)	15.99	1.86

Chhattisgarh

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	0.00	2750771.10
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	3.51
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	0.00	27.40
III.	Loans and Advs. from the Centre (1 to 6)	0.00	5.84
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	0.00	0.70
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.03
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	0.00	1.67
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	3.51
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	6.02
X.	Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	0.00	52.73
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00
XII.	Mesc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.01
XIII.	Remittances (net)	0.00	2.09

Haryana

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (1 to XIII)	175312.22	4822135.30
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	1.73
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	17.57	21.57
III.	Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	36.25	23.54
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	15.34	2.63
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	19.90	13.71
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	1.30	1.69
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	1.24	5.93
X.	Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	8.44	29.00
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00
XII.	Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00
XIII	Remittances (net)	-0.05	1.93

Himachal Pradesh

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (1 to XIII)	83686.33	1137487.60
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	6.00
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	40.71	27.90
III.	Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	92.07	22.00
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	12.03	0.81
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	0.06	0.00
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	61.06	10.48
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	-3.51	1.07
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	-2.56	3.14
X.	Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	-99.51	26.48
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	-0.06	0.00
XII.	Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00
XIII	Remittances (net)	-0.30	8.11

Jharkhand

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (1 to XIII)	0.00	542406.60
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	15.73
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	0.00	49.33
III.	Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	0.00	13.59
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	0.00	0.12
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	1.03
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	0.00	7.75
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	0.57
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	7.11
X.	Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	0.00	3.96
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00
XII.	Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00
XIII	Remittances (net)	0.00	6.54

Madhya Pradesh

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	260496.00	6450078.40
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	5.36
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	21.35	18.52
III.	Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	41.42	14.60
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	10.79	3.95
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	0.01	-0.12
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	22.19	8.47
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	1.59	1.06
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	3.87	8.84
X.	Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	-0.12	40.19
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00
XII.	Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00
XIII.	Remittances (net)	-1.10	4.50

Maharashtra

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	587721.44	8243252.00
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	11.08
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	13.92	27.98
III.	Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	41.39	7.64
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	7.08	3.30
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	0.72	0.64
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	7.52	4.82
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	22.52	5.48
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	7.94	7.56
X.	Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	1.69	33.84
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	-0.84	0.86
XII.	Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00
XIII.	Remittances (net)	-1.94	8.26

Punjab

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	287387.78	5466257.00
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	6.92
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	18.23	23.85
III.	Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	53.67	19.26
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	2.77	2.64
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	-0.02	0.01
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	14.83	5.57
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.26	0.75
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	2.81	2.85
X.	Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	1.84	43.23
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00
XII.	Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00
XIII.	Remittances (net)	0.44	1.84

Uttarakhand

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	0.00	2045652.60
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	5.86
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	0.00	13.92
III.	Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	0.00	5.28
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	0.00	0.29
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.31
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	0.00	3.49
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	0.81
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	12.05
X.	Suspense and Misc. @ @ (net) (1+2)	0.00	51.55
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00
XII.	Mesc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.28
XIII	Remittances (net)	0.00	12.00

UTTAR PRADESH

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	740796.67	22632473.60
	TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	3.63
I.	External Debt	0.00	0.00
II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	24.08	18.90
III.	Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	44.84	14.95
IV.	Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	4.14	3.19
V.	Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00
VI.	Contingency Fund (net)	-1.33	0.62
VII.	Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	9.88	4.65
VIII.	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	8.54	4.47
IX.	Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	10.05	8.35
X.	Suspense and Misc. @ @ (net) (1+2)	1.32	45.04
XI.	Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	-1.05
XII.	Mesc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00
XIII	Remittances (net)	-1.52	0.88

Table III.3. Revenue Expenditure - Ten-year Averages**Andhra Pradesh**

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)		
I.	Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	67.34	66.88
A.	Social Services (1 to 12)	38.62	35.97
B.	Economic Services (1 to 9)	28.72	26.92
II.	Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	31.86	36.39
A.	Organs of State	1.08	0.89
B.	Fiscal Services (I to iii)	1.77	1.39
C.	Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	13.71	18.24
D.	Administrative Services (I to v)	7.82	6.60
E.	Pensions	7.47	9.27
F.	Miscellaneous General Services #	0.00	0.00
III.	Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.35
IV.	Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.79	0.38
V.	Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Bihar

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)		
I.	Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	59.82	55.11
A.	Social Services (1 to 12)	37.04	38.49
B.	Economic Services (1 to 9)	22.78	16.63
II.	Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	39.99	44.87
A.	Organs of State	1.94	1.68
B.	Fiscal Services (I to iii)	2.14	1.37
C.	Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	18.27	18.48
D.	Administrative Services (I to v)	11.27	10.34
E.	Pensions	6.37	13.00
F.	Miscellaneous General Services #	0.00	0.00
III.	Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.01
IV.	Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.05	0.01
V.	Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Chhattisgarh

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)		
I.	Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	0.00	66.20
A.	Social Services (1 to 12)	0.00	40.03
B.	Economic Services (1 to 9)	0.00	26.17
II.	Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	0.00	30.16
A.	Organs of State	0.00	0.91
B.	Fiscal Services (I to iii)	0.00	2.28
C.	Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	0.00	13.52
D.	Administrative Services (I to v)	0.00	7.29
E.	Pensions	0.00	6.17
F.	Miscellaneous General Services #	0.00	0.00
III.	Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	2.42
IV.	Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.00	1.22
V.	Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Haryana

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)			
I.	Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	55.22	62.62
A.	Social Services (1 to 12)	27.34	32.05
B.	Economic Services (1 to 9)	27.88	30.57
II.	Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	44.61	36.49
A.	Organs of State	0.91	0.95
B.	Fiscal Services (I to iii)	0.89	0.96
C.	Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	12.87	16.85
D.	Administrative Services (I to v)	6.67	7.30
E.	Pensions	4.50	7.74
F.	Miscellaneous General Services #	18.77	2.68
III.	Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.77
IV.	Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.17	0.12
V.	Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Himachal Pradesh

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)			
I.	Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	66.06	56.75
A.	Social Services (1 to 12)	36.91	34.10
B.	Economic Services (1 to 9)	29.15	22.65
II.	Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	32.36	43.02
A.	Organs of State	1.20	0.97
B.	Fiscal Services (I to iii)	1.95	1.29
C.	Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	14.86	23.13
D.	Administrative Services (I to v)	8.95	6.74
E.	Pensions	6.36	10.73
F.	Miscellaneous General Services #	0.30	0.15
III.	Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.03
IV.	Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.33	0.20
V.	Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Jharkhand

Items		Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)			
I.	Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	0.00	63.47
A.	Social Services (1 to 12)	0.00	38.86
B.	Economic Services (1 to 9)	0.00	24.61
II.	Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	0.00	36.49
A.	Organs of State	0.00	1.31
B.	Fiscal Services (I to iii)	0.00	1.45
C.	Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	0.00	11.63
D.	Administrative Services (I to v)	0.00	13.45
E.	Pensions	0.00	8.65
F.	Miscellaneous General Services #	0.00	0.00
III.	Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.03
IV.	Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.00	0.00
V.	Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Madhya Pradesh

Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)		
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	66.60	58.69
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	37.70	33.42
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	28.90	25.27
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	30.64	36.69
A. Organs of State	0.93	0.97
B. Fiscal Services (I to iii)	2.90	3.86
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	12.65	16.40
D. Administrative Services (I to v)	8.47	7.72
E. Pensions	5.19	7.59
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	0.02	0.15
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	3.43
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	2.76	1.19
V. Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Maharashtra

Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)		
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	65.04	57.08
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	36.58	37.48
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	28.46	19.60
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	34.35	41.18
A. Organs of State	1.09	0.91
B. Fiscal Services (I to iii)	4.33	6.88
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	15.18	17.75
D. Administrative Services (I to v)	9.82	8.48
E. Pensions	3.71	6.14
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	0.21	1.01
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.04	0.98
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.58	0.76
V. Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Punjab

Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)		
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	51.93	41.65
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	26.44	22.46
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	25.49	19.19
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	47.15	56.83
A. Organs of State	0.93	0.87
B. Fiscal Services (I to iii)	1.29	1.11
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	21.56	21.27
D. Administrative Services (I to v)	13.02	9.61
E. Pensions	5.74	9.52
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	4.61	14.45
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	1.21
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.92	0.31
V. Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Uttarakhand

		Average	Average
Items		1991-2000	2001-2010
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)			
I.	Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	0.00	61.65
A.	Social Services (1 to 12)	0.00	38.39
B.	Economic Services (1 to 9)	0.00	23.26
II.	Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	0.00	34.84
A.	Organs of State	0.00	1.21
B.	Fiscal Services (I to iii)	0.00	1.72
C.	Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	0.00	15.84
D.	Administrative Services (I to v)	0.00	9.25
E.	Pensions	0.00	6.74
F.	Miscellaneous General Services #	0.00	0.08
III.	Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	2.02
IV.	Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.00	1.49
V.	Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Uttar Pradesh

		Average	Average
Items		1991-2000	2001-2010
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)			
I.	Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	54.56	51.04
A.	Social Services (1 to 12)	32.05	31.82
B.	Economic Services (1 to 9)	22.51	19.22
II.	Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	43.31	44.96
A.	Organs of State	1.36	1.10
B.	Fiscal Services (I to iii)	2.80	2.09
C.	Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	21.71	25.01
D.	Administrative Services (I to v)	9.99	8.47
E.	Pensions	4.50	8.24
F.	Miscellaneous General Services #	2.95	0.05
III.	Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	2.77
IV.	Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	2.12	1.23
V.	Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00

Table III.4. Capital Expenditure of Selected States - Ten-year Averages**Andhra Pradesh**

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	13.77
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	41.41	26.58
	1 Developmental (a+b)	40.72	25.89
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	5.28	2.65
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	37.86	23.24
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.68	0.69
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	2.85	6.88
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	16.76	7.39
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	38.99	11.54
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	37.43	11.19
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	7.95	3.78
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	29.48	7.41
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	1.56	0.35
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	1.44
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	1.29
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	20.39
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	46.43
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
XII	Remittances	0.00	5.25
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	35.81	16.95
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-36.43	-15.99
C.	Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B) Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	-0.67	0.96
D.	Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	0.35	0.27
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.54	0.54
F.	Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	-1.52	0.23

Bihar

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	16.73
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	39.85	31.64
	1 Developmental (a+b)	39.29	30.69
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	8.54	4.51
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	30.75	26.18
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.56	0.95
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	5.08	5.63
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	31.62	9.22
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	23.44	11.74
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	23.20	11.69
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	2.93	0.72
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	20.56	10.97
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.23	0.05
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.43
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	3.24
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	0.49
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	10.24
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	48.18
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
XII	Remittances	0.00	3.06
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	39.13	25.52
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-72.54	-29.49
C.	Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B) Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	-33.41	-3.97
D.	Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	182.40	-5.08
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	-217.14	1.03
F.	Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	1.32	0.00

Chhattisgarh

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	6.32
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	0.00	14.45
	1 Developmental (a+b)	0.00	14.09
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	0.00	3.00
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	0.00	11.09
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.00	0.36
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	0.00	1.41
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	0.00	2.26
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	0.00	1.96
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.00	1.93
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	0.00	0.93
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	0.00	1.00
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.00	0.03
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.03
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	0.95
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	0.67
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	3.00
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	69.21
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
XII	Remittances	0.00	6.06
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	0.00	2.57
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	0.00	-2.96
C.	Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B) Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	0.00	-0.39
D.	Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	0.00	-1.10
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.00	0.40
F.	Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	0.00	0.00

Haryana

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	3.48
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	44.08	25.56
	1 Developmental (a+b)	42.64	24.59
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	11.55	4.31
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	31.09	20.28
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	1.38	0.97
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	2.54	4.41
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	15.08	5.99
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	38.31	7.39
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	35.98	6.44
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	2.61	0.92
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	33.51	5.52
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	2.19	0.95
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	1.62
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	0.45
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	5.35
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	76.00
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
XII	Remittances	0.00	5.59
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	85.04	20.19
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-45.91	-20.57
C.	Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B) Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	39.37	-0.18
D.	Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	-0.15	-1.19
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	40.13	1.01
F.	Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	-0.86	0.00

Himachal Pradesh

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	15.28
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	69.21	63.26
	1 Developmental (a+b)	66.46	30.14
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	20.42	12.61
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	46.03	17.52
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	2.76	1.06
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	10.50	14.62
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	13.91	10.72
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	6.38	1.82
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	4.97	1.74
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	1.84	1.07
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	3.13	0.67
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	1.41	0.08
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	4.82
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	0.67
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	6.28
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	39.16
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
XII	Remittances	0.00	14.51
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	20.28	48.37
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-38.35	-38.92
C.	Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B) Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	-18.07	9.45
D.	Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	-14.32	3.89
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	-0.25	-1.99
F.	Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	-3.39	7.68

Jharkhand

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	38.99
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	0.00	39.39
	1 Developmental (a+b)	0.00	37.96
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	0.00	12.74
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	0.00	25.23
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.00	1.43
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	0.00	4.63
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	0.00	3.12
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	0.00	10.62
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.00	10.50
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	0.00	1.22
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	0.00	9.28
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.00	0.12
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	1.50
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	2.54
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	1.24
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	13.74
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	6.27
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
XII	Remittances	0.00	16.39
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	0.00	-10.01
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	0.00	-9.95
C.	Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B) Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	0.00	-19.97
D.	Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	0.00	-14.47
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.00	0.00
F.	Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	0.00	0.09

Madhya Pradesh

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	6.35
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	59.46	25.26
	1 Developmental (a+b)	58.61	24.78
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	9.52	4.38
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	49.09	20.40
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.84	0.48
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	2.65	5.65
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	17.82	7.77
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	20.07	7.64
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	19.44	7.54
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	3.11	2.63
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	16.32	4.92
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.63	0.10
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.03
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	1.70
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	0.41
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	6.55
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	67.15
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.01
XII	Remittances	0.00	8.50
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	55.06	37.67
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-55.08	-34.88
C.	Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B) Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	-0.02	2.80
D.	Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	1.29	1.85
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.40	0.49
F.	Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	-1.71	0.39

Maharashtra

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	9.54
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	60.47	30.60
	1 Developmental (a+b)	59.39	30.19
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	3.20	1.43
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	56.20	28.21
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	1.08	0.41
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	2.46	7.19
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	12.73	6.72
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	24.34	7.11
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	18.58	10.24
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	5.83	2.36
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	15.13	7.88
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	3.38	-3.13
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.76
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	1.33
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	3.16
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	7.36
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	50.54
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.43
XII	Remittances	0.00	12.45
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	34.52	44.47
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-31.37	-48.07
C.	Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B) Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	3.15	-3.60
D.	Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	-0.24	-0.34
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	3.39	-3.14
F.	Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	0.00	0.00

Punjab

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	4.26
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	33.21	15.62
	1 Developmental (a+b)	31.12	14.97
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	5.29	1.72
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	25.83	13.25
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	2.05	0.65
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	1.68	6.99
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	35.89	15.93
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	29.25	6.56
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	27.78	6.27
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	2.06	1.72
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	25.73	4.56
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	1.47	0.29
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	2.14
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	0.18
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	3.55
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	78.15
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
XII	Remittances	0.00	2.26
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	135.45	50.10
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-94.74	-47.53
C.	Overall Sur. (+)/Def. (-) (A+B) Fin.Sar (+)/Def (-)	40.71	2.57
D.	Increase (+)/Decr. (-) in cash Balances	-0.69	-1.28
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	35.43	0.46
F.	Increase (-)/Decr. (+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	2.57	3.34

Uttarakhand

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	7.77
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	0.00	9.65
	1 Developmental (a+b)	0.00	8.54
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	0.00	1.58
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	0.00	6.96
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.00	1.11
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	0.00	3.35
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	0.00	7.13
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	0.00	2.86
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.00	2.83
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	0.00	0.51
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	0.00	2.31
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.00	0.03
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.09
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	1.06
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	0.64
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	7.18
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	68.94
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
XII	Remittances	0.00	10.05
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	0.00	3.38
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	0.00	-10.05
C.	Overall Sur. (+)/Def. (-) (A+B) Fin.Sar (+)/Def (-)	0.00	-6.67
D.	Increase (+)/Decr. (-) in cash Balances	0.00	-6.58
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.00	-0.14
F.	Increase (-)/Decr. (+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	0.00	-0.06

UTTAR PRADESH

	Items	Average 1991-2000	Average 2001-2010
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)		
	Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	4.11
I.	Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	33.98	22.48
	1 Developmental (a+b)	32.04	21.41
(a)	Social Services (1 to 9)	5.64	2.04
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 10)	26.39	19.37
	2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	1.94	1.08
II.	Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	9.82	6.57
III.	Repayment of Loans to the Centre	17.38	9.10
IV.	Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	38.83	6.14
	1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	38.59	6.05
(a)	Social Services (1 to 4)	2.21	1.16
(b)	Economic Services (1 to 9)	36.38	4.89
	2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.24	0.09
V	Inter-State Settlement	0.00	0.00
VI	Contingency Fund	0.00	0.05
VII	Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)	0.00	0.74
VIII	Reserve Funds (1 to 4)	0.00	0.50
IX	Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)	0.00	4.35
X	Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)	0.00	79.69
XI	Appropriation to Contingency Fund	0.00	0.00
XII	Remittances	0.00	2.20
A.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	71.19	39.79
B.	Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-74.88	-39.77
C.	Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B) Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	-3.68	0.01
D.	Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	0.64	-0.36
E.	Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.32	0.48
F.	Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	-4.64	-0.11

ANNEXURE IV

Notes on Table IV-1. (Revenue Receipts)

(These asterisks and notes relate to individual states and all states totals)

[Blank or '0' or '-' means either zero or not available or not relevant; in many cases, changes in classification resulting in deletion/addition of new sub-heads in some years have been responsible for them; and in some others, blanks have been introduced while cross checking the totals.]

[The Accounts figures are provided for the period 1980-81 to 2000-01. For the subsequent years 2001-02 and 2002-03, Revised Estimates (RE) and Budget Estimates (BE) figures, respectively, are given.]

Indicates the presence of some proviso explained in notes [nos. (xxi) to (xxiv)]

Special Notes

- (i) Additional Resource Mobilisation (ARM) measures are not included in the Annexure; the details of the same are presented in Appendix Table 16. The ARM proposed by the state governments for 2002-03 is estimated at Rs 3528.7 crore.
- (ii) In terms of the change in the Constitutional provision for sharing Central taxes between the Centre and the states, all taxes and duties (except surcharge on taxes and duties and any cess for specific purposes) are distributed between the Union and the states from the year 2000-01 as against the earlier provision for sharing of income tax and union excise duty. As details of states' share in the Central taxes are not uniformly available in the 'state budgets, only aggregate position of the states' share in Central taxes has been presented.
- (iii) The data shown in the tables may differ from those reported in the states' budget papers due to adjustments made to ensure uniformity in presentation.
- (iv) Under Economic Services, the item 'Industries' includes Non-Ferrous Mining and Metallurgical Industries and Other Industries while 'Others' includes receipts from Dairy Development, Land Reforms, Other Rural Development Programmes, Hill Areas, Civil Aviation, Inland Water Transport, Foreign Trade and Export Promotion, Non-Conventional Energy Sources, General Economic Services, Civil Supplies, Roads and Bridges, etc.
- (v) Where details are not available in respect of one or several sub-heads under a major group, the relevant amount is shown against the sub-head 'Others' except for Sales Tax where the relevant amount is shown against the sub-head 'State Sales Tax' in the columns which present the total for all states together.
- (vi) In case of 'Grants from the Centre', where details are not available in respect of 'State Plan Scheme', 'Central Plan Scheme', 'Centrally Sponsored Scheme', and 'Non-Plan Grants', the relevant amounts are shown against 'State Plan Schemes'. Similarly, where the break-up of grants for 'Central Plan Schemes' and 'Centrally Sponsored Schemes' are not available, the relevant amount is shown against 'Centrally Sponsored Schemes'.

- (vii) Earlier, the receipts from 'Surcharge on Cash Crops' was part of 'Taxes on Property and Capital Transactions'. And this 'Surcharge on Cash Crops' relates to 'Surcharge on Commercial Crops other than Sugarcane'. This item was given separately till 1984-85 (Accounts) and discontinued there after. Similarly, the receipts from 'Surcharge and Cess on Sugarcane' which was provided separately under 'Taxes on Commodities and Services', discontinued since 1984-85.
- (viii) 'NEC/ Special Plan Scheme' was introduced in 1992-93 (Accounts).
- (ix) The detailed breakup of receipts under the head 'Interest Receipts' are not available since 1984-85 (Accounts).
- (x) The receipts from 'Minor Irrigation' was part of 'Agriculture' till 1984-85 (Accounts).
- (xi) The amounts shown against 'Road Transport' refers to receipts under 'Road and Water Transport Services' until 1984-85 (Accounts).
- (xii) Receipts under the head 'Royalty on Minerals and Mineral Concession Fees' were given separately until 1984-85 (Accounts).
- (xiii) The amounts given under the head 'Crop Husbandry' refer to receipts under the head Agriculture until 1984-85 (Accounts).
- (xiv) Receipts under 'Diary Development' were given separately until 1984-85 (Accounts).
- (xv) The item 'Turnover Tax' was introduced as a separate head in 1985-86 (Accounts).
- (xvi) Figures in respect of Bihar and Nagaland for 2000-01 relate to revised estimates.
- (xvii) The budget estimates and revised estimates for 2001-02 and budget estimates for 2002-03 include three new states, viz., Chattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttaranchal formed in November 2000. The accounts for 2000-01 include the data of Chattisgarh and Uttaranchal for the period November 2000 to March 2001 and do not include those of Jharkhand.
- (xviii) Data in respect of lottery receipts (2000-01) 'All states' do not include those of 'Sikkim' due to non-availability of information.
- (xix) For the year 1988-89 for All States, the figure Rs. 445 lakh shown against 'Ports and Light Houses' does not agree with the sum of individual states for the sub-head of Revenue Receipts. (see RBI's Finances of State Governments, 1990-91, p.95)
- (xx) For the year 1993-94 for Uttar Pradesh, the figure Rs. 43837 lakh shown against 'Economic Services', does not agree with the sum of its constituent items. (see RBI's Finances of State Governments, 1995-96, p.1178)
- (xxi) The amount of Rs. 11077 lakh for 1987-88 for Gujarat shown against 'Industries' has been changed by EPWRF to accord with sub-head and all states totals. We have used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure is Rs. 1077 lakh. (see RBI's Finances of State Governments, 1989-90, p.1169)
- (xxii) The amount of Rs 167533 lakh for 1994-95 for Delhi shown against 'Taxes on Commodities and Services' has been changed by EPWRF to accord with sub-head and all states totals. We have used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure was Rs. 358150 lakh. (see RBI's Finances of State Governments, 1996-97, p.113)
- (xxiii) The amount of Rs 274529 lakh for 1994-95 for West Bengal shown against 'Taxes on Commodities and Services' has been changed by EPWRF to accord with sub-head and all states totals. We have used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure was Rs. 167533 lakh. (see RBI's Finances of State Governments, 1996-97, p.113)

- (xxiv) The amount of Rs. 24432 lakh for 1992-93 for Mizoram shown against 'Grants from the Centre' has been changed by EPWRF to accord with sub-head and all states totals. We have used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure was Rs. 23432 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1994, p.1217)

Notes on Table IV.2. (Capital Receipts)

(These asterisks and notes relate to individual states and all states totals)

[Blank or '0' or '-' means either zero or not available or not relevant; in many cases, changes in classification resulting in deletion/addition of new sub-heads in some years have been responsible for them; and in some others, blanks have been introduced or '0's have appeared by default while cross checking the totals.]

[The Accounts figures are provided for the period 1980-81 to 2000-01. For the subsequent years 2001-02 and 2002-03, Revised Estimates (RE) and Budget Estimates (BE) figures, respectively, are given.]

- * Excludes Ways and Means Advances and Overdrafts from the Reserve Bank of India.
- ** Indicates the presence of some proviso explained in the note (x)
- # Indicates the presence of some proviso explained in the notes (xiv to xli)
- ^ Indicates the presence of some proviso explained in the notes (xi, xii, xiii)
- \$ It includes provisional data for remittances of (-) Rs. 688664 lakh for Bihar as given in the budget documents. (see note-vii)
- (a) Include Land Compensation Bonds, Loans from Khadi and Village Industries Commission, Central Warehouse Corporation (CWC), etc.
- (b) With the change in the system of accounting with effect from 1999-2000, States' share of small savings collections, which was included earlier under loans from the Centre, is included under Internal Debt and shown as Special Securities issued to National Small Savings Fund (NSSF) of the Central Government as a separate item. For the subsequent years, it has been placed under 'Internal Debt'.
- (c) Comprise 'Recovery of Loans and Advances' to 'Government Servants' for housing, purchase of conveyances, festivals, marriages, etc.
- (d) Include 'Recovery of Loans and Advances' for Education, Art and Culture, Social Security and Welfare, Fisheries and Animal Husbandry, etc.
- (e) Excludes Cash Balance Investment Account.
- (f) Does not match with the constituents in the source.
- (g) Excludes the medium-term loans of Rs. 1743.46 lakh given by the Centre in July 1982 to the States to clear their overdrafts outstanding with the Reserve bank of India as at the end of March 1982.
- (h) All States figures for the indicators 'Suspense and Miscellaneous (XI)', Suspense, and Others as reported in RBI's annual study on State Finances for 1982-83 are (-) Rs 2772 lakh, (-) Rs 21769 lakh and Rs 18997 lakh, respectively. But it does not match with the sum of the corresponding figure of All States. The discrepancies are Rs. 4578 lakh, Rs 4688 lakh and (-) Rs. 110 lakh, respectively (see *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*, October 1984, p.748)

Special Notes

- (i) Where details are not available in respect of one or several sub-heads under a major group, the relevant amount is shown against the sub-head 'Others'.
- (ii) In case of 'Loans and Advances from the Centre', where details are not available in respect of 'State Plan Schemes', 'Central Plan Schemes', and 'Centrally Sponsored Schemes', the relevant amount is shown against 'State Plan Schemes'. Similarly, where the break-up of loans for 'Central Plan Schemes' and 'Centrally Sponsored Schemes' are not available, the relevant amount is shown against 'Centrally Sponsored Schemes'.
- (iii) The amount shown against 'Internal Debt' may not match with its constituents for 1999-00 as 'Special Securities Issued to NSSF' was not included under 'Internal Debt' during that period.
- (iv) Figures in respect of Bihar and Nagaland for 1987-88 and 2000-01 relate to revised estimates.
- (v) The budget estimates and revised estimates for 2001-02 and budget estimates for 2002-03 include three new states, viz., Chattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttaranchal formed in November 2000. The accounts for 2000-01 include the data of Chattisgarh and Uttaranchal for the period November 2000 to March 2001 and do not include those of Jharkhand.
- (vi) For the year 2000-01, Jammu and Kashmir and Sikkim, information on 'Market Loans' is not available in the budget documents. As per RBI records, Market Loans in respect of Jammu and Kashmir and Sikkim amounted to Rs. 239 crore and Rs. 25 crore, respectively.
- (vii) For 1996-97 'Total Receipts' for All States as provided in RBI's annual study on State Finances is Rs. 4289094 lakh. It includes provisional data for remittances of (-) Rs. 688664 lakh for Bihar as given in the budget documents. By excluding net remittances aggregate receipts become Rs 4977758 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1999, pp.S222 and S223)
- (viii) For the year 1982-83 for Tripura, there is a discrepancy of Rs. 634 lakh in 'Total Receipts'. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1984, p.746). [See note (g) above].
- (ix) For the year 1999-00 for All States, reproduced the same figure Rs. 64 lakh given by RBI under 'Land Compensation and Other Bonds', which is a constituent item of 'Others' under 'Internal Debt'. This does not add up to the total of all the states Rs. 58 lakh. (see RBI's annual study on State Finances: 2001-02, p. A107).
- (x) For the year 1993-94, for Orissa, 'Non-Plan' under 'Loans and Advances' does not add up to its constituents (i), (ii), and (iii) with the amount of Rs. 12292 lakh, discrepancy shown is Rs. 23 lakh. Same discrepancy in All States total. (see RBI's Finances of State Governments : 1995-96, p. 1247 and 1252, respectively).
- (xi) For the year 1982-83, for Bihar the figure against 'Total Receipts' does not add up to its constituent items. Total should be Rs. 55048 lakh. Discrepancy of Rs. 3944 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1984, p. 738)
- (xii) For the year 1998-99 for Sikkim, the figure against 'State Plan Schemes' under 'Loans and Advances from the Centre' the RBI is erroneously shown as Rs. 5324 lakh instead of Rs. 5354 lakh, discrepancy of Rs. 30 lakh (see RBI's annual study of State Finances, 2000-01, p. A95)

- (xiii) For the year 1982-83 for Uttar Pradesh, there is a discrepancy of Rs. 85 lakh in 'Others' under 'Non-Plan', the figure should be Rs. 4117 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1984, p.747)
- (xiv) For the year 1991-92 for All States, the figure against 'Minor Irrigation' and 'Co-operation' under the category of 'Recovery of Loans and Advances' as shown in RBI's annual study on State Finances is Rs. 586 lakh and Rs. 24230 lakh, respectively. It has been changed by EPWRF to Rs. 86 lakh for 'Minor Irrigation' and Rs. 24730 lakh for 'Co-operation' (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 298)
- (xv) For the year 1994-95, for All States, the figure against 'Advance release of Plan Assistance for Natural Calamities' under 'State Plan Schemes' has been changed by EPWRF to Rs. 19637 lakh, in accord with the total of all the states and by judging the other cross totals. The figure given by RBI was Nil (see 966 Finances of State Governments : 1996-97, p. 186).
- (xvi) For the year 1983-84, for All States, the figure against 'Others' under 'Non Plan' has been changed by EPWRF to Rs. 76005 lakh to accord with the sub-group totals. The figure given by RBI's annual study on State Finances is Rs. 36005 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, November 1985, p. 917)
- (xvii) For the year 1983-84, for All States, 'Total Receipts' figure has been changed to Rs. 873300 lakh by EPWRF to correct the mismatch between the aggregate figure and its constituents. Available data in RBI's annual study on State Finances (1985) is Rs. 909350 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, November 1985, p. 917)
- (xviii) For the year 1983-84, for All States, the figure under 'Loans and Advances from the Centre' has been changed to Rs. 530257 lakh by EPWRF to accord with sub-head and All States totals. The figure provided in RBI's annual study on State Finances is Rs. 490257 lakh (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, November 1985, p. 917)
- (xix) The figures for All States against 'Deposits and Local Funds' and 'Civil Advances' under the category of 'Deposits and Advances (net)' for 1989-90 as provided in the RBI's annual study on State Finances are Rs. 46047 lakh and (-) Rs. 9080 lakh, respectively. The figures have been changed to Rs 38692 lakh and (-) Rs. 1725 lakh, respectively by EPWRF. In fact, difference of (-) Rs. 7355 lakh and Rs. 7355 lakh is noticed for 'Deposits and Local Funds' and 'Civil Advances', respectively when the figures for all states is subtracted from the corresponding sum of each state's figure. For the category as a whole (Deposits and Advances) no mismatch between figures for All States and sum of each state's is noticed though it is observed in its constituents. (see RBI's Finances of State Governments 1991-92, p. 697)
- (xx) For the year 1990-91, for Orissa the figure against 'Land Compensation and Other Bonds' under 'Others' wrongly entered Rs. 10 lakh instead of 0 (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, March 1993, p.345).
- (xxi) For the year 1987-88 the figures for All States against 'Land Compensation and Other Bonds' is Rs. 171 lakh while the corresponding each state's figure adds up to Rs. 191 lakh. Therefore, the figures for All States has been changed to Rs. 191 lakh by EPWRF (see RBI's annual study on Finances of State Governments, 1989-90, p. 1258)

- (xxii) For the year 2002-03(BE), for Bihar, the figure against 'State Plan Schemes' under 'Loans and Advances from the Centre' has been changed by EPWRF to Rs. 151800 lakh from Rs. 51800 lakh wrongly printed (see RBI's annual study on State Finances 2002-03, p. A94)
- (xxiii) For the year 2002-03(BE), for Goa, the figure against 'Internal Debt' has been changed by EPWRF to Rs. 25350 lakh from Rs. 2535 lakh wrongly printed (see RBI's annual study on State Finances 2002-03, p. A95)
- (xxiv) For the year 2002-03(BE), for Uttaranchal, the figure against 'Land Compensation and Other Bonds', constituent item of 'Others' under 'Internal Debt' has been changed by EPWRF to Rs. 5000 lakh from Rs. 500 lakh wrongly printed (see RBI's annual study on State Finances 2002-03, p. A105)
- (xxv) For the year 1982-83 for Gujarat, the figure against 'Loans and Advances from the Centre' has been corrected to Rs. 28237 lakh by EPWRF (on certain credible assumptions). The RBI figure is erroneously given as Rs. 35697 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1984, p. 738)
- (xxvi) For 1991-92 for Andhra Pradesh shown against 'Others' under 'Non-Plan' has been changed by EPWRF to Rs 3320 lakh accord with all states totals. EPWRF has used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure was blank. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 286)
- (xxvii) For the year 1991-92 for Arunachal Pradesh shown against 'Others' under 'Non-Plan' has been changed by EPWRF to Rs 11 lakh accord with all states totals. EPWRF has used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure is Rs. 3596 lakh (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 286)
- (xxviii) For the year 1991-92 for Goa, the figure against 'Others' under 'Non-Plan' has been changed to Rs. 10 lakh by EPWRF to accord with all the states totals. EPWRF has used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure is blank. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p.288)
- (xxix) For the year 1991-92 for Gujarat, the figure against 'Others' under 'Non-Plan' has been changed to Rs. 745 lakh by EPWRF to accord with all the states totals. EPWRF has used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure is 0. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 288)
- (xxx) The amount of Rs. 455 lakh for 1991-92 for Kerala shown against 'Others' under 'Non-Plan' has been changed by EPWRF to accord with all states totals. EPWRF has used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure is blank. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 291)
- (xxxi) The amount of Rs. 1904 lakh for 1991-92 for Madhya Pradesh shown against 'Others' under 'Non-Plan' has been changed by EPWRF to accord with all states totals. EPWRF has used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure is Rs. 442 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 291)
- (xxxii) The amount of Rs. 2936 lakh for 1991-92 for Maharashtra shown against 'Others' under 'Non-Plan' has been changed by EPWRF to accord with all states totals. EPWRF has used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure is blank. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 292)

- (xxxiii) The amount of Rs. 104 lakh for 1991-92 for Manipur shown against 'Others' under 'Non-Plan' has been changed by EPWRF to accord with all states totals. EPWRF has used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. The RBI figure is Rs. 2670 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 292)
- (xxxiv) For the year 1990-91 for Mizoram, the figure against 'Market Loans' under 'Internal Debt' has been corrected by EPWRF to 0. The RBI figure is erroneously given as Rs. 512 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, March 1993, p. 344)
- (xxxv) For the year 1992-93 for Punjab, the figure against 'Total Receipts' does not add up to its constituents; it has been corrected by EPWRF to Rs. 430851 lakh. The RBI figure is erroneously given as Rs. 431251 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1994, p. 1295 or RBI's Finances of State Governments 1994-95, p. 1295)
- (xxxvi) For the year 1991-92 for Rajasthan, the figures against 'Ways and Means Advances from the Centre' and 'Loans for Special Schemes' has been changed by EPWRF to 0 and Rs. 245 lakh, respectively to accord with all states totals. The RBI figure is erroneously given as Rs. 245 to 'Ways and Means Advances from the Centre' and 0 to 'Loans for Special Schemes'. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 295)
- (xxxvii) For the year 1982-83 for Tripura, the figure against 'Others' under 'Suspense and Miscellaneous' has been changed to (-) Rs. 40 lakh by EPWRF to accord with sub-head and all states totals. The figure given by RBI is Rs. 40 lakh (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1984, p.746)
- (xxxviii) For the year 1984-85 for Uttar Pradesh, the figure against 'Civil Advances' under 'Deposits and Advances' has been changed to (-) Rs. 23 lakh by EPWRF, to accord with sub-group and all states totals. The figure given by RBI is Rs. 23 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, November 1986, p. 833)
- (xxxix) For the year 1984-85 for Uttar Pradesh, the figure against 'Suspense' under 'Suspense and Miscellaneous' has been changed to (-) Rs. 15462 lakh by EPWRF, to accord with sub-group and all states totals. The figure given by RBI is Rs. 15462 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, November 1986, p. 833).
- (xl) For the year 1991-92 for Uttar Pradesh, the figures against 'Central Plan Schemes', 'Centrally Sponsored Schemes', 'Non-Plan', 'Share of Small Savings', 'Relief for Natural Calamities', 'Others', 'Ways and Means Advances from the Centre' and 'Loans for Special Schemes' have been changed by EPWRF to Rs. 5 lakh, Rs. 1159 lakh, Rs. 84438 lakh, Rs. 80333 lakh, 0, Rs. 4105 lakh and Rs. 2500 lakh, 0, respectively. EPWRF has used the time series properties to guess the correct figure. These figures are wrongly printed in RBI's study. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, p. 297).
- (xli) For the year 1990-91 for West Bengal, the figure against 'Contingency Fund' has been changed by EPWRF to (-) Rs. 2 lakh, RBI's figure is Rs. 2 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, March 1993, p. 349).

Notes on Table IV.3. (Revenue Expenditure)
(These asterisks and notes relate to individual states and all states totals)

[Blank or '0' or '-' means either zero or not available or not relevant; in many cases, changes in classification resulting in deletion/addition of new sub-heads in some years have been responsible for them; and in some others, blanks have been introduced while cross checking the totals.]

- ^ Indicates the presence of some proviso explained below (\$\$).
- \$\$ For 1994-95, Revised Estimates have been used in respect of Bihar, Jammu & Kashmir and Nagaland for the same year, as per the original source, Plan and Non-Plan figures do not add up to the total for many items under 'Social Services' and 'Interest Payments and Servicing of Debt' (RBI's Annual Study on State Finances 1996-97, p.170)
- * Include expenditure on Information and Publicity, Secretariat-Social Services, Other Social Services, etc.
- @ Include expenditure on Non-Ferrous Mining and Metallurgical Industries.
- ** Include expenditure on Other Industries and Other Outlays on Industries and Minerals.
- @ @ Include expenditure on Port and Light Houses, Civil Aviation, Road Transport, Inland Water Transport, etc.
- + Include expenditure on Foreign Trade and Export Promotion, Census, Survey and Statistics and Other General Economic Services.
- ++ Include expenditure on Public Service Commission, Treasury Accounts, Administrative, Jails, Supplies and Disposal, Stationary and Printing, Other Administrative Services, etc.

Special Notes

- (i) Figures given in this Annexure may in some cases differ from those given in the states' budget papers due to adjustments made to ensure uniformity in presentation.
- (ii) Where details are not available in respect of one or several sub-heads under major heads, the relevant amount is shown against the sub-head 'Others'.
- (iii) During 1980-81 to 1984-85, the item 'Energy' under 'Economic Services' represents revenue expenditure on 'Power Sector' alone. The figures are not available for the item 'Energy' during the period mentioned above.
- (iv) Difference of the group total 'Economic Services' and the sum of its constituents in 1986-87, 1987-88 (Accounts) are due to the adjustment of transfers of Reserve Funds under various functional heads.
- (v) Figures in respect of Bihar and Nagaland for 2000-01 relate to revised estimates.
- (vi) The budget estimates and revised estimates for 2001-02 and budget estimates for 2002-03 include three new states, viz., Chattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttaranchal formed in November 2000. The accounts for 2000-01 include data of Chattisgarh and Uttaranchal for the period November 2000 to March 2001 and do not include those of Jharkhand.
- (vii) Due to the non-availability of data in case of Manipur, the breakup of Plan and Non-Plan expenditure for 1999-2000 relate to revised estimates and would not add up to the aggregate figures which relate to the accounts data available in the budget documents.

- (viii) For the year 1994-95, transfers to State Road Fund, Employment Guarantee Fund, Education Cess Fund, etc. and grants to local bodies reported by Maharashtra under the head 'Fiscal Services', has been distributed under the functional heads of 'Social Services', 'Economic Services', 'General Services' and 'Compensation and Assignment to local bodies' according to the expenditure pattern of the relevant funds. In the years where the total Transfer under the 'Fiscal Services' exceeds total expenditure of the fund, the difference in amount has been reported as transfer to Road Fund, Education Cess Fund, etc.
- (ix) For the years from 1984-85 to 1980-81, EPWRF has reallocated the figures from 'Power Project' under 'Water and Power Development' to 'Power' under 'Energy' to be consistent with other years. Also, as 'Power' is a constituent item of 'Energy', the same figure is repeated against 'Energy' also to achieve internal consistency. However, this has not altered the figures of group totals or aggregate expenditure.

Notes on Table IV.4. (Capital Expenditure)
(These asterisks and notes relate to individual states and all states totals)

[Blank or '0' or '-' means either zero or not available or not relevant; in many cases, changes in classification resulting in deletion/addition of new sub-heads in some years have been responsible for them; and in some others, blanks have been introduced or '0's have appeared by default while cross checking the totals.]

[The Accounts figures are provided for the period 1980-81 to 2000-01. For the subsequent years 2001-02 and 2002-03, Revised Estimates (RE) and Budget Estimates (BE) figures, respectively, are given.]

- \$ Plan and Non-Plan figures might not add up to total RBI February 1997, p. 235. Due to the nonavailability of data on minor budget heads as well as the break-up of major budget heads into Plan and Non-Plan for 1994-95 (Accounts) in the budget documents of the Government of Uttar Pradesh, the figures reported against these heads in the Plan and Non-Plan columns relate to the revised estimates for 1994-95. As a consequence, these data do not correspond to the aggregate of major budget heads, reported herein, which relate to the actuals or accounts data available in the budget documents. Due to the non-availability of data in the case of Manipur, the break-up of Plan and Non-Plan expenditure for 1999-2000 relate to revised estimates and would not add up to the aggregate figures which relate to the accounts data available in the budget documents
- * Indicates the presence of some proviso explained in the note (xxi)
- # Indicates the presence of some proviso explained in the note (xxv)
- ^ Indicates the presence of some proviso explained in the notes (xxiii, xxiv, xxv)
- + Excludes Ways and Means Advances and Overdrafts from the Reserve Bank of India and loans to the State Bank of India and other banks (xiii)
- ** Include outlay on Cement and Non-Metallic Industries, Petro-Chemical Industries, Chemical Industries and Engineering Industries, Telecommunications and Electronic Industries, Consumer Industries, Atomic Energy Industries, Other Industries and Industries and Minerals, etc. (x)
- (a) Includes outlay on Information and Publicity, Other Social Services, etc.

- (b) Includes outlay on other Agricultural Programmes, etc.
- (c) Includes outlay on Indian Railway Commercial Lines, Indian Railway Strategic Lines, Ports and Light Houses, Shipping, Civil Aviation, Road Transport, Inland Water Transport, Other Transport, etc.
- (d) Includes outlay on Foreign Trade and Export promotion, Technology, Other General Economic Services and Investments in General Financial and Trading Institutions, International Financial Institutions, etc.
- (e) This includes the provisional data for Bihar as given in the budget documents (xxii)

Special Notes

- (i) Figures given here may differ from those given in the states' budget papers due to adjustments made to ensure uniformity in presentation.
- (ii) Where details are not available for one or several sub-head under a major group, the relevant amount is shown against the sub-group 'Others'.
- (iii) Amounts under the head 'Medical and Public Health' relate to expenditures under the head 'Medical, Family Planning, Public Health, etc.' until 1984-85. Over the period 1985-86 to 1987-88, amounts under 969 From 1988-89 to 1994-95, amounts under the head 'Medical and Public Health' relate to expenditures under the head 'Medical, Public Health and Family Welfare'.
- (iv) Amounts given under the head 'Education, Sports, Art and Culture' relate to Expenditures under the head 'Education, Art and Culture, Scientific Services and Research' until 1984-85.
- (v) Until 1984-85, expenditures on 'Urban Development' were included under the head I(a) 10 'Others'. After that year they have been given a separate head.
- (vi) Until 1984-85, expenditures on 'Welfare of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and 'Other Backward Classes' were included under the head I(a) 10 'Others'. After that year they have been given a separate head.
- (vii) Amounts given under the head I 1(b) 1(i) 'Crop Husbandry' relate to expenditures under the head 'Agriculture' until 1984-85.
- (viii) Amounts given under the head I 1 (b) 1(ii) 'Soil and Water Conservation' relate to expenditures under the head 'Minor Irrigation, Soil Conservation and Area Development' until 1984-85.
- (ix) I 1(b) 1(xi) 'Food and Nutrition' was carried as a separate head until 1984-85.
- (x) Until 1984-85, amounts under the sub-head I 1(b) 7 Industry and Minerals were distributed over subheads (i) Industrial Research and Development (ii) Village and Small Industries (iii) Machinery and Engineering Industries Industries and (iv) Others (iv) Consumer Industries and (v) Others. Since that year, amounts under the same sub-group have been distributed over sub-head (i) Village and Small Industries (ii) Iron and Steel Industries (iii) Non-Ferrous Mining and Metallurgical (which includes outlays on Cement and Non-metallic Industries, Fertiliser Industries, Petro-Chemical Industries, Chemical Industries, Engineering Industries, Telecommunication and Electronic Industries, Consumer Industries, Atomic Energy Industries, Other Industries and Industries and Minerals, etc.)
- (xi) Amounts under the head 'Energy' were, prior to 1985-86, given under the sub-head 'Power Projects', a sub-item in the sub-head 'Water and Power Development'.

- (xii) After 1984-85, the sub-head 'Water and Power Development' was replaced by the sub-groups I 1(b) 4 (Major and Medium Irrigation and Flood Control) and I 1(b) 6 (Energy)
- (xiii) The sub-head 'Discharge of Internal Debt' excludes repayment of Ways and Means Advances and Overdrafts from the Reserve Bank of India and repayment of loans to the State Bank of India and other banks.
- (xiv) Since 1995-96, loans for Education, Sports, Art and Culture [IV 1(a)1] have been reported as a separate sub-head.
- (xv) Amounts given under the head IV 1(b)1 'Crop Husbandry' relate to 'Loans and Advances' made under the head 'Agriculture' until 1984-85.
- (xvi) Amounts given under the head IV 1(b)2 Soil and Water Conservation relate to 'Loans and Advances' made under the head 'Minor Irrigation, Soil Conservation and Area Development' until 1984-85.
- (xvii) Amounts given under the head IV 1(b)8 Other Industries and Minerals relate to 'Loans and Advances' made under the head 'Industrial Research and Development' until 1984-85.
- (xviii) Owing to the redistribution of certain sub-heads over sub-groups to preserve consistency of presentation over time, the sub-totals of some sub-groups such as 'Agriculture and Allied Activities', 'General Services', etc., given here may not tally with the same sub-totals as reported by the Reserve Bank of India publications prior to 1987. The major totals such as those for 'Social Services' and 'Economic Services' (and their superior heads), however, are in full conformity with those reported by the Reserve Bank of India publications for all years.
- (xix) IV 1(b)5 Major and Medium Irrigation was introduced as a separate head from 1995-96.
- (xx) OBC= Other Backward Classes.
- (xxi) For the year 1998-99 for All States, the figure against 'Land Compensation Bonds', a constituent of 'Others' under 'Discharge of Internal Debt', does not add up to the total of all the states. Sum of all the states is Rs. 1561 lakh, discrepancy of Rs. 611 lakh. The figure given by RBI for All States is Rs. 950 lakh. (see. RBI's annual study on State Finances: 2000-2001, p. A153)
- (xxii) For the year 1996-97 for All States, the figure against Items under 'Contingency Fund' from C to F, includes provisional data for Bihar as given in the budget documents. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1999, p. S330)
- (xxiii) For the year 1995-96 for All States, the figure shown against 'Public Health', a constituent of 'Medical & Public Health' under 'Social Services' does not add up to the across total of all the states, because this total does not incorporate Goa.
- (xxiv) For the year 1991-92 for All States, the figure against 'Government Servants (Housing)', a constituent item of 'Social Services' under 'Developmental Purposes' is not tallying with the across total of all the states. The figure for Madhya Pradesh is not incorporated in All States, hence the discrepancy of Rs. 394 lakh. Across total is Rs. 13231 lakh and Rs. 16150 lakh for Non-Plan and Total, and All States is Rs. 12837 lakh and Rs. 15756 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, February 1994, pp. 323 and 351)

- (xxv) For the year 1989-90 for All States, discrepancies of Rs. 55 lakh, (-) Rs. 85 lakh and Rs. 30 lakh against 'Crop Husbandry', 'Soil and Water Conservation', and 'Co-operation' under 'Economic Services' of 'Development Purposes' because Jammu & Kashmir figures are not incorporated. (see RBI's annual study on Finances of State Governments, 1991-92, pp. 716 and 750)
- (xxvi) For the year 1993-94 for All States, the figure against 'Urban Development' under 'Social Services' has been changed by EPWRF to accord with sub-head and all states totals. The figure given by RBI is Rs. 12568 lakh. (see RBI's annual study on State Finances: 1995-96, p. 1306)
- (xxvii) For the year 2002-03 for Uttaranchal, the figure against 'Non-Developmental (General Services)' has been changed by EPWRF to Rs. 6505 lakh. The figure provided by RBI is Rs. 650 lakh. (see RBI's annual study on State Finances: 2002-03, p. A160)
- (xxxviii) For the year 1992-93 for Assam, the figure against 'Non-Plan' value has been changed by EPWRF to Rs. 41748 lakh. The figure provided by RBI is Rs. 41794 lakh (see RBI's Finances of State Governments 1994-95, p.1305)
- (xxix) For the year 1987-88 for All States, discrepancies of Rs. 53 lakh and (-) Rs. 53 lakh, in 'Food Storage and Warehousing' under 'Agriculture and Allied Activities' under 'Economic Services'. (see RBI's annual study on Finances of State Governments, 1989-90, p. 1309)
- (xxx) For the year 1981-82 for Sikkim, the figures shown against 'Discharge of Internal Debt', 'Loans and Advances by State Government' not tallying with All States, hence the discrepancies of (-) Rs. 13 lakh, (-) Rs. 10 lakh and (-) Rs. 23 lakh. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1983, p. 760)
- (xxxi) For the year 1982-83 for All States, discrepancy of Rs. 17 lakh which is against 'Others' in Orissa and 'Government Servants' in All States. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1984, pp. 778 and 794)
- (xxxii) For the year 1982-83 for All States, discrepancy of Rs. 151 lakh against 'Government Servants' and 'Miscellaneous' under 'Non-Developmental Purposes'. (see Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, October 1984, pp. 74 and 794.)

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Andhra Pradesh											(Rs. in Lakhs)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		
Total Revenue Receipts (I+II)											
I	628199	706636	825045	878638	987489	1119331	1384110	1425950	1680462		
	69.26	69.83	66.90	69.55	67.68	69.87	76.04	76.93	73.50		
A.	48.63	47.96	46.46	48.11	41.73	43.61	51.39	55.83	53.61		
	0.50	0.48	0.47	0.47	0.43	0.65	0.55	0.85	0.74		
	3.24	3.52	3.52	4.39	4.05	4.69	3.89	4.28	4.26		
iii)											
	44.89	43.96	42.47	43.25	37.25	38.28	46.96	50.70	48.60		
B	20.63	21.88	20.45	21.43	25.95	26.25	24.64	21.10	19.90		
II	30.74	30.17	33.10	30.45	32.32	30.13	23.96	23.07	26.50		
C.	15.61	15.26	16.38	17.42	16.26	14.52	12.92	12.95	14.53		
	10.17	8.18	8.55	8.75	7.27	7.36	6.53	8.03	8.45		
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.02		
	0.89	0.75	0.64	0.84	1.01	1.00	0.67	0.63	0.61		
	0.76	0.76	0.86	0.73	0.63	0.61	0.52	0.52	1.67		
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
	3.78	5.57	6.32	7.06	7.30	5.48	5.16	3.71	3.78		
D.	15.13	14.90	16.72	13.03	16.06	15.62	11.04	10.12	11.97		

(Contd.)

Andhra Pradesh (Concd.)

Items	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03RE (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
Total Revenue Receipts	1947524	2184505	2410679	2686848	2874951	3485120	4424549	5414255	6968595	7896370
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	74.61	71.47	72.72	70.25	77.61	75.06	74.11	73.84	70.18	66.83
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	54.18	57.51	58.10	51.38	56.54	55.11	54.08	53.18	51.29	51.50
1 Taxes on income	0.71	5.21	5.59	0.63	0.63	0.65	0.71	0.66	0.56	0.57
2 Taxes on Property and Capital (I to iii)	4.11	3.80	4.32	4.28	4.95	5.98	6.79	6.13	5.28	4.38
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (I to vii)	49.36	48.51	48.19	46.48	50.96	48.48	46.58	46.39	45.44	46.55
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	20.43	13.95	14.61	18.86	21.07	19.94	20.04	20.66	18.90	15.34
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	25.39	28.53	27.28	29.75	22.39	24.94	25.89	26.16	29.82	33.17
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	14.08	13.36	13.37	13.42	13.06	13.46	14.66	13.05	12.05	16.39
1 Interest Receipts	7.53	7.04	7.05	6.77	5.95	5.85	5.04	6.51	6.18	5.64
2 Dividends and Profits	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.18	0.16	0.13	0.11	0.02	0.05	0.02
3 General Services	0.78	0.85	0.67	1.02	1.52	2.42	4.60	1.82	1.47	5.46
4 Social Services	0.97	0.98	0.74	0.93	0.45	0.41	0.56	0.36	0.41	0.44
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (I to xvii)	4.79	4.48	4.90	4.52	4.99	4.65	4.35	4.33	3.94	4.82
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	11.30	15.18	13.91	16.34	9.33	11.48	11.22	13.11	17.76	16.77

- I. TAX REVENUE (I+II)
- I.A.1 Taxes on Income (i+ii)
- i) Agricultural Income Tax
- ii) Taxes on Professions, Trades, Callings and Employment
- I.A.2 Taxes on Property and Capital transactions (i to iii)
- i) Land Revenue
- ii) Stamps and Registration fees
- iii) Urban immovable Property Tax
- I.A.3 Taxes on Commodities and Services (i to vii)
- i) Sales Tax (a to f)
- (a) State Sales tax
- (b) Central Sales Tax
- (c) Sales Tax on Motor Spirit and Lubricants
- (d) Surcharge on Sales Tax
- (e) Receipts of Turnover Tax
- (f) Other Receipts
- ii) State Excise
- iii) Taxes on Vehicles
- iv) Taxes on Goods and Passengers
- v) Taxes and Duties on Electricity
- vi) Entertainment Tax
- vii) Other Taxes and Duties
- Shares in Central Taxes (1 to 3)
1. Income Tax
2. Estate Duty
3. Union Excise Duties
- Social Services (i to viii)
- i) Education, Sports, Art and Culture
- ii) Medical, Public Health and Family Welfare
- iii) Housing
- iv) Urban Development
- v) Labour and Employment
- vi) Social Security and Welfare

- II.C.6
- vii) Water Supply and Sanitation
- viii) Others
- Economic Services (i to xvii)
- i) Crop Husbandry
- ii) Animal Husbandry
- iii) Fisheries
- iv) Forestry and Wildlife
- v) Plantations
- vi) Co-operation
- vii) Other Agricultural
- viii) Major and Medium Irrigation Projects
- ix) Minor Irrigations
- x) Power
- xi) Petroleum
- xii) Village and Small Industries
- xiii) Industries@
- xiv) Ports and Light Houses
- xv) Road Transport
- xvi) Tourism
- xvii) Others*
- II.D Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)
1. State Plan Schemes of which: Advance for Natural Calamities
2. Central Plan Schemes
3. Centrally Sponsored Schemes
4. NEC/ Special Plan Scheme
5. Non-Plan Grants (a to c)
- a) Statutory Grants
- b) Grants for relief on account of Natural Calamities
- c) Others

See 'Notes on Tables'.

Source: Upto 2001-2002 Handbook of Statistics on State Government Finances, RBI publication, 2004.

2002-2010, RBI's State Finances A Study of Budgets of various years.

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Bihar											(Rs. in Lakhs)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		
Total Revenue Receipts	485374	596358	662912	679784	737741	803791	869255	927206	1257860		
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	66.46	64.59	64.03	68.02	73.99	78.74	74.37	76.71	69.46		
A. States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	26.98	26.22	26.37	27.01	26.75	28.00	27.50	28.81	28.92		
1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	2.70	3.35	3.46	4.27	3.18	3.14	3.08	3.18	3.36		
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	24.28	22.87	22.91	22.74	23.57	24.86	24.42	25.64	25.56		
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	39.48	38.37	37.66	41.01	47.25	50.74	46.87	47.90	40.54		
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	33.54	35.41	35.97	31.98	26.01	21.26	25.63	23.29	30.54		
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	11.17	13.04	13.38	14.34	12.40	13.20	4.48	12.36	13.98		
1 Interest Receipts	0.14	0.12	0.49	0.43	0.27	0.70	1.01	1.47	2.61		
2 Dividends and Profits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.70	0.00	1.11	0.00		
3 General Services	0.26	0.28	0.35	0.51	0.20	0.26	1.51	0.85	1.37		
4 Social Services	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.50	0.40	0.30	1.06	0.85	0.47		
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	10.28	12.17	12.05	12.90	11.53	11.24	0.90	8.94	9.52		
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	22.37	22.37	22.59	17.64	13.61	8.06	21.14	10.93	16.56		

(Contd.)

Bihar (Concdd.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
Total Revenue Receipts	1138472	1021848	1156876	1352493	1571415	1783671	2308318	2820970	3631723	4183743
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	83.52	84.26	82.02	80.55	79.32	78.39	75.05	77.46	71.86	74.16
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	25.78	23.90	23.90	24.85	21.27	19.96	17.47	18.03	17.50	17.53
1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	3.35	3.67	3.94	4.10	2.94	3.14	2.29	2.61	2.15	1.97
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	22.43	20.23	19.95	20.75	18.33	16.82	15.18	15.42	15.35	15.56
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	57.74	60.36	58.12	55.70	58.05	58.42	57.58	59.43	54.36	56.62
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	16.48	15.74	17.98	19.45	20.68	21.61	24.95	22.54	28.14	25.84
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	7.08	3.53	2.80	3.29	2.66	2.93	2.21	1.86	1.21	1.29
1 Interest Receipts	1.17	0.87	0.25	0.22	0.48	1.21	0.76	0.61	0.16	0.13
2 Dividends and Profits	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3 General Services	1.49	0.82	0.86	0.89	0.93	0.36	0.27	0.17	0.22	0.38
4 Social Services	0.45	0.60	0.50	0.92	0.26	0.44	0.34	0.18	0.18	0.10
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	3.98	1.24	1.19	1.26	0.98	0.91	0.85	0.91	0.65	0.61
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	9.40	12.21	15.19	16.15	18.02	18.68	22.73	20.67	26.93	24.55

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

(Rs. in Lakh)

Chhattisgarh

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
* Total Revenue Receipts	188291	437570	582017	595932	724887	883851	1144961	1387867	1677780	1889721
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	66.90	72.42	64.61	69.77	70.41	74.22	72.01	69.55	66.03	66.11
A. States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	39.81	45.55	39.33	43.43	44.53	45.85	44.07	40.48	37.72	37.20
1 Taxes on income	1.52	1.09	0.97	0.72	0.37	0.23	0.14	0.08	0.02	0.02
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	3.51	3.15	3.02	2.93	3.81	3.84	3.93	3.97	3.70	3.81
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	34.78	41.31	35.34	39.78	40.34	41.77	39.99	36.43	34.00	33.37
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	27.08	26.87	25.28	26.34	25.88	28.37	27.94	29.07	28.32	28.91
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	33.10	27.58	35.39	30.23	29.59	25.78	27.99	30.45	33.97	33.89
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	15.31	16.51	15.33	18.87	17.16	13.91	12.68	14.56	12.03	14.53
1 Interest Receipts	0.18	1.12	1.29	2.05	1.40	1.11	1.62	1.48	0.97	0.82
2 Dividends and Profits	0.00	0.11	0.37	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01
3 General Services	0.46	0.70	0.61	1.66	0.90	0.68	0.42	2.37	0.90	0.81
4 Social Services	0.30	0.57	0.21	0.40	0.32	0.48	0.43	0.28	0.21	0.19
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	14.37	14.00	12.86	14.17	14.55	11.64	10.20	10.43	9.94	12.70
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	17.79	11.07	20.06	11.36	12.43	11.87	15.32	15.89	21.94	19.36

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Haryana											(Rs. in Lakh)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		

(Contd.)

Haryana (Concd.)

Items	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
Total Revenue Receipts	657389	760055	878191	984349	1114907	1385331	1795243	1975074	2177060	2243700
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	70.83	71.33	70.46	70.59	72.29	74.20	68.09	67.10	74.52	73.84
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	65.58	65.42	63.83	64.49	66.73	65.53	60.87	58.82	65.69	65.28
1 Taxes on income	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	6.56	6.68	6.82	7.27	6.62	9.77	9.90	8.98	9.71	5.52
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	59.01	58.73	57.00	57.22	60.11	55.77	50.97	49.85	55.98	59.76
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	5.25	5.91	6.62	6.10	5.56	8.67	7.22	8.27	8.83	8.56
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	29.17	28.67	29.54	29.41	27.71	25.80	31.91	32.90	25.48	26.16
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	21.90	21.92	21.38	22.58	22.82	17.75	25.57	25.81	17.53	16.05
1 Interest Receipts	3.59	4.38	4.84	4.86	4.24	3.19	3.61	3.83	3.15	2.58
2 Dividends and Profits	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.04
3 General Services	7.30	6.82	6.75	6.89	7.52	2.15	1.36	1.36	1.23	1.32
4 Social Services	2.02	1.92	1.87	2.71	3.95	6.40	15.36	15.42	7.67	6.66
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	8.96	8.79	7.88	8.09	7.10	6.00	5.21	5.16	5.45	5.45
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	7.27	6.75	8.17	6.82	4.89	8.05	6.34	7.10	7.95	10.11

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Himachal Pradesh											(Rs. in Lakhs)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		
Total Revenue Receipts											
I		99242	105249	146512	130636	175403	199201	217045	231193	371529	
	Tax Revenues (A+B)	43.61	47.31	37.22	51.16	42.29	42.79	51.94	56.20	41.48	
A.	States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	19.44	21.06	17.46	22.92	19.47	20.69	21.94	24.74	16.70	
	1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	2 Taxes on Property and Capital	0.89	1.06	0.76	1.01	0.84	1.07	0.94	0.98	0.84	
	3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	18.55	20.01	16.69	21.92	18.64	19.61	21.00	23.76	15.86	
B	Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	24.17	26.25	19.76	28.23	22.82	22.10	30.00	31.46	24.79	
II	Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	56.39	52.69	62.78	48.84	57.71	57.21	48.06	43.80	58.52	
C.	State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	7.50	6.34	8.23	10.16	6.69	7.37	10.23	8.89	28.43	
	1 Interest Receipts	0.56	0.43	0.22	0.71	1.45	1.22	0.60	0.41	4.29	
	2 Dividends and Profits	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	
	3 General Services	1.21	1.50	1.16	0.90	1.35	1.36	1.42	1.37	1.50	
	4 Social Services	0.63	0.72	0.56	0.72	0.53	0.55	3.68	2.08	0.68	
	5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	5.08	3.68	6.28	7.80	3.35	4.20	4.51	5.00	21.94	
D.	Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	48.89	46.35	54.55	38.68	51.02	49.84	37.83	34.91	30.09	

(Contd.)

Himachal Pradesh (Concl'd.)

Items	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03RE (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
Total Revenue Receipts	304558	371580	388073	398092	463451	655862	783522	914156	1005111	1047833
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	34.76	33.39	33.60	36.02	38.61	30.35	29.17	30.10	32.42	35.64
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	23.92	24.64	23.76	24.73	27.01	22.83	21.14	21.42	22.89	25.77
1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	1.09	2.32	0.98	1.34	1.68	1.27	1.20	0.97	0.97	1.07
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	22.83	22.32	22.78	23.39	25.34	21.55	19.94	20.45	21.93	24.70
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	10.85	8.75	9.84	11.29	11.59	7.52	8.03	8.68	9.53	9.88
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	65.24	66.61	66.40	63.98	61.39	69.65	70.83	69.90	67.58	64.36
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	5.81	5.34	6.67	7.33	13.18	10.52	17.06	19.94	14.18	15.41
1 Interest Receipts	0.49	0.21	0.28	0.29	0.92	0.75	1.11	0.73	1.00	1.00
2 Dividends and Profits	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.44	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.03
3 General Services	1.09	0.86	0.92	0.93	1.25	0.72	1.59	1.20	0.69	1.10
4 Social Services	0.98	0.90	0.91	1.56	1.22	1.11	0.92	0.95	1.06	1.10
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	3.23	3.34	4.54	4.54	9.77	7.50	13.42	17.05	11.41	12.19
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	59.43	61.27	59.72	56.65	48.22	59.14	53.77	49.96	53.39	48.94

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Items	Jharkhand										(Rs. in Lakh)
	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)	
* Total Revenue Receipts	609963		740648	744349	730718	820277	1014447	1161207	1610709	1793360	
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	69.98		61.89	59.48	66.73	62.44	68.47	71.87	68.96	65.87	
A. States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	34.03		30.75	30.60	32.87	35.21	30.84	30.57	31.56	33.74	
1 Taxes on income	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	1.42		1.33	1.56	1.94	1.89	1.26	1.25	2.64	2.29	
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	32.62		29.42	29.04	30.93	33.32	29.57	29.32	28.92	31.46	
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	35.95		31.14	28.89	33.86	27.22	37.64	41.29	37.40	32.13	
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	30.02		38.11	40.52	33.27	37.56	31.53	28.13	31.04	34.13	
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	15.73		12.96	15.46	16.78	16.95	14.13	13.77	13.63	17.13	
1 Interest Receipts	0.82		0.76	0.75	1.22	1.09	0.58	0.53	0.46	0.90	
2 Dividends and Profits	0.02		0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.06	
3 General Services	0.30		0.28	0.40	0.19	0.42	0.36	0.36	0.23	0.21	
4 Social Services	0.46		0.43	0.69	0.64	0.48	0.46	0.46	0.42	1.20	
5 fiscal Services	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	14.13		11.48	13.60	14.71	14.93	12.69	12.39	12.45	14.76	
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	14.29		25.15	25.05	16.49	20.61	17.40	14.36	17.41	16.99	

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

(Rs. in Lakh)

Madhya Pradesh

Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Total Revenue Receipts	537699	644259	706979	761828	865347	1001423	1125712	1134585	1320368
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	63.39	60.12	61.65	62.30	66.01	67.30	70.10	70.87	68.59
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	39.38	36.22	37.87	37.68	40.66	40.98	40.55	45.03	43.89
1 Taxes on income	0.19	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.17	1.12	0.72	0.97	1.40
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	3.39	3.06	3.12	3.29	3.42	3.42	3.46	3.77	3.89
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	35.79	33.13	34.69	34.36	37.07	36.43	36.36	40.29	38.60
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	24.01	23.90	23.78	24.62	25.36	26.32	29.55	25.84	24.70
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	36.61	39.88	38.35	37.70	33.99	32.70	29.90	29.13	31.41
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	19.34	22.35	19.86	21.20	20.55	19.72	17.93	15.71	18.70
1 Interest Receipts	1.01	5.31	3.05	2.80	1.63	2.69	1.98	1.30	1.95
2 Dividends and Profits	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01
3 General Services	1.60	1.07	1.19	1.39	1.08	1.08	1.19	0.98	1.61
4 Social Services	0.82	0.82	0.73	0.62	0.53	0.57	0.69	0.60	0.71
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	15.90	15.11	14.87	16.39	17.28	15.35	14.05	12.82	14.42
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	17.27	17.53	18.50	16.50	13.44	12.98	11.97	13.43	12.71

(Contd.)

Madhya Pradesh (Concd.)

Items	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03RE (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
Total Revenue Receipts	1366707	1120098	1417816	1428896	1974325	2059679	2569428	3068874	3494900	3996103
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	76.26	72.39	70.28	77.23	65.08	75.04	72.24	72.41	70.87	67.87
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	41.26	41.98	42.24	47.51	39.37	44.25	40.76	39.16	40.06	40.23
1 Taxes on income	1.26	1.63	1.41	1.35	0.78	0.77	0.66	0.63	0.45	0.50
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	3.77	4.40	3.95	4.61	4.23	5.27	5.38	5.41	5.31	4.31
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	36.23	35.95	36.88	41.55	34.35	38.21	34.72	33.12	34.31	35.42
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	35.00	30.41	28.04	29.72	25.71	30.79	31.48	33.25	30.80	27.65
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	23.74	27.61	29.72	22.77	34.92	24.96	27.76	27.59	29.13	32.13
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	12.62	14.30	10.15	10.36	22.60	10.72	10.35	8.92	9.00	9.85
1 Interest Receipts	1.35	2.20	0.63	0.13	0.13	2.56	0.52	0.67	0.43	0.44
2 Dividends and Profits	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.19	0.30	0.25
3 General Services	1.35	2.06	1.12	0.88	0.95	0.90	3.35	1.66	1.53	0.57
4 Social Services	0.55	0.66	0.27	0.57	0.45	0.37	0.29	0.31	1.11	1.49
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	9.36	9.37	8.11	8.71	21.06	6.86	6.13	6.08	5.63	7.11
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	11.12	13.31	19.57	12.41	12.32	14.24	17.41	18.67	20.13	22.28

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Maharashtra											(Rs. in Lakhs)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		
Total Revenue Receipts	977259	1081821	1298679	1508948	1655928	1925524	2031657	2173709	2526947		
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	73.41	73.56	71.13	74.05	76.16	72.66	76.05	78.78	78.65		
A. States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	60.93	60.65	59.26	62.66	66.03	60.84	67.53	65.34	68.32		
1 Taxes on income	2.17	2.18	1.95	1.98	2.00	1.99	1.95	2.51	3.20		
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	4.24	5.14	5.31	8.15	8.19	7.19	8.77	7.91	8.38		
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	54.52	53.33	52.00	52.52	55.84	51.66	56.80	54.91	56.75		
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	12.48	12.91	11.87	11.40	10.13	11.81	8.53	13.44	10.32		
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	26.59	26.44	28.87	25.95	23.84	27.34	23.95	21.22	21.35		
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	18.29	17.87	18.35	19.24	16.76	19.50	17.92	16.44	15.58		
1 Interest Receipts	8.01	7.65	7.15	7.80	7.68	10.57	8.34	7.61	6.82		
2 Dividends and Profits	0.09	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.02		
3 General Services	2.23	1.87	1.77	1.57	1.82	1.50	1.57	1.30	1.72		
4 Social Services	1.29	1.07	1.15	1.04	0.99	0.91	1.14	1.21	1.25		
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	6.67	7.22	8.26	8.80	6.25	6.48	6.83	6.29	5.78		
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	8.30	8.58	10.52	6.71	7.08	7.84	6.03	4.79	5.77		

(Contd.)

Maharashtra (Concd.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03RE	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
Total Revenue Receipts	2956692	3009294	3418215	3437051	4101332	4843828	6219535	7958315	8296993	8906065
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	76.13	78.94	77.35	83.07	83.39	79.33	74.16	69.27	70.03	66.87
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	66.71	70.74	69.74	73.21	74.62	69.24	64.47	59.72	60.37	57.25
1 Taxes on income	3.19	3.26	2.93	2.96	2.62	2.39	2.00	1.87	1.75	1.80
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	8.18	8.98	9.35	10.81	10.92	11.76	11.09	11.39	11.21	11.64
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	55.35	58.49	57.47	59.44	61.08	55.10	51.37	46.46	47.41	43.81
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	9.41	8.20	7.61	9.86	8.77	10.29	9.68	9.55	9.66	9.62
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	23.87	21.06	22.65	16.93	16.61	20.47	25.84	30.73	29.85	33.13
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	18.93	15.47	13.86	10.33	10.04	12.25	12.09	21.30	12.61	15.60
1 Interest Receipts	10.69	6.13	3.32	1.04	1.80	3.59	4.03	1.47	1.50	1.25
2 Dividends and Profits	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.15	0.01	0.01
3 General Services	1.85	2.51	4.07	2.84	2.50	3.14	3.26	15.01	5.06	8.77
4 Social Services	1.03	1.12	1.08	1.11	0.94	0.89	0.88	0.82	1.07	1.05
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	5.34	5.69	5.33	5.28	4.74	4.62	3.91	3.84	4.96	4.53
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	4.95	5.59	8.79	6.60	6.57	8.22	13.76	9.44	17.24	17.53

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Items	Punjab										(Rs. in Lakh)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
Total Revenue Receipts		371584	278693	327663	530092	518475	556861	635130	575564	746786	
I Tax Revenues (A+B)		49.42	75.63	77.17	57.04	59.65	58.60	58.28	66.88	61.41	
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)		41.52	63.11	65.61	49.03	51.13	49.11	47.94	56.68	52.86	
1 Taxes on income		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
2 Taxes on Property and Capital		3.31	5.28	5.39	4.71	4.45	3.33	3.74	4.54	4.43	
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)		38.21	57.83	60.22	44.32	46.68	45.78	44.20	52.15	48.43	
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)		7.89	12.52	11.56	8.00	8.52	9.49	10.34	10.20	8.55	
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)		50.58	24.37	22.83	42.96	40.35	41.40	41.72	33.12	38.59	
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)		44.29	11.80	12.64	37.80	34.28	34.92	37.10	26.19	31.62	
1 Interest Receipts		38.86	2.56	2.26	1.54	1.68	26.29	15.47	1.82	7.16	
2 Dividends and Profits		0.01	0.20	0.10	0.15	0.09	0.10	0.05	0.03	0.12	
3 General Services		1.21	2.04	2.06	30.33	26.90	3.00	16.58	18.58	19.60	
4 Social Services		0.89	1.27	1.39	0.94	0.76	0.94	0.82	0.89	0.94	
5 fiscal Services		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)		3.32	5.73	6.83	4.84	4.86	4.59	4.18	4.88	3.80	
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)		6.29	12.57	10.20	5.17	6.07	6.48	4.62	6.93	6.97	

(Contd.)

Punjab (Concdd.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
Total Revenue Receipts	937686	892862	1210990	1213896	1380748	1696647	1679513	1923762	2291942	2407234
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	59.88	60.82	53.46	56.84	56.83	60.22	63.01	61.72	60.76	68.92
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	52.21	53.99	48.16	50.63	50.30	52.98	53.69	51.46	50.38	58.42
1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	4.60	5.07	4.62	6.12	7.09	9.94	10.83	8.24	8.37	9.22
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (I to vii)	47.61	48.91	43.54	44.51	43.20	43.04	42.86	43.22	42.01	49.20
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	7.67	6.84	5.29	6.21	6.54	7.23	9.32	10.27	10.38	10.50
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	40.12	39.18	46.54	43.16	43.17	39.78	36.99	38.28	39.24	31.08
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	31.30	33.16	33.15	38.43	38.81	26.74	23.65	27.31	29.54	22.57
1 Interest Receipts	7.53	6.18	6.46	12.06	13.69	3.80	3.92	1.81	0.97	0.57
2 Dividends and Profits	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.60	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01
3 General Services	19.54	22.71	23.16	21.36	21.48	19.74	16.21	22.73	24.89	19.60
4 Social Services	0.78	0.87	0.89	0.87	0.88	0.80	1.16	1.03	1.13	1.02
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	3.42	3.39	2.63	4.12	2.75	1.80	2.34	1.73	2.55	1.37
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	8.82	6.02	13.39	4.72	4.36	13.05	13.34	10.97	9.70	8.52

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Uttarakhand												(Rs. in Lakhs)	
Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)			
Total Revenue Receipts												1094767	
I													
A.													
1													
2													
3													
B													
II													
C.													
1													
2													
3													
4													
5													
6													
D.													

Table IV.1. Revenue Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Uttar Pradesh											(Rs. in Lakhs)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		
Total Revenue Receipts	967461	1167618	1213142	1339323	1521521	1602857	1757111	1737869	2149512		
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	64.38	62.39	63.34	65.99	69.03	77.23	80.32	78.72	78.53		
A. States's own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	36.15	33.28	34.06	36.42	35.94	39.34	39.83	45.52	43.74		
1 Taxes on income	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.03		
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	5.05	4.48	4.78	5.17	5.25	5.92	5.84	6.45	6.02		
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	31.10	28.79	29.28	31.23	30.68	33.38	33.95	38.99	37.68		
Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	28.23	29.11	29.28	29.57	33.09	37.88	40.49	33.21	34.79		
Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	35.62	37.61	36.66	34.01	30.97	22.77	19.68	21.28	21.47		
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	11.20	12.17	14.16	14.11	15.77	8.23	7.35	8.49	9.36		
1 Interest Receipts	3.09	2.72	2.92	2.79	3.05	2.99	2.76	2.46	2.22		
2 Dividends and Profits	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03		
3 General Services	4.79	5.18	7.05	7.72	8.67	1.21	1.09	1.92	1.55		
4 Social Services	0.98	1.31	0.53	0.61	0.67	0.89	0.94	1.28	1.38		
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00		
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	2.31	2.92	3.61	2.92	3.36	3.09	2.52	2.77	4.18		
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	24.42	25.44	22.50	19.90	15.20	14.55	12.33	12.79	12.11		

(Contd.)

Uttar Pradesh (Concld.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
Total Revenue Receipts	2474330	2559791	2863649	3163797	3761738	4534916	6059954	6867247	8514644	9443984
I Tax Revenues (A+B)	80.93	80.16	80.06	84.94	81.74	81.72	76.27	78.99	74.79	77.42
A. States' own Tax Revenue (1 to 3)	44.38	40.36	42.53	42.99	41.72	41.58	37.95	36.35	34.28	35.43
1 Taxes on income	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02
2 Taxes on Property and Capital	5.45	5.87	6.83	7.63	7.40	6.85	7.76	6.36	6.51	5.86
3 Taxes on Comd. & serv. (1 to vii)	38.91	34.43	35.68	351.42	34.29	34.71	30.17	29.96	27.76	29.54
B Share in Central Taxes (1 to 4)	36.56	39.80	37.54	41.95	40.02	40.14	38.31	42.65	40.50	41.99
II Non-Tax Revenue (C+D)	19.07	19.84	19.94	15.06	18.26	18.28	23.73	21.01	25.21	22.58
C. State's own Non-tax Rev. (1 to 6)	7.86	6.98	6.02	7.21	7.23	6.46	10.78	8.47	9.78	5.96
1 Interest Receipts	2.12	2.12	1.53	2.08	1.59	1.01	1.37	1.82	1.91	1.14
2 Dividends and Profits	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01
3 General Services	1.06	1.30	1.37	0.90	0.92	0.79	4.39	2.20	3.44	1.79
4 Social Services	1.32	1.11	1.20	1.13	1.84	2.31	1.59	2.11	0.85	0.29
5 fiscal Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6 Economic Services (1 to xvii)	3.32	2.42	1.90	3.08	2.86	2.33	3.42	2.32	3.57	2.73
D. Grants from the Centre (1 to 5)	11.21	12.86	13.91	7.84	11.03	11.81	12.95	12.54	15.44	16.62

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Andhra Pradesh

Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	156722	193701	255278	338071	445679	445709	486252	681394	622066
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	23.77	20.51	17.84	14.33	15.02	15.78	24.62	28.71	54.03
III. Loans and Advts. from the Centre (1 to 6)++	58.23	52.42	58.79	44.85	36.52	36.71	42.24	44.35	32.92
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	7.20	4.70	5.02	30.73	36.04	31.56	19.73	5.81	3.15
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	-0.09	0.02	-0.01	0.09	0.01	-0.20	0.23	-0.02	-0.12
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	8.20	7.13	5.95	6.67	5.96	5.44	7.02	4.90	7.93
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.35	0.71	3.16	-0.33	0.23	1.13	0.42	-1.11	0.84
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	7.85	14.76	2.79	8.79	8.67	9.11	6.79	16.57	1.16
X. Suspense and Misc. @ (net) (1+2)	-3.74	1.72	3.74	-3.08	-0.27	-0.68	-1.36	-0.73	1.85
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-1.79	-1.98	2.73	-2.04	-2.16	1.13	0.30	1.52	-1.76

(Contd.)

Andhra Pradesh (Concld.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	830951	973205	1076393	11071732	15291039	16479976	9444040	15218064	4086709	4580834
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.67	8.16	14.35	15.62	50.38	48.19
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	61.01	48.99	68.99	15.39	9.33	4.85	8.87	6.97	33.79	46.83
III. Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	22.74	38.20	27.35	2.82	1.20	0.31	0.33	0.60	2.86	5.42
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	4.84	9.73	5.23	1.13	0.90	0.11	0.50	0.13	0.61	0.60
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.09	-0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	5.12	3.29	3.65	1.18	0.84	0.86	1.87	1.30	5.39	5.29
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	-0.42	0.73	-0.70	0.77	0.48	0.52	1.08	0.87	2.16	1.98
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	5.68	-0.79	-4.51	10.68	9.20	10.36	24.19	19.75	42.94	39.88
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	-0.75	-0.39	0.00	63.33	73.70	77.55	48.77	54.86	0.00	0.00
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	4.31	12.23	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	1.68	0.27	0.00	4.70	4.33	5.44	12.37	11.22	0.00	0.00

II.	Internal Debt* (1 to 6)	
	1. Market Loans	
III.	2. Loans from L.I.C.	
	3. Loans from S.B.I. and other Banks (net)	
	4. Loans from National Agricultural Credit Fund of RBI	
	5. Loans from National Co-operative Development Corporation	
	6. Others @ of which: Land Compensation and other Bonds	
IV.	Loans and Advances from the Centre (1 to 6)	
	1. State Plan Schemes of which: Advance release of Plan Assistance for Natural Calamities	
	2. Central Plans Schemes	
	3. Centrally Sponsored Schemes	
	4. Non-plan (i to iii)	
	(i) Share of small savings	
	(ii) Relief for Natural Calamities	
	(iii) Others	
	5. Ways and Means Advances from Centre	
	6. Loans for Special Schemes	
	Recovery of Loans and Advances (1 to 12)	
	1. Housing	
V.	2. Urban Development	
	3. Crop Husbandary	
	4. Food Storage and Warehousing	
	5. Co-operation	
	6. Minor Irrigation	
VI.	7. Power Projects	
	8. Village and Small Industries	
	9. Industries and Minerals	
	10. Road Transport	
	11. Government Servants, etc+	
	12. Others **	
VII.	Small Saving, Provident Funds etc. (net) (1+2)	
	1. State Provident Funds	
VIII.	2. Others	
	Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	
IX.	1. Depreciation/Renewal Reserve Funds	
	2. Sinking Funds,	
	3. Famine Relief Fund	
X.	Deposits and Advance (net) (1 to 4)	
	1. Civil Deposits	
	2. Deposits of Local Funds	
	3. Civil Advances	
XI.	4. Others	
	Supreme and Miscellaneous @ (net)(1+2)	
	1. Suspense	
XII.	2. Others	

Source: Budget Documents of the State Governments.

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Bihar

Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	190277	173768	175214	180857	172666	-511633	252145	677232	599290
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	21.77	23.52	25.04	26.18	34.46	-11.06	28.42	11.14	45.70
III. Loans and Advts. from the Centre (1 to 6)	59.60	53.80	56.19	58.85	66.85	-26.21	71.00	41.48	25.21
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	1.31	1.64	1.86	2.47	0.49	-0.10	0.57	0.15	4.08
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	16.95	21.05	19.36	19.08	14.80	-3.57	0.00	0.41	25.50
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.27	0.05	0.00	0.05	-1.09
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	0.37	0.00	0.00	-3.82	-3.09	4.20	0.00	23.49	2.60
X. Suspense and Misc. @ (net) (1+2)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-6.22	-0.41	0.00	1.97	-0.33
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	-2.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	-2.76	-7.55	134.60	0.00	21.31	-1.67

(Contd.)

Bihar (Concdd.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	611249	490153	515390	1253222	4920295	9882178	9201152	8754151	859869	988629
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.62	5.09	3.83	4.84	57.67	61.19
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	51.87	55.07	66.70	46.71	12.14	3.81	2.56	1.31	52.25	42.21
III. Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	27.99	25.29	30.03	11.12	3.36	0.00	0.00	0.53	0.09	14.18
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	1.09	0.78	0.68	0.25	0.03	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.16	0.29
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.79	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	19.53	17.26	3.74	5.73	2.43	1.10	1.10	1.24	13.07	12.37
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	-1.07	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.38	0.44	0.00	0.45	1.95	1.69
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	2.55	2.86	-0.08	24.19	6.36	1.91	3.28	5.12	32.48	29.26
X. Suspense and Misc. @ (net) (1+2)	-0.33	0.37	0.51	2.84	72.78	90.58	87.58	83.68	0.00	0.00
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-1.64	-1.63	-1.59	5.75	2.52	2.09	5.48	7.64	0.00	0.00

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Chhattisgarh

Items (1)	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (1 to XIII)	25873	132545	166425	2533608	2962990	3743371	5030447	4708666	4078233	4125353
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.35	3.88	2.93	3.12	7.97	8.81
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	135.61	49.32	59.82	7.81	5.00	3.15	1.75	0.30	5.14	6.13
III. Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	-0.01	25.72	27.53	1.79	1.45	0.15	0.11	0.25	0.72	0.70
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	0.28	0.26	1.10	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.71	0.93	1.75	1.82
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.10
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	0.91	4.22	3.02	1.87	1.52	1.01	0.81	0.99	1.20	1.19
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	19.11	7.11	2.14	0.62	1.02	0.65	0.81	0.75	1.45	1.50
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	14.07	13.50	4.74	3.04	3.04	2.72	3.33	4.54	5.68	5.54
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	-41.42	0.98	0.72	76.71	80.45	85.26	85.34	82.14	79.00	78.10
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-28.55	-1.11	0.92	8.12	7.48	6.89	7.13	10.04	4.99	4.93

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Haryana

Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	49990	53685	68204	112835	393818	152269	188212	302987	255810
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	10.76	19.31	28.17	7.48	3.04	12.18	13.82	13.30	50.05
III. Loans and Advts. from the Centre (1 to 6)	52.78	47.52	44.56	36.55	20.46	34.91	42.61	33.19	13.69
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	6.10	5.78	4.69	35.39	0.73	30.24	27.75	18.26	9.12
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	26.97	24.65	24.97	17.67	5.63	16.16	16.40	24.57	22.11
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	-0.13	1.82	3.79	0.55	0.34	1.02	1.40	0.96	1.97
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	-0.34	3.11	-2.90	1.00	0.88	5.25	-1.45	8.04	-2.39
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	4.86	-2.66	-1.08	0.38	69.06	-0.22	-1.33	1.28	5.67
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-1.00	0.48	-2.20	0.97	-0.14	0.45	0.80	0.40	-0.21

(contd.)

Haryana (Concl'd.)

Items (1)	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (1 to XIII)	254163	281731	319414	2318424	4215133	9579804	12221843	6896326	5632467	6502048
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.53	2.79	3.95	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	44.94	63.98	16.36	26.32	9.91	3.45	1.63	16.36	16.36	16.36
III. Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	12.53	12.02	52.07	1.81	0.70	0.04	0.02	52.07	52.07	52.07
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	2.73	3.01	4.35	0.67	0.37	0.30	1.80	4.35	4.35	4.35
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	19.62	14.38	23.52	4.31	2.47	1.22	1.02	23.52	23.52	23.52
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	2.58	-0.93	3.31	0.76	0.47	0.52	0.23	3.31	3.31	3.31
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	-0.38	10.58	5.23	19.23	5.40	1.98	1.58	5.23	5.23	5.23
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	16.91	-2.37	-5.22	38.98	76.33	89.87	91.21	-5.22	-5.22	-5.22
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	1.08	-0.67	0.37	7.91	4.34	2.62	2.52	0.37	0.37	0.37

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Himachal Pradesh

Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	128311	28541	37230	38692	3957	72637	114680	76757	252372
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	86.54	13.27	9.95	11.92	141.04	10.57	9.81	46.57	36.75
III. Loans and Advts. from the Centre (1 to 6)	8.31	40.56	39.23	79.38	470.00	46.28	62.40	60.75	21.74
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	0.55	6.70	2.18	4.74	65.43	2.21	1.59	3.82	21.03
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	5.08	33.38	31.30	30.51	368.08	17.83	17.14	35.19	11.03
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	0.19	0.56	3.96	-45.31	0.37	8.65	0.00	0.00
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	-0.08	3.98	3.49	-7.66	7.66	6.80	-0.31	-46.33	9.44
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	-1.63	1.51	14.67	-23.11	-898.13	11.90	-0.79	0.00	0.00
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.52	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	1.24	0.42	-1.37	0.26	-8.77	4.04	1.50	0.00	0.00

(contd.)

Himachal Pradesh (Concl'd.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	234936	155095	232987	1235135	1248208	1988148	2125372	3231385	481085	442525
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	29.66	11.82	9.45	9.02	0.00	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	56.92	82.90	9.22	51.39	34.79	9.99	9.80	5.57	9.22	9.22
III. Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	9.36	19.48	62.16	2.34	1.87	0.14	0.18	0.16	62.16	62.16
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	1.16	1.89	1.45	0.23	0.21	0.11	0.11	0.08	1.45	1.45
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	10.86	13.34	17.19	6.75	7.39	5.16	5.23	4.49	17.19	17.19
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	6.25	0.00	1.14	0.42	1.08	0.61	1.21	0.00	0.00
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	7.21	-8.29	0.15	11.13	10.60	3.56	3.72	3.05	0.15	0.15
X. Suspense and Misc. @ @ (net) (1+2)	15.68	-18.02	9.54	6.68	24.49	66.05	65.83	75.48	9.54	9.54
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-1.20	2.44	0.30	20.34	20.25	13.92	14.52	9.97	0.30	0.30

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Jharkhand

Items (1)	2000-01 (2)	2001-02 (3)	2002-03 (4)	2003-04 (5)	2004-05 (6)	2005-06 (7)	2006-07 (8)	2007-08 (9)	2008-09 (10)	2009-10 (11)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	0	156077	181584	421520	685264	552124	828765	833140	703997	1061595
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	52.88	42.26	62.13	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	0.00	67.86	67.86	29.16	32.83	36.29	55.78	67.86	67.86	67.86
III. Loans and Advcs. from the Centre (1 to 6)	0.00	22.10	22.10	10.35	15.01	0.00	0.00	22.10	22.10	22.10
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.32	0.23	0.18	0.14	0.07	0.07	0.07
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.56	2.19	2.72	1.81	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	0.00	10.25	10.25	9.74	5.69	6.12	4.72	10.25	10.25	10.25
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.48	1.01	1.27	1.95	0.00	0.00	0.00
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	0.67	0.67	21.30	15.13	18.77	12.51	0.67	0.67	0.67
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	0.00	-0.63	-0.63	13.60	9.50	11.79	7.86	-0.63	-0.63	-0.63
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	0.00	-0.32	-0.32	10.48	18.42	22.86	15.23	-0.32	-0.32	-0.32

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Madhya Pradesh

Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	106138	134028	173314	191192	174800	345284	312042	424444	483222
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	18.20	15.92	11.91	19.89	26.29	18.06	20.86	17.48	43.55
III. Loans and Advts. from the Centre (1 to 6)	58.00	44.18	37.99	38.90	44.71	30.85	46.21	43.86	28.10
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	3.80	2.52	28.66	1.83	2.14	24.93	25.45	1.33	6.49
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	-0.69	0.99	-0.57	0.68	-0.59	0.27	0.10	0.00	-0.14
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	25.60	32.87	23.63	24.85	28.16	14.59	10.68	20.53	18.80
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	2.80	0.80	2.01	0.93	2.00	1.37	1.03	1.78	1.60
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	-8.02	8.15	-4.33	14.95	-2.22	10.97	-2.59	16.14	1.74
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	1.77	0.83	-0.44	-4.24	3.59	0.81	-1.32	-0.23	-1.88
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-1.46	-6.26	1.13	2.21	-4.09	-1.86	-0.41	-0.89	1.73

(contd.)

Madhya Pradesh (Concl.d.)

Items (1)	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (1 to XIII)	362739	631345	511780	4218728	4461948	6338379	9784517	15837479	11585317	10768552
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	22.63	13.95	6.13	2.44	0.00	8.46
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	51.72	28.99	12.95	34.04	20.62	7.68	4.26	1.79	12.95	10.16
III. Loans and Advcs. from the Centre (1 to 6)	27.39	22.98	42.18	4.08	4.22	0.46	0.44	0.34	42.18	1.71
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	0.37	25.15	4.55	0.08	0.12	4.50	0.03	0.07	4.55	0.04
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	-0.18	0.00	-0.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00	-0.61	0.09
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	20.85	6.41	22.37	2.84	4.06	2.10	1.45	0.91	22.37	1.37
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	3.42	1.35	0.58	0.87	0.79	1.07	0.84	0.45	0.58	0.64
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	-2.76	10.79	20.03	9.78	8.69	6.56	4.53	3.50	20.03	7.26
X. Suspense and Misc. @ (net) (1+2)	3.21	1.75	1.08	37.78	49.59	67.67	81.62	87.30	1.08	70.81
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Mesc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-4.04	2.53	-3.12	10.52	11.92	9.97	6.74	5.64	-3.12	7.91

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Maharashtra										
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	320100	248113	293728	554309	501201	559638	760239	933465	1118700	
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	7.16	10.93	10.02	9.13	11.41	11.59	9.36	8.57	47.15	
III. Loans and Advts. from the Centre (1 to 6)	47.93	48.95	50.05	26.64	37.93	53.68	49.78	50.53	7.01	
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	7.26	5.42	7.17	29.22	3.22	3.74	2.54	2.89	2.24	
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	-0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	-2.50	-0.04	0.58	8.93	-7.03	2.33	-2.59	6.75	
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	5.08	7.33	7.59	4.66	5.82	7.24	4.54	6.83	18.62	
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	20.76	33.56	28.78	19.71	24.63	25.13	20.86	24.93	4.33	
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	5.65	8.49	7.45	8.57	8.07	9.46	0.85	9.32	13.63	
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	8.02	-8.09	-6.31	0.03	9.86	-4.42	14.55	-3.48	5.05	
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-7.98	7.15	-2.63	2.14	-6.26	
XII. Mesc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
XIII. Remittances (net)	-1.85	-4.07	-4.71	1.46	-1.89	-6.54	-2.19	0.85	1.47	

(contd.)

Maharashtra (Concd.)

Items (1)	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	1291284	1149928	1486379	6659750	7755565	12017317	10867343	10949380	18010910	12244664
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.05	18.85	13.88	3.20	10.53	24.24
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	46.48	67.89	11.58	45.72	30.85	19.28	12.94	12.27	11.92	20.89
III. Loans and Advss. from the Centre (1 to 6)	5.75	7.52	56.35	1.88	2.32	0.41	0.46	0.30	0.43	1.01
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	20.10	2.59	5.30	0.72	2.63	0.46	0.05	0.67	0.19	0.30
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	-0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	-3.01	-2.70	7.11	1.33	0.52	1.63	1.19	0.37	0.00	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	5.46	5.52	23.35	2.57	2.17	1.49	1.74	1.88	1.25	2.72
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	9.91	16.11	8.29	8.17	8.33	4.58	5.51	-8.40	0.98	1.35
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	11.86	11.21	-9.23	8.42	9.63	6.97	8.19	9.91	6.49	12.19
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	1.09	-10.13	3.26	14.54	28.75	54.01	57.58	68.30	71.18	49.78
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	2.71	3.04	0.00	1.28	0.39	0.87	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-0.36	-1.06	-2.14	15.36	14.41	10.30	12.35	14.38	7.56	11.76

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Punjab										
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	116943	431251	169611	205907	181642	229500	294614	443069	513953	
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	3.92	1.29	3.39	25.02	27.67	12.52	17.08	20.13	53.03	
III. Loans and Advts. from the Centre (1 to 6)	83.15	28.63	79.67	57.59	44.04	66.14	49.37	53.26	21.22	
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	3.54	1.03	3.83	2.26	2.96	3.58	3.22	2.42	2.11	
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.17	-0.05	0.07	
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	10.37	4.04	13.66	12.23	17.52	20.62	18.94	18.62	17.48	
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	-0.57	0.23	0.35	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.94	0.16	0.65	
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	1.86	0.26	0.33	2.23	3.91	-2.01	9.17	4.12	5.47	
X. Suspense and Misc. @ (net) (1+2)	-1.79	18.15	-0.97	-0.10	1.79	-0.53	-0.23	0.73	-0.49	
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	
XIII. Remittances (net)	-0.47	-0.09	-0.26	0.60	1.95	-0.53	1.68	0.60	0.46	

(contd.)

Punjab (Concld.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	499960	653705	630639	5011017	2643739	4324606	15012396	4333453	10585000	10968055
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.50	11.76	3.20	17.54	0.00	8.23
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	71.98	62.65	2.96	22.17	38.48	11.81	2.83	12.97	2.96	9.69
III. Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	12.48	12.78	81.40	1.08	2.07	0.06	0.01	0.99	81.40	0.36
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	2.54	13.34	2.88	0.21	0.51	0.32	0.26	3.34	2.88	0.15
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	12.83	8.26	8.02	2.61	5.40	3.43	1.01	4.33	8.02	1.82
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.10	3.15	-0.19	0.44	1.69	0.51	0.21	1.17	-0.19	0.54
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	-0.43	1.41	3.18	1.82	4.56	3.38	1.39	6.40	3.18	3.65
X. Suspense and Misc. @ (net) (1+2)	-2.10	-0.02	-0.46	70.60	44.48	78.14	93.44	66.37	-0.46	82.27
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	2.59	-1.65	2.20	1.06	2.80	2.37	0.84	4.44	2.20	1.53

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Uttarakhand

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	46544	154563	189155	2681522	2778826	3993743	3685702	4204232	1245843	1476396
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.03	6.12	3.04	4.24	16.37	20.77
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	19.14	36.70	19.14	11.89	8.25	4.93	5.11	4.50	12.89	16.65
III. Loans and Advcs. from the Centre (1 to 6)	21.14	7.96	21.14	1.06	0.53	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.24	0.65
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	0.38	0.23	0.38	0.09	0.31	0.09	0.05	0.16	0.49	0.73
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	1.94	0.00	0.21	0.09	0.04	0.09	0.06	0.48	0.23
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	5.49	8.33	5.49	1.22	1.08	0.80	0.89	1.07	3.92	6.64
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	0.00	2.26	0.00	0.19	1.05	0.64	0.81	0.46	1.69	1.02
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	28.26	9.65	28.26	7.08	6.66	5.51	5.95	4.35	13.80	10.96
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	4.01	26.61	4.01	72.03	75.65	81.25	79.16	82.52	49.51	40.79
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.80	2.03
XIII. Remittances (net)	21.59	6.32	21.59	6.24	6.39	6.71	7.88	6.84	16.18	20.31

Table IV.2. Capital Receipts of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Uttar Pradesh

Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (1 to XIII)	366627	467828	354174	879613	638638	701661	835726	1265531	1157372
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	17.07	13.71	26.52	21.78	20.62	17.66	19.20	21.87	58.28
III. Loans and Advts. from the Centre (1 to 6)	60.74	41.74	50.34	36.57	43.30	46.46	50.23	44.94	29.28
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	5.10	1.47	3.32	9.53	2.38	3.22	3.92	6.02	2.27
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	-2.50	-2.29	0.44	-4.85	-0.69	0.81	-1.62	-1.76	0.47
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	9.56	8.83	11.42	5.51	9.20	9.03	13.93	10.12	11.36
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	9.51	6.73	11.81	4.97	8.55	9.28	8.94	7.05	10.03
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	13.35	14.14	7.68	11.32	12.51	18.74	9.44	3.15	0.13
X. Suspense and Misc. @ (net) (1+2)	-6.56	16.02	-5.99	12.91	2.06	-1.73	-2.32	7.93	-10.47
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-6.27	-0.34	-5.54	2.26	2.07	-3.47	-1.69	0.69	-1.36

(contd.)

Uttar Pradesh (Concld.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
TOTAL RECEIPTS (I to XIII)	1407596	1198453	1628175	18325119	17515002	30430128	61797413	48587098	21692836	23742916
TOTAL RECEIPTS (Net of Public Accounts)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.43	7.53	3.46	3.78	9.14	0.00
I. External Debt	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
II. Internal Debt* (1 to 7)	44.82	60.37	15.37	19.35	19.90	5.30	1.83	1.79	4.93	15.37
III. Loans and Adv. from the Centre (1 to 6)	17.88	23.01	52.25	1.68	1.62	0.40	0.06	0.08	0.23	52.25
IV. Recovery of Loans and Adv. (1 to 12)	2.10	3.05	9.56	6.82	0.16	0.19	0.06	0.09	0.28	9.56
V. Inter-State Settlement (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund (net)	-2.29	0.59	3.65	0.03	0.04	0.10	0.10	0.12	0.22	3.65
VII. Small Savings, P. F. etc. (net) (1+2)	7.40	5.41	11.95	1.70	1.84	1.18	0.79	1.09	3.19	11.95
VIII. Reserve Funds (net) (1 to 4)	10.76	13.59	6.53	1.21	1.55	1.05	0.50	0.83	2.14	6.53
IX. Deposits and Advances (net) (1 to 4)	10.81	16.14	13.49	6.96	7.08	5.44	2.47	4.00	3.59	13.49
X. Suspense and Misc. @@ (net) (1+2)	9.14	-20.99	-5.83	59.68	64.91	83.63	92.17	89.26	84.26	-5.83
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund (net)	0.00	0.00	-5.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-5.24
XII. Misc. Capital Receipts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XIII. Remittances (net)	-0.63	-1.17	-1.73	2.56	2.91	2.71	2.02	2.73	1.16	-1.73

Table IV.3. Revenue Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

(Rs. in Lakh)

Andhra Pradesh

Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)	645156	719017	801817	951412	1061367	1439236	1454429	1694356	1803787
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	70.88	69.79	68.24	66.55	65.48	70.62	66.59	65.95	61.97
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	36.38	38.06	36.83	36.15	44.01	36.24	37.64	41.64	40.65
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	34.50	31.73	31.40	30.40	21.47	34.38	28.95	24.31	21.33
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	28.35	29.37	30.90	32.64	33.79	28.71	32.53	33.16	37.33
A. Organs of State	1.17	0.97	0.88	1.18	1.25	1.06	1.09	0.85	1.31
B. Fiscal Services (1 to iii)	2.12	2.09	2.10	1.97	1.88	1.37	1.45	1.39	1.59
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	10.77	11.54	12.78	13.21	14.41	12.78	14.81	15.60	17.53
D. Administrative Services (I to v)	7.92	8.59	8.78	8.43	7.84	6.53	7.36	7.21	7.71
E. Pensions	6.37	6.18	6.35	7.84	8.41	6.98	7.83	8.11	9.19
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.77	0.84	0.86	0.81	0.73	0.67	0.88	0.89	0.70
V. Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

(Contd.)

Andhra Pradesh (Concld.)

Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I-II+III+IV+V)	2307036	2472633	2727246	2983013	3130734	3491530	4143839	5398356	6761904	7655717
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	62.29	61.31	58.63	59.07	57.94	60.71	62.45	65.88	110.68	69.86
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	34.82	33.21	33.40	34.42	33.47	34.82	37.09	34.57	41.77	42.17
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	27.47	28.11	25.23	24.65	24.47	25.89	25.36	31.31	28.99	27.69
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	37.00	37.56	40.39	40.00	41.33	38.64	36.96	33.66	28.70	29.66
A. Organs of State	0.91	0.91	1.00	1.06	1.12	0.83	0.87	0.68	0.61	0.91
B. Fiscal Services (i to iii)	1.54	1.48	1.41	1.58	1.53	1.55	1.46	1.15	1.08	1.16
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	16.77	18.91	22.21	22.98	22.65	20.64	18.08	14.76	12.95	12.44
D. Administrative Services (1 to v)	7.46	6.87	6.26	6.24	6.40	6.47	6.52	7.64	5.75	6.34
E. Pensions	10.31	9.39	9.51	8.13	9.64	9.16	10.02	9.43	8.31	8.81
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.72	0.65	0.59	0.46	0.55	0.48
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.71	1.13	0.98	0.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
V. Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

I. Development Expenditure (A + B)

A. Social Services (1 to 12)

1. Education, sports, art and culture
2. Medical and public health
3. Family Welfare
4. Water supply and sanitation
5. Housing
6. Urban development
7. Welfare of Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe and other backward Classes
8. Labour and Labour welfare
9. Social Security and Welfare
10. Nutrition

11. Relief on account of Natural Calamities

12. Others*

B. Economic Services (1 to 9)

- I. Agriculture and Allied Activities (i to xii)
 - (i) Crop Husbandry
 - (ii) Soil and Water Conservation
 - (iii) Animal Husbandary
 - (iv) Dairy Development
 - (v) Fisheries
 - (vi) Forestry and Wild Life
 - (vii) Plantations

- (viii) Food Storage and Warehousing
- (ix) Agricultural Research and Education
- (x) Agricultural Finance Institutions
- (xi) Co-operation
- (xii) Other Agricultural Programmes
- 2. Rural Development
- 3. Special Area Programmes
- 4. Irrigation and Flood Control *of which*
 - (i) Major and Medium Irrigation
 - (ii) Minor Irrigation
 - (iii) Flood Control and Drainage
- 5. Energy *of which*: Power
- 6. Industry and Minerals (i to iii)
 - (i) Village and Small Industries
 - (ii) Industries @
 - (iii) Others**
- 7. Transport and Communications (i + ii)
 - (i) Roads and Bridges
 - (ii) Others@
- 8. Science, Technology and Environment
- 9. General Economic Services (i to iv)
 - (i) Secretariat - Economic Services
 - (ii) Tourism
 - (iii) Civil Supplies
 - (iv) Others +

II. Non-Developmental Expenditure (General services) (A to F)

A. Organs of State

B. Fiscal Services (i to iii)

- (i) Collection of Taxes and Duties
- (ii) Transfers to Road Fund, Education Cess Fund, etc.
- (iii) Other Fiscal Services

C. Interest Payments and Servicing of Debt (1+2)

1. Appropriation for Reduction or Avoidance of Debt

2. Interest Payments (i to iv)

- (i) Interest on Loans from the Centre
- (ii) Interest on Internal Debt *of which*: Interest on market loans
- (iii) Interest on Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc.
- (iv) Others

D. Administrative Services (i to v)

- (i) Secretariat-General Services
- (ii) District Administration
- (iii) Police
- (iv) Public Works
- (v) Others ++

E. Pensions

F. Miscellaneous General Services *of which* Payment on account of State Lotteries

III. Grant-In-Aid and Assignments to Local

IV. Compensation and Assignments to Local Bodies and Panchayati Raj Institutions

V. Reserve with Finance Department

See 'Notes on Tables'.

Source: Upto 2001-2002 Handbook of Statistics on State Government Finances, RBI publication, 2004.

2002-2010, RBI's State Finances A Study of Budgets of various years.

Table IV.3. Revenue Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

(Rs. in Lakh)

Bihar

Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)	573869	656955	731864	773122	845617	825386	895646	1062254	1612832
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	63.54	63.06	62.83	59.89	59.36	58.03	57.52	56.49	57.66
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	37.88	33.82	33.01	36.41	38.45	39.03	40.14	36.00	38.61
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	25.65	29.25	29.83	23.48	20.92	19.00	17.38	20.49	19.05
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	34.97	36.89	37.13	40.08	40.62	41.95	42.46	43.49	42.32
A. Organs of State	1.78	1.30	1.44	2.94	1.92	1.50	2.36	1.69	2.53
B. Fiscal Services (1 to iii)	2.01	2.34	2.27	2.24	1.83	2.26	2.09	2.38	1.88
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	17.50	18.88	18.46	20.19	19.72	17.17	17.15	17.63	17.74
D. Administrative Services (1 to v)	9.78	10.67	11.41	10.57	10.58	12.51	12.42	12.15	11.34
E. Pensions	3.90	3.71	3.55	4.13	6.57	8.51	8.45	9.64	8.83
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.19	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
V. Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

(Contd.)

Table IV.3. Revenue Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Chhattisgarh												(Rs. in Lakh)	
Items	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)			
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)													
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	161186	491412	632548	660042	710305	745714	880243	1083985	1572919	1809104			
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	66.30	62.36	66.01	63.42	61.33	66.21	64.61	66.95	71.90	72.94			
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	45.71	38.95	36.22	34.37	34.22	38.19	39.29	37.98	46.39	48.98			
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	20.60	23.41	29.78	29.05	27.11	28.02	25.31	28.97	25.52	23.95			
A. Organs of State	30.79	34.94	31.39	32.64	35.11	29.33	29.98	28.04	24.93	24.44			
B. Fiscal Services (I to iii)	0.78	0.78	0.85	1.05	0.97	0.84	0.84	0.81	1.01	1.16			
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	2.27	2.42	2.03	1.70	1.61	1.98	2.79	2.66	2.70	2.64			
D. Administrative Services (I to v)	17.86	15.10	14.90	16.81	19.15	13.56	12.22	11.44	7.59	6.52			
E. Pensions	8.33	7.33	7.55	6.16	5.87	6.75	7.04	6.82	8.10	8.91			
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	1.54	9.30	6.05	6.91	7.52	6.19	7.10	6.31	5.53	5.21			
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.55	4.46	5.41	5.01	3.17	2.63			
V. Reserve with Finance Department	2.91	2.70	2.60	3.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			

Table IV.3. Revenue Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Haryana											(Rs. in Lakhs)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)		
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)	227402	237934	340100	627292	536155	676700	661717	701889	695205		
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	65.98	68.15	51.49	44.34	51.99	45.69	50.72	60.41	58.24		
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	31.24	34.18	25.73	18.62	29.66	20.63	23.83	29.70	32.47		
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	34.74	33.97	25.77	25.72	22.33	25.07	26.89	30.71	25.77		
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	33.56	31.37	48.34	55.55	47.85	54.20	49.28	39.59	41.76		
A. Organs of State	1.11	1.02	0.80	0.77	0.77	0.69	0.84	0.96	1.22		
B. Fiscal Services (I to iii)	1.05	1.14	0.90	0.54	0.68	0.63	0.76	1.07	1.24		
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	14.15	14.43	12.40	7.76	10.36	10.58	12.40	14.20	19.53		
D. Administrative Services (I to v)	8.03	8.68	6.87	4.54	5.74	5.07	6.08	7.59	7.43		
E. Pensions	3.67	4.50	3.54	2.20	3.10	3.60	3.89	7.56	8.45		
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	5.54	1.61	23.82	39.74	27.20	33.62	25.30	8.19	3.89		
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan Raj Inst.	0.46	0.48	0.17	0.11	0.17	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.01		
V. Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		

(Contd.)

Haryana (Concl'd.)

[illegible]

Table IV.3. Revenue Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Himachal Pradesh										(Rs. in Lakhs)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)										
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	98256	114557	135150	161428	190435	214687	269914	333426	382154	
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	65.36	65.32	65.66	67.27	67.04	67.06	68.37	66.92	61.57	
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	37.68	38.57	35.76	35.35	37.29	36.81	36.81	37.93	36.02	
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	27.68	26.75	29.90	31.92	29.75	30.24	31.57	28.99	25.55	
A. Organs of State	23.12	34.35	34.07	32.50	32.74	32.73	31.21	32.63	37.93	
B. Fiscal Services (1 to iii)	1.29	1.09	1.11	1.19	1.36	1.24	1.22	1.16	1.12	
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	2.26	2.01	1.79	3.02	1.87	1.79	1.57	1.65	1.55	
D. Administrative Services (1 to v)	15.05	15.46	15.51	13.79	14.98	14.58	13.78	14.94	15.63	
E. Pensions	10.10	9.85	9.75	9.20	8.86	8.84	8.26	7.96	7.71	
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	5.25	5.42	5.67	5.16	5.42	5.89	6.13	6.67	11.65	
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.36	0.53	0.24	0.14	0.25	0.39	0.24	0.26	0.27	
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
V. Reserve with Finance Department	0.33	0.33	0.27	0.23	0.22	0.22	0.42	0.44	0.50	

(Contd.)

Himachal Pradesh (Concl.)

[illegible]

Table IV.3. Revenue Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Items	Madhya Pradesh										(Rs. in Lakh)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)		542082	615731	751793	780877	913087	1146206	1172644	1421764	1613594	
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)		69.30	69.08	69.84	65.98	65.97	67.96	64.25	63.55	63.48	
A. Social Services (1 to 12)		38.83	37.77	35.58	38.66	37.30	35.25	38.22	39.21	38.49	
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)		30.47	31.30	34.25	27.32	28.66	32.71	26.03	24.35	25.00	
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)		27.98	28.74	28.02	31.84	31.12	29.17	32.89	33.52	32.50	
A. Organs of State		0.78	0.68	0.73	1.23	1.09	1.05	0.73	1.07	1.05	
B. Fiscal Services (1 to iii)		3.15	3.04	2.96	3.17	2.93	2.43	2.97	2.92	2.55	
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)		11.21	12.04	11.54	14.01	12.68	12.01	14.16	12.90	13.25	
D. Administrative Services (1 to v)		8.83	8.83	8.38	8.46	8.62	7.72	8.61	8.58	8.23	
E. Pensions		3.99	4.14	0.00	4.94	5.78	5.95	6.42	8.04	7.41	
F. Miscellaneous General Services #		0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.		2.72	2.19	2.15	2.18	2.91	2.87	2.86	2.92	4.01	
V. Reserve with Finance Department		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

(Contd.)

Table IV.3. Revenue Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Maharashtra										(Rs. in Lakh)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)	1004872	1154670	1310869	1481219	1716839	2084580	2289651	2566303	2953822	
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)	67.87	67.74	68.69	67.41	67.16	67.52	65.31	57.96	55.65	
A. Social Services (1 to 12)	35.85	35.66	35.33	35.82	38.26	35.82	37.87	36.74	37.85	
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)	32.02	32.08	33.36	31.59	28.91	31.70	27.44	21.22	17.80	
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)	31.66	31.75	30.97	32.29	32.56	32.06	34.06	41.36	42.45	
A. Organs of State	1.02	0.88	0.83	1.49	1.05	1.09	1.13	0.88	1.48	
B. Fiscal Services (I to iii)	3.22	2.46	1.87	2.99	3.48	3.29	3.31	10.49	7.83	
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)	14.11	14.57	14.44	14.81	14.66	14.37	15.51	17.27	16.91	
D. Administrative Services (I to v)	9.72	10.37	10.25	9.44	9.66	9.39	9.93	8.90	10.73	
E. Pensions	3.21	3.19	3.30	3.30	3.52	3.79	4.02	3.71	5.38	
F. Miscellaneous General Services #	0.38	0.28	0.27	0.25	0.19	0.14	0.17	0.10	0.11	
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.	0.47	0.51	0.00	0.31	0.27	0.42	0.63	0.69	1.90	
V. Reserve with Finance Department	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

(Contd.)

Table IV.3. Revenue Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Items	Punjab										(Rs. in Lakh)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)		419671	342252	404356	604276	563499	692567	783520	838431	1019527	
I. Developmental Expenditure (A+B)		75.86	56.59	52.21	36.29	45.31	56.99	52.61	46.75	44.75	
A. Social Services (1 to 12)		22.78	30.08	28.36	20.38	28.23	23.67	26.32	31.48	26.64	
B. Economic Services (1 to 9)		53.08	26.51	23.85	15.91	17.07	33.32	26.29	15.27	18.11	
II. Non-Developmental Exp. (Gen.Ser.) (A to F)		23.40	42.44	46.38	62.92	53.55	42.05	46.50	52.38	54.75	
A. Organs of State		0.72	0.85	0.85	0.83	0.98	1.05	1.04	1.14	0.94	
B. Fiscal Services (1 to iii)		0.96	1.20	1.32	1.31	1.37	1.11	1.15	1.85	1.35	
C. Interest Payments and Serv. of Debt (1+2)		8.59	12.00	25.77	20.58	26.43	23.60	23.60	27.63	25.86	
D. Administrative Services (1 to v)		9.63	23.73	13.53	11.07	11.90	11.21	12.30	13.07	10.70	
E. Pensions		3.40	4.58	4.73	3.61	4.96	5.03	5.54	8.58	11.18	
F. Miscellaneous General Services #		0.08	0.09	0.17	25.52	7.90	0.05	2.88	0.09	4.72	
III. Grants-in-Aid and Contributions		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
IV. Compen. & Assigns to Local Bodies & Pan.Raj Inst.		0.75	0.97	1.41	0.79	1.14	0.96	0.90	0.87	0.49	
V. Reserve with Finance Department		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

(Contd.)

Table IV.3. Revenue Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Uttar Pradesh										(Rs. in Lakhs)
Items	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE (I+II+III+IV+V)										
I.	1039920	1269074	1328013	1539597	1755586	1920770	2219503	2607485	2874773	
A.	59.16	58.77	57.01	53.16	52.03	55.14	53.06	52.55	50.19	
B.	33.09	31.89	30.52	30.41	31.32	33.19	33.80	34.06	30.18	
C.	26.07	26.88	26.49	22.76	20.70	21.95	19.27	18.49	20.01	
II.	39.15	39.31	41.29	45.29	46.41	43.31	44.15	44.10	46.81	
A.	1.28	1.00	1.17	1.68	1.72	1.44	1.49	1.20	1.29	
B.	2.98	2.86	2.99	2.67	2.71	2.86	2.81	2.74	2.56	
C.	18.25	17.78	17.79	22.27	21.30	23.93	24.02	24.06	26.03	
D.	10.13	9.71	10.26	9.66	9.95	10.23	11.03	9.25	9.74	
E.	2.82	3.73	3.20	3.23	4.12	4.66	4.75	6.81	7.17	
F.	3.70	4.23	5.88	5.78	6.61	0.20	0.06	0.04	0.03	
III.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
IV.	1.69	1.91	1.70	1.54	1.56	1.55	2.78	3.35	2.99	
Pan.Raj Inst.										
V.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
(Contd.)										

(Contd.)

Uttar Pradesh (Concl.)

[illegible]

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Andhra Pradesh

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Items (1)	1991-92 (2)	1992-93 (3)	1993-94 (4)	1994-95 (5)	1995-96 (6)	1996-97 (7)	1997-98 (8)	1998-99 (9)	1999-2000 (10)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	130629	179330	252303	294489	368702	187240	320071	501389	472880
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I.									
1 Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	32.09	44.77	54.14	65.25	65.70	7.02	33.93	27.63	42.13
1 Developmental (a+b)	31.24	43.93	53.62	64.60	65.26	5.94	33.25	27.12	41.50
(a) Social Services (1 to 9)	5.30	3.01	1.79	1.47	1.23	3.96	24.04	2.47	4.22
(b) Economic Services (1 to 10)	25.94	40.91	51.83	63.13	64.03	2.10	30.86	24.66	37.28
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.86	0.85	0.52	0.65	0.43	0.97	0.68	0.51	0.63
II.									
Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	1.03	2.08	2.78	0.58	2.95	1.34	1.20	9.10	4.57
III.									
Repayment of Loans to the Centre	17.17	12.23	10.27	9.11	7.97	44.22	14.95	22.74	12.13
IV.									
Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	49.71	40.91	32.80	25.06	23.38	47.42	49.92	40.53	41.17
(a)									
1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	48.13	38.68	31.16	23.18	21.90	45.43	48.60	39.51	40.32
(a) Social Services (1 to 4)	11.89	8.98	7.48	6.47	5.63	14.11	6.98	5.24	4.80
(b) Economic Services (1 to 9)	36.24	29.69	23.68	16.71	16.27	31.33	41.62	34.27	35.52
(b)									
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	1.59	2.23	1.64	1.88	1.48	1.99	1.32	1.02	0.85
V									
Inter-State Settlement									
VI									
Contingency Fund									
VII									
Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)									
VIII									
Reserve Funds (1 to 4)									
IX									
Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)									
X									
Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)									
XI									
Appropriation to Contingency Fund									
XII									
Remittances									
A.									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	19.97	8.01	1.18	14.80	20.88	138.04	51.92	35.90	31.55
B.									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-12.98	-6.90	9.21	-24.71	-20.04	-170.85	-21.97	-53.53	-26.08
C.									
Overall Sur. (+)/Def. (-) (A+B)	6.99	0.66	10.39	-9.91	0.84	-32.81	29.95	-17.63	5.47
D.									
Fin.Sur. (+)/Def. (-)	-1.92	3.49	-4.43	-2.00	6.30	-6.16	2.83	-2.43	7.51
Increase (+)/Decr. (-) in cash Balances									
E.									
Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	8.91	-2.38	14.81	-7.92	-5.46	-9.24	16.93	-10.81	0.00
F.									
Increase (-)/Decr. (+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-17.41	10.19	-4.38	-2.04

(Contd.)

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Andhra Pradesh

(Rs. in Lakh)

Items (1)	1991-92 (2)	1992-93 (3)	1993-94 (4)	1994-95 (5)	1995-96 (6)	1996-97 (7)	1997-98 (8)	1998-99 (9)	1999-2000 (10)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	130629	179330	252303	294489	368702	187240	320071	501389	472880
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	32.09	44.77	54.14	65.25	65.70	7.02	33.93	27.63	42.13
(a) 1 Developmental (a+b)	31.24	43.93	53.62	64.60	65.26	5.94	33.25	27.12	41.50
(b) Social Services (1 to 9)	5.30	3.01	1.79	1.47	1.23	3.96	24.04	2.47	4.22
Economic Services (1 to 10)	25.94	40.91	51.83	63.13	64.03	2.10	30.86	24.66	37.28
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.86	0.85	0.52	0.65	0.43	0.97	0.68	0.51	0.63
II. Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	1.03	2.08	2.78	0.58	2.95	1.34	1.20	9.10	4.57
III. Repayment of Loans to the Centre	17.17	12.23	10.27	9.11	7.97	44.22	14.95	22.74	12.13
IV. Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	49.71	40.91	32.80	25.06	23.38	47.42	49.92	40.53	41.17
(a) 1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	48.13	38.68	31.16	23.18	21.90	45.43	48.60	39.51	40.32
(b) Social Services (1 to 4)	11.89	8.98	7.48	6.47	5.63	14.11	6.98	5.24	4.80
Economic Services (1 to 9)	36.24	29.69	23.68	16.71	16.27	31.33	41.62	34.27	35.52
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	1.59	2.23	1.64	1.88	1.48	1.99	1.32	1.02	0.85
V. Inter-State Settlement									
Contingency Fund									
VI. Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)									
VIII. Reserve Funds (1 to 4)									
IX. Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)									
X. Suspend and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)									
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund									
XII. Remittances									
A. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	19.97	8.01	1.18	14.80	20.88	138.04	51.92	35.90	31.55
B. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-12.98	-6.90	9.21	-24.71	-20.04	-170.85	-21.97	-53.53	-26.08
C. Overall Sur.(+)/Def.(-)(A+B)	6.99	0.66	10.39	-9.91	0.84	-32.81	29.95	-17.63	5.47
D. Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	-1.92	3.49	-4.43	-2.00	6.30	-6.16	2.83	-2.43	7.51
E. Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	8.91	-2.38	14.81	-7.92	-5.46	-9.24	16.93	-10.81	0.00
F. Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-17.41	10.19	-4.38	-2.04

(Contd.)

I (a)**Social Services (1 to 9)**

1. Education, Sports, Art and Culture
2. Medical and Public health
3. Family Welfare
4. Water supply and sanitation
5. Housing
6. Urban development
7. Welfare of Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribes and other backward Classes
8. Social Security and Welfare
9. Others*

I (b)**Economic Services (1 to 10)**

1. Agriculture and allied Activities (i to xi)
 - (i) Crop Husbandry
 - (ii) Soil and Water Conservation
 - (iii) Animal Husbandry
 - (iv) Dairy Development
 - (v) Fisheries
 - (vi) Forestry and Wild Life
 - (vii) Plantations
 - (viii) Food Storage and Warehousing
 - (ix) Agricultural Research and Education
 - (x) Co-operation
 - (xi) Others @
2. Rural Development
3. Special Area Programmes of which: Hill Areas
4. Major and Medium Irrigation and flood Control
5. Energy
6. Industry and Minerals (i to iv)
 - (i) Village and Small Industries
 - (ii) Iron and Steel Industries
 - (iii) Non-Ferrous Mining and Metallurgical Industries
 - (iv) Others #
7. Transport (i + ii)
 - (i) Roads and Bridges
 - (ii) Others **
8. Communications

9. Science, Technology and Environment
10. General Economic Services (i + ii)
 - (i) Tourism
 - (ii) Others @

II. Discharge of Internal Debt + (1 to 5)

1. Market Loans
2. Loans from L.I.C.
3. Loans from NABARD
4. Loans from National Co-operative Development Corporation
5. Others of which: Land Compensation Bonds

IV. 1. (a) Social Services (1 to 4)

1. Education, Sports, Art and Culture
2. Housing
3. Government Servants (Housing)
4. Others

(b) Economic Services (1 to 9)

1. Crop Husbandry
2. Soil and Water Conservation
3. Food Storage and Warehousing
4. Co-operation
5. Major and Medium Irrigation etc.
6. Power Projects
7. Village and Small Industries
8. Other Industries and Minerals
9. Others

IV. 2. Non-Developmental Purposes (a + b)

- (a) Government Servants (other than Housing)
- (b) Miscellaneous

D. Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances

- (a) Opening Balance
- (b) Closing Balance

See 'Notes on Tables'.

Source: Upto 2001-2002 Handbook of Statistics on State Government Finances, RBI publication, 2004.

2002-2010, RBI's State Finances A Study of Budgets of various years.

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Bihar

Items (1)	1991-92 (2)	1992-93 (3)	1993-94 (4)	1994-95 (5)	1995-96 (6)	1996-97 (7)	1997-98 (8)	1998-99 (9)	1999-2000 (10)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	106599	117389	111461	82332	96078	115290	125936	154857	341987
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I.	45.18	37.91	36.15	42.14	39.47	39.05	17.99	45.17	55.64
1 Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	44.15	37.67	35.77	41.87	39.14	38.54	17.33	44.86	54.29
(a) Developmental (a+b)	8.96	8.11	9.16	10.86	8.67	6.54	7.72	9.83	7.02
(b) Social Services (1 to 9)	35.19	29.56	26.62	31.01	30.47	32.00	9.61	35.03	47.27
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	1.03	0.23	0.38	0.27	0.33	0.50	0.66	0.31	1.35
II.	0.90	6.77	6.01	3.96	11.42	8.63	4.55	0.95	2.53
Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	28.08	29.04	32.78	40.96	36.51	32.40	37.32	32.00	15.53
Repayment of Loans to the Centre	25.84	26.28	25.06	12.94	12.60	19.93	40.13	21.88	26.30
IV.	25.68	26.28	24.23	12.28	12.35	19.89	40.07	21.88	26.20
1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	3.64	6.83	2.48	3.12	2.87	2.47	2.44	1.14	1.34
(a) Social Services (1 to 4)	22.04	22.00	21.75	9.15	9.47	17.41	37.63	20.74	24.86
(b) Economic Services (1 to 9)	0.16	0.00	0.83	0.66	0.26	0.04	0.06	0.00	0.10
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)									
Inter-State Settlement									
Contingency Fund									
Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)									
VIII									
Reserve Funds (1 to 4)									
IX									
Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)									
X									
Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)									
XI									
Appropriation to Contingency Fund									
XII									
Remittances									
A.	78.59	48.03	57.20	119.67	79.71	-543.78	100.22	337.33	75.24
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	-83.02	-51.62	-61.86	-113.37	-112.28	-18.73	-20.96	-87.21	-103.80
B.									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-4.52	-3.59	-4.66	6.30	-32.57	-562.51	79.26	250.12	-28.56
C.									
Overall Sur. (+)/Def. (-) (A+B)	-4.52	-3.59	-4.66	-0.02	-83.51	-597.87	79.26	2287.41	-30.90
D.									
Fin.Sar. (+)/Def. (-)									
Increase (+)/Decr. (-) in cash Balances									
E.									
Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.32	42.43	35.36	0.00	-2040.70	2.34
F.									
Increase (-)/Decr. (+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.52	0.00	0.00	3.40	0.00

(Contd.)

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Haryana

Items (1)	1991-92 (2)	1992-93 (3)	1993-94 (4)	1994-95 (5)	1995-96 (6)	1996-97 (7)	1997-98 (8)	1998-99 (9)	1999-2000 (10)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	45281	57667	70802	63890	76986	106398	118826	156167	140671
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I.	32.24	39.60	42.78	32.33	37.13	41.98	41.42	65.68	63.56
1 Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	30.58	38.62	41.82	31.36	36.07	40.31	39.49	63.89	61.62
(a) Developmental (a+b)	6.52	10.72	9.95	14.18	12.23	18.21	10.92	9.53	11.69
(b) Economic Services (1 to 10)	24.06	27.90	31.87	17.17	23.84	22.10	28.57	54.36	49.93
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	1.66	0.97	0.97	0.98	1.07	1.10	1.94	1.79	1.94
II.	1.24	3.83	3.32	1.39	1.23	1.13	2.46	3.96	4.28
Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	16.38	14.09	13.03	13.56	12.01	19.81	19.23	15.77	11.80
Repayment of Loans to the Centre	50.14	42.49	40.87	52.72	49.63	37.09	36.89	14.59	20.35
IV.	47.10	40.43	39.06	49.91	46.71	34.83	36.89	11.19	17.66
1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	4.10	4.41	3.78	2.46	1.97	1.11	3.51	0.93	1.22
(a) Social Services (1 to 4)	42.99	36.02	35.28	47.45	44.75	33.72	33.37	11.54	16.45
(b) Economic Services (1 to 9)	3.04	2.06	1.81	2.81	2.91	2.25	0.00	2.12	2.69
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)									
Inter-State Settlement									
Contingency Fund									
Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc.									
V									
VI									
VII									
VIII									
IX									
X									
Reserve Funds (1 to 4)									
Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)									
Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)									
XI									
Appropriation to Contingency Fund									
Remittances									
XII									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	10.40	-6.91	-3.67	76.61	411.54	43.11	58.39	94.01	81.85
A.	-7.12	-0.29	11.36	-61.12	-45.05	-67.55	-60.54	-98.63	-84.26
B.									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	3.28	-7.20	7.69	15.49	366.50	-24.43	-2.15	-4.61	-0.28
C.									
Overall Sur(+)/Def(-)(A+B)	13.69	-9.96	-4.84	8.60	5.41	-7.41	-3.03	-3.17	-0.62
D.									
Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)									
Increase (+)/Decr(-) in cash Balances	-10.41	2.76	12.54	6.89	361.09	-16.42	0.35	-0.26	4.68
E.									
Withdr. from (-)/Add to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.60	0.54	-1.18	-6.47
F.									
Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)									

(Contd.)

Haryana (Concl'd.)

[illegible]

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Himachal Pradesh

Items (1)	1991-92 (2)	1992-93 (3)	1993-94 (4)	1994-95 (5)	1995-96 (6)	1996-97 (7)	1997-98 (8)	1998-99 (9)	1999-2000 (10)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	135828	30125	33929	39423	44567	48576	75408	83289	89234
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I.									
1 Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	13.85	68.16	64.95	125.34	74.33	72.42	71.71	70.06	62.07
(a) Developmental (a+b)	13.54	64.49	63.21	122.36	70.77	68.82	69.11	67.51	58.28
(b) Social Services (1 to 9)	5.82	26.34	20.01	23.16	21.52	23.95	19.17	21.34	22.52
2 Economic Services (1 to 10)	7.64	38.16	43.20	99.20	49.26	44.87	49.94	46.18	35.77
Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.38	3.66	1.74	2.98	3.56	3.60	2.59	2.55	3.79
II.	78.38	2.41	2.38	1.37	2.13	1.32	1.28	2.02	3.18
Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+									
Repayment of Loans to the Centre	3.91	18.72	16.90	14.71	8.80	9.50	6.98	17.72	28.00
Loans and Advances by State Govt.	3.87	10.72	15.77	-41.42	14.74	16.76	20.03	10.20	6.75
III.									
1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	3.30	10.31	15.12	-43.45	12.28	13.83	18.19	8.97	6.18
(a) Social Services (1 to 4)	0.10	1.05	2.52	2.44	1.64	2.51	1.09	1.45	3.75
(b) Economic Services (1 to 9)	3.20	9.26	12.61	-45.89	10.63	11.32	17.10	7.52	2.43
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.57	0.40	0.65	2.02	2.46	2.93	1.84	1.22	0.57
Inter-State Settlement									
Contingency Fund									
Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc.									
VI									
VII									
Reserve Funds (1 to 4)									
Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)									
Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)									
VIII									
IX									
X									
Appropriation to Contingency Fund									
Remittances									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	-5.53	-5.26	9.73	-1.85	-91.12	49.53	52.08	-7.84	182.82
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	0.73	-30.90	33.49	-78.11	-33.73	-31.88	-70.11	-122.74	-11.91
Overall Sur. (+)/Def. (-) (A+B)	-4.81	-36.16	43.22	-79.96	-124.85	17.65	-18.03	-130.59	170.91
Fin. Sur. (+)/Def. (-)	-2.55	-33.18	17.77	-52.64	-38.00	-4.69	-73.85	-32.27	90.54
Increase (+)/Decr. (-) in cash Balances									
Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal.	-2.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Inv. A/c									
Increase (-)/Decr. (+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	0.00	-1.98	25.45	-27.32	-86.85	22.34	55.82	-98.32	80.38

(Contd.)

Himachal Pradesh (Concl.)

Items (1)	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	93875	109324	93783	1084904	1111694	2001030	2131277	3200476	538718	484020
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.16	10.60	11.48	7.26	59.60	58.96
I. Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	53.40	59.44	63.73	7.23	5.88	4.10	5.21	4.42	391.93	38.49
(a) Developmental (a+b)	51.29	58.68	62.42	7.02	5.61	3.84	4.92	4.23	38.00	37.23
(b) Social Services (1 to 9)	24.30	24.66	26.49	2.80	2.97	1.84	2.69	1.83	16.40	12.25
Economic Services (1 to 10)	26.99	34.02	35.93	4.22	2.65	2.00	2.23	2.40	21.59	24.97
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	2.10	0.76	1.31	0.21	0.27	0.26	0.29	0.18	1.20	1.26
Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	4.98	8.06	16.55	42.12	30.21	7.42	5.55	2.75	20.89	19.09
III. Repayment of Loans to the Centre	37.33	29.73	16.38	1.47	1.79	0.28	0.60	0.17	1.05	1.17
IV. Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	4.29	2.78	3.34	0.18	0.21	0.07	0.12	0.04	1.99	0.21
(a) 1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	4.23	2.72	3.26	0.17	0.21	0.07	0.12	0.04	1.96	0.20
(b) Social Services (1 to 4)	3.33	1.23	2.75	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.03	0.26	0.20
Economic Services (1 to 9)	0.89	1.49	0.51	0.07	0.17	0.01	0.06	0.01	1.70	0.00
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.06	0.05	0.09	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01
V Inter-State Settlement				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI Contingency Fund				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)				5.51	5.95	3.58	3.71	2.84	5.75	6.40
VIII Reserve Funds (1 to 4)				1.59	1.10	1.00	0.57	0.41	0.00	0.00
IX Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)				13.30	3.93	3.02	6.00	3.08	6.94	7.72
X Suspend and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)				6.35	27.73	67.28	64.10	76.40	15.27	16.99
XI Appropriation to Contingency Fund				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII Remittances	150.26	41.87	148.43	22.25	23.20	13.25	14.14	9.88	8.92	9.92
A. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account				13.85	13.14	1.15	-2.05	1.86	-10.70	-8.57
B. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-141.74	-78.71	-185.94	-14.81	-10.42	0.46	0.90	2.66	6.14	5.30
C. Overall Sur(+)/Def(-)(A+B)	8.52	-36.84	-37.50	-0.97	2.72	1.61	-1.16	4.51	-4.55	-3.27
D. Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-) Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	6.73	-14.07	-37.50	-0.97	1.86	-0.18	0.62	3.62	-4.55	-3.27
E. Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.00	-22.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.68	-1.58	0.76	0.00	0.00
F. Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	1.79	-0.02	0.00	1.40	0.86	0.11	-0.20	0.13	0.00	0.00

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)
Jharkhand

Items (1)	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)			2072.17	4871.95	6445.88	6848.79	7630.00	8997.26	9857.78	12318.07
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu. Public A/c)			0.00	0.00	49.90	53.46	58.87	58.51	52.37	38.80
I. Total Capital Outlay (1+2)			74.17	31.35	31.22	32.44	36.04	41.66	39.60	28.66
(a) 1 Developmental (a+b)			72.32	30.65	30.56	31.09	34.92	39.85	37.19	27.12
(b) 2 Social Services (1 to 9)			18.42	8.28	7.73	9.98	11.97	15.74	17.96	11.81
Economic Services (1 to 10)			53.91	22.37	22.83	21.11	22.96	24.11	19.23	15.31
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)			1.85	0.71	0.66	1.35	1.12	1.81	2.41	1.54
II. Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+			2.32	7.31	7.51	2.20	2.30	4.21	6.16	5.06
III. Repayment of Loans to the Centre			7.98	5.69	2.80	1.97	1.80	1.54	1.67	1.51
IV. Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)			15.52	5.86	8.37	16.84	18.73	11.10	4.94	3.57
(a) 1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)			15.18	5.74	8.30	16.69	18.63	11.02	4.88	3.57
(b) 2 Social Services (1 to 4)			3.77	0.66	0.92	1.17	0.94	0.91	0.85	0.52
Economic Services (1 to 9)			11.42	5.08	7.37	15.52	17.69	10.11	4.03	3.00
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)			0.34	0.12	0.08	0.15	0.10	0.08	0.06	0.05
V. Inter-State Settlement			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund			0.00	3.08	2.33	2.19	0.00	1.67	1.52	1.22
VII. Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)			0.00	5.77	3.65	2.70	2.53	2.51	2.65	0.50
VIII. Reserve Funds (1 to 4)			0.00	1.28	1.02	1.02	2.12	2.21	1.40	0.86
IX. Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)			0.00	17.88	13.96	13.20	11.85	12.43	14.68	25.93
X. Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)			0.00	11.35	9.29	8.75	7.85	7.24	4.51	1.20
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Remittances			0.00	10.43	19.86	18.69	16.78	15.44	22.88	27.03
A. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account			-12.37	-13.48	6.31	-19.38	8.62	-7.40	-28.58	-13.82
B. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account			-15.96	2.90	-17.24	-22.68	-14.28	-16.49	6.37	-2.25
C. Overall Sur(+)/Def(-)(A+B)			-28.33	-10.58	-10.93	-42.06	-5.66	-23.89	-22.22	-16.07
D. Increase (+)/Decr. (-) in cash Balances			-28.81	-10.58	-10.93	-42.06	-5.66	-23.89	22.22	-16.07
E. Withdr. from (-)/Add to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F. Increase (-)/Decr. (+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)			0.48	0.21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Madhya Pradesh

Items (1)	1991-92 (2)	1992-93 (3)	1993-94 (4)	1994-95 (5)	1995-96 (6)	1996-97 (7)	1997-98 (8)	1998-99 (9)	1999-2000 (10)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	121664	150538	135970	150575	145074	163085	249811	175068	182150
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I.									
1 Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	63.22	55.56	59.38	58.04	59.30	62.59	67.16	57.68	52.16
(a) Developmental (a+b)	62.69	55.03	58.63	57.25	58.54	61.31	66.27	56.52	51.29
(b) Social Services (1 to 9)	7.12	7.50	8.32	10.07	9.65	13.03	6.82	12.48	10.69
2 Economic Services (1 to 10)	55.58	47.53	50.31	47.18	48.89	48.27	59.45	44.03	40.60
3 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.53	0.52	0.75	0.79	0.77	1.28	0.89	1.17	0.87
II.									
Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	1.16	1.79	2.64	1.22	1.39	1.36	1.72	5.15	7.43
Repayment of Loans to the Centre	18.25	18.81	21.53	15.01	16.34	16.52	12.40	19.94	21.59
III.									
Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	17.36	23.85	16.45	25.72	22.96	19.53	18.71	17.23	18.82
IV.									
1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	16.78	23.20	15.21	24.91	22.51	18.84	18.30	16.66	18.55
(a) Social Services (1 to 4)	3.20	2.93	1.76	2.87	2.67	4.74	2.21	3.04	4.52
(b) Economic Services (1 to 9)	13.58	20.14	13.45	22.04	19.83	14.10	16.09	13.61	14.02
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.58	0.65	1.24	0.81	0.46	0.69	0.41	0.57	0.28
V									
Inter-State Settlement									
VI									
Contingency Fund									
VII									
Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)									
VIII									
Reserve Funds (1 to 4)									
IX									
Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)									
X									
Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)									
XI									
Appropriation to Contingency Fund									
XII									
Remittances									
A.									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	-12.76	-10.97	27.46	26.97	20.49	111.72	24.91	142.45	165.29
B.									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-3.60	18.95	-32.96	-12.65	-32.91	-88.78	-18.79	-164.04	-160.98
C.									
Overall Sur. (+)/Def. (-) (A+B)	-16.36	7.98	-5.49	14.32	-12.42	22.94	6.12	-21.59	4.31
D.									
Fin.Sar. (+)/Def. (-)	3.64	0.01	5.09	-9.24	8.90	-0.96	11.63	-10.60	3.16
E.									
Increase (+)/Decr. (-) in cash Balances	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.77	-3.12	8.44	-5.51	0.00	0.00
F.									
Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	-20.00	7.98	-10.58	19.80	-18.20	15.47	0.00	-11.00	1.15
Increase (-)/Decr. (+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)									

(Contd.)

Madhya Pradesh (Concl'd.)

Items (1)	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	193764	259090	435804	3749621	4637579	6339792	10155269	16443179	11796073	10924875
A(c)\$ Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24.55	13.27	7.73	5.88	8.87	9.59
I. Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	57.31	56.76	62.25	7.14	10.68	10.45	5.09	4.16	5.64	6.22
(a) 1 Developmental (a+b)	56.49	55.92	60.42	7.05	10.36	10.26	5.02	4.11	5.54	6.11
(b) Social Services (1 to 9)	7.01	6.62	16.79	1.43	0.93	1.00	0.71	0.69	1.19	1.06
Economic Services (1 to 10)	49.49	49.30	43.63	5.62	9.43	9.25	4.31	3.42	4.35	5.05
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.82	0.84	1.83	0.10	0.32	0.19	0.07	0.04	0.10	0.11
II. Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	6.75	5.77	3.54	21.17	7.92	0.89	0.97	0.75	1.63	5.30
III. Repayment of Loans to the Centre	20.68	14.37	20.91	1.29	4.21	0.62	0.73	0.27	0.38	0.46
IV. Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	15.26	23.10	13.30	0.55	7.14	1.32	0.94	0.70	1.64	1.27
(a) 1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	14.77	22.81	13.25	0.54	7.14	1.32	0.94	0.70	1.64	1.27
(b) Social Services (1 to 4)	2.89	13.34	5.52	0.09	0.18	0.89	0.24	0.36	0.34	0.50
Economic Services (1 to 9)	11.88	9.55	7.74	0.45	6.96	0.43	0.70	0.34	1.30	0.77
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.49	0.29	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
V. Inter-State Settlement				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI. Contingency Fund				0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.09
VII. Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)				2.96	2.52	2.10	1.24	0.76	1.15	1.20
VIII. Reserve Funds (1 to 4)				0.03	0.03	0.84	0.49	0.52	0.40	0.57
IX. Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)				11.89	8.29	5.62	3.60	3.20	6.21	7.05
X. Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)				43.14	47.77	68.27	80.40	84.25	76.24	69.97
XI. Appropriation to Contingency Fund				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII. Remittances				11.83	11.43	9.90	6.47	5.39	6.62	7.87
A. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	87.21	143.68	17.43	12.51	-2.78	0.68	-1.82	-3.53	-3.03	-1.25
B. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-68.09	-122.27	-34.73	-11.94	3.70	0.05	3.28	3.09	2.69	1.56
C. Overall Sur. (+)/Def. (-) (A+B)	19.12	21.41	-17.30	0.57	0.92	0.73	1.46	-0.44	-0.34	0.31
D. Fin.Sur(+)/Def(-) Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	-0.23	34.10	-17.30	0.57	-0.09	0.03	-0.37	-0.59	0.90	0.12
E. Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	16.09	-12.69	0.00	-0.07	0.43	0.70	1.83	0.15	-1.24	0.18
F. Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	3.26	0.00	0.00	-0.71	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure Of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Maharashtra

Items (1)	1991-92 (2)	1992-93 (3)	1993-94 (4)	1994-95 (5)	1995-96 (6)	1996-97 (7)	1997-98 (8)	1998-99 (9)	1999-2000 (10)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV) Total Capital Disb. (Exclu. Public A/c)\$	200284	246686	287443	521414	420807	415915	477863	465416	870539
I.									
1 Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	48.59	55.94	58.25	72.80	64.25	65.39	67.21	68.59	43.21
(a) Developmental (a+b)	47.55	54.88	57.07	71.82	63.40	64.32	66.15	66.99	42.35
(b) Social Services (1 to 9)	3.30	3.24	3.37	1.98	3.02	2.92	2.88	5.98	2.08
2 Economic Services (1 to 10)	44.25	51.64	53.70	69.84	60.38	61.40	63.28	61.01	40.27
(b) Non-Developmental (General Services)	1.04	1.06	1.19	0.98	0.84	1.07	1.06	1.61	0.86
II.									
Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	3.55	4.84	4.52	0.76	1.04	1.07	1.57	2.49	2.29
III.									
Repayment of Loans to the Centre	15.91	14.42	13.58	7.98	10.96	13.04	13.56	15.73	9.39
IV.									
Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	31.95	24.79	23.63	18.46	23.76	20.50	17.66	13.19	45.11
1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	31.79	2.98	22.40	15.99	25.30	21.08	17.52	14.47	15.66
(a) Social Services (1 to 4)	7.75	5.10	6.12	4.29	7.67	6.67	6.13	5.70	3.06
(b) Economic Services (1 to 9)	24.03	19.35	16.28	11.70	17.63	14.40	11.39	8.77	12.61
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.16	0.34	1.24	2.48	-1.54	-0.58	0.14	-1.29	29.45
V									
Inter-State Settlement									
VI									
Contingency Fund									
VII									
Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)									
VIII									
Reserve Funds (1 to 4)									
IX									
Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)									
X									
Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)									
XI									
Appropriation to Contingency Fund									
XII									
Remittances									
A.									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital	59.82	0.58	2.19	6.31	19.10	34.56	59.09	100.57	28.51
B.									
Account	-13.79	-29.53	-4.24	5.32	-14.47	-38.24	-53.99	-84.35	-49.04
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue									
C.									
Account	46.04	-28.95	-2.05	11.63	4.63	-3.69	5.10	16.21	-20.53
Overall Sur. (+) Def. (-) (A+B)									
D.									
Fin. Sur. (+) Def. (-) in cash	2.15	-0.91	-2.05	-4.57	0.00	0.70	2.60	0.56	-0.64
Increase (+)/Decr. (-) in cash									
E.									
Balances	43.89	-28.05	0.00	16.19	4.63	-4.39	2.50	15.66	-19.89
Withdr. from (-)/Add. to (+) cash bal.									
F.									
Inv. A/c									
Increase (+)/Decr. (+) in ways Means	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Adv. And									
overdrafts from RBI (net)									

(Contd.)

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Punjab

Items (1)	1991-92 (2)	1992-93 (3)	1993-94 (4)	1994-95 (5)	1995-96 (6)	1996-97 (7)	1997-98 (8)	1998-99 (9)	1999-2000 (10)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	81568	78505	117716	146248	136866	62164	163364	257826	178424
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I.									
1 Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	35.75	33.00	42.08	48.65	49.62	-38.41	59.37	44.22	24.60
1 Developmental (a+b)	34.70	31.41	40.36	47.11	47.85	-43.64	57.20	42.59	22.48
(a) Social Services (1 to 9)	12.62	8.96	5.59	4.01	4.05	4.63	2.79	2.63	2.34
(b) Economic Services (1 to 10)	22.07	22.45	34.78	43.11	43.80	-48.27	54.41	39.97	20.13
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	0.69	1.59	1.72	1.53	1.77	5.23	2.17	1.63	2.12
II.									
Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	0.95	2.15	1.85	0.60	0.68	1.66	1.44	1.48	4.30
Repayment of Loans to the Centre	11.89	13.67	30.92	24.87	28.58	67.80	32.09	49.73	63.42
IV.									
Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	51.41	51.17	25.16	25.88	21.12	68.95	7.27	4.57	7.68
(a)									
1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	50.61	49.89	24.28	24.82	19.97	65.98	3.51	3.67	7.28
(a) Social Services (1 to 4)	1.63	1.29	1.89	1.82	1.78	4.56	0.04	1.67	3.82
(b) Economic Services (1 to 9)	48.98	48.61	22.39	23.01	18.19	61.42	3.46	2.00	3.47
(b)									
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.80	1.28	0.88	1.06	1.15	2.97	3.76	0.89	0.40
V									
Inter-State Settlement									
VI									
Contingency Fund									
VII									
Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)									
VIII									
Reserve Funds (1 to 4)									
IX									
Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)									
X									
Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)									
XI									
Appropriation to Contingency Fund									
XII									
Remittances									
A.									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	43.37	448.82	44.08	40.79	32.72	269.18	80.18	71.85	188.05
B.									
Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-58.95	-80.96	-65.15	-50.72	-32.90	-218.30	-90.83	-101.96	-152.86
C.									
Overall Sur(+)/Def(-)(A+B)	-15.58	367.86	-21.07	-9.93	-0.18	50.88	-10.66	-30.11	35.19
D.									
Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-)	9.87	-8.65	-6.99	-4.96	0.84	16.22	-12.20	4.99	-5.28
Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances									
E.									
Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	-25.45	376.50	-12.56	-0.21	-19.00	-1.85	1.44	0.00	0.01
F.									
Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	0.00	0.00	-14.08	-4.76	0.00	36.51	0.10	-35.10	40.46

(Contd.)

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Uttarakhand

Items (1)	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)										
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu. Public A/c)\$		147854	0.00	2602454	2677629	3969810	3779108	4267612	1310655	1457374
I. Total Capital Outlay (1+2)			26.46	2.05	4.21	5.17	5.40	6.37	20.50	19.74
(a) 1 Developmental (a+b)			22.68	1.83	3.69	4.30	4.50	5.24	17.04	13.43
(b) Social Services (1 to 9)			5.43	0.47	0.61	0.52	0.98	0.98	15.48	12.04
2 Economic Services (1 to 10)			17.25	1.35	3.08	3.30	3.05	3.79	2.81	0.83
3 Non-Developmental (General Services)			3.79	0.22	0.52	0.47	0.46	0.47	12.67	11.21
II. Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+			4.02	1.60	3.18	1.10	2.34	1.76	1.56	1.38
III. Repayment of Loans to the Centre									4.05	8.74
IV. Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)			51.69	4.51	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.29	0.26
(a) 1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)			17.58	0.52	0.67	0.34	0.27	0.50	0.65	2.11
(b) Social Services (1 to 4)			3.81	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.64	2.11
Economic Services (1 to 9)			13.78	0.46	0.62	0.29	0.23	0.45	0.03	0.02
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)			0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61	2.09
V Inter-State Settlement				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00
VI Contingency Fund				0.08	0.06	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)				0.65	0.70	0.56	0.64	0.69	0.19	0.23
VIII Reserve Funds (1 to 4)				0.37	0.96	0.65	0.35	0.59	2.06	2.12
IX Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)				6.74	6.28	5.05	5.36	3.95	1.38	0.21
X Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)				77.01	77.58	80.63	78.54	80.65	12.09	10.77
XI Appropriation to Contingency Fund				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	46.87	41.31
XII Remittances				6.49	6.26	7.30	7.59	6.54	0.00	0.00
A. Surplus(+) / Deficit(-) on Capital Account			27.93	3.04	3.36	0.99	-2.43	-2.20	15.38	20.83
B. Surplus(+) / Deficit(-) on Revenue Account			-80.74	-2.93	-3.55	-0.19	2.37	1.49	-4.95	1.31
C. Overall Sur. (+) / Def. (-) (A+B)			-52.81	0.11	-0.19	0.80	-0.06	-0.71	4.58	-1.46
D. Fin.Sar.(+) / Def.(-)			-52.81	0.11	0.23	0.42	-0.09	0.01	-0.37	-0.16
E. Increase (+) / Decr. (-) in cash Balances									-0.37	-0.16
Withdr. from (-) / Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c			0.00	-0.89	-0.29	0.30	0.04	-0.31	0.00	0.00
F. Increase (-) / Decr. (+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)			0.00	0.00	-0.13	0.09	0.00	-0.40	0.00	0.00

Table IV.4. Capital Expenditure of Individual States (Percentage to Total)

Uttar Pradesh

Items (1)	1991-92 (2)	1992-93 (3)	1993-94 (4)	1994-95 (5)	1995-96 (6)	1996-97 (7)	1997-98 (8)	1998-99 (9)	1999-2000 (10)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS (I+II+III+IV)	284692	344464	299518	566586	323118	380904	443045	538750	586758
Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
I. Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	25.07	36.88	31.69	19.77	34.95	37.68	37.64	38.92	43.18
1 Developmental (a+b)	23.55	35.52	29.60	18.97	31.41	34.96	35.03	36.98	42.31
(a) Social Services (1 to 9)	5.67	5.16	4.74	3.61	5.78	7.86	8.49	5.12	4.38
(b) Economic Services (1 to 10)	17.88	30.36	24.86	15.36	25.63	27.11	26.54	31.86	37.94
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	1.52	1.36	2.09	0.80	3.55	2.72	2.61	1.94	0.86
II. Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+ Repayment of Loans to the Centre	2.99	5.55	10.26	25.93	12.26	1.47	6.25	12.79	10.85
III. Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	16.26	14.18	18.48	10.49	19.91	19.73	19.73	18.56	19.13
IV. Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	55.68	43.39	39.58	43.81	32.88	41.15	36.38	29.73	26.85
1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	55.00	43.24	39.40	43.66	32.28	41.02	36.27	29.62	26.77
(a) Social Services (1 to 4)	2.22	2.04	2.75	1.49	2.11	4.38	1.31	0.95	2.65
(b) Economic Services (1 to 9)	52.78	41.20	36.65	42.17	30.18	36.63	34.97	28.67	24.12
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.68	0.14	0.17	0.15	0.59	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.08
V Inter-State Settlement Contingency Fund									
VI Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)									
VIII Reserve Funds (1 to 4)									
IX Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)									
X Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)									
XI Appropriation to Contingency Fund									
XII Remittances									
A. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	28.78	35.81	18.25	55.25	97.65	84.21	88.63	134.90	97.25
B. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-25.45	-29.45	-38.35	-35.35	-72.44	-83.46	-104.37	-161.41	-123.60
C. Overall Sur(+)/Def(-)(A+B)	3.33	6.36	-20.10	19.90	25.21	0.75	-15.73	-26.51	-26.36
D. Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-) in cash Balances	-4.41	-0.48	7.24	-3.72	7.19	-0.09	-0.01	-0.07	0.10
E. Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash bal. Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal.	1.28	12.42	-15.50	23.62	11.32	9.34	-25.52	-15.85	1.75
F. Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	6.46	-5.58	-11.84	0.00	6.70	-8.51	9.79	-10.59	-28.20

(Contd.)

Uttar Pradesh (Concl.)

Items (1)	2000-01 (11)	2001-02 (12)	2002-03 (13)	2003-04 (14)	2004-05 (15)	2005-06 (16)	2006-07 (17)	2007-08 (18)	2008-09 (19)	2009-10 (20)
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS	564859	632404	867850	16466576	16762455	30278520	62301209	48909520	22525361	23888138
(I+II+III+IV) Total Capital Disb. (Exclu.Public A/c)\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.66	4.37	3.10	4.51	12.49	12.03
I. Total Capital Outlay (1+2)	57.85	56.22	51.51	5.66	3.37	2.88	2.24	3.47	10.81	10.13
(a) 1 Developmental (a+b)	55.95	54.20	45.98	5.52	3.22	2.77	2.14	3.35	10.30	9.72
(b) Social Services (1 to 9)	4.62	3.34	4.56	0.20	0.30	0.38	0.35	0.45	1.76	2.13
Economic Services (1 to 10)	51.33	50.86	41.42	5.32	2.92	2.39	1.79	2.92	8.53	7.60
2 Non-Developmental (General Services)	1.90	2.03	5.53	0.14	0.15	0.10	0.10	0.12	0.52	0.41
II. Discharge of Internal Debt (1 to 5)+	3.24	12.80	3.27	14.67	16.33	2.36	0.60	0.85	1.41	5.88
III. Repayment of Loans to the Centre	22.66	22.66	31.72	0.76	1.20	0.39	0.35	0.24	0.53	0.50
IV. Loans and Advances by State Govt. (1+2)	16.26	8.32	13.51	0.75	0.38	0.23	0.14	0.15	0.40	0.53
(a) 1 Developmental Purposes (a+b)	16.20	8.14	12.83	0.75	0.37	0.23	0.14	0.15	0.40	0.53
(b) Social Services (1 to 4)	6.03	1.50	1.45	0.15	0.11	0.12	0.07	0.07	0.33	0.33
Economic Services (1 to 9)	10.17	6.64	11.38	0.60	0.26	0.11	0.07	0.08	0.16	0.19
2 Non-Developmental Purposes (a+b)	0.06	0.18	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01
V Inter-State Settlement				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI Contingency Fund				0.05	0.03	0.06	0.00	0.02	0.21	0.00
VII Small Savings, Provident Funds, etc. (1+2)				0.80	0.84	0.54	0.34	0.58	1.03	1.06
VIII Reserve Funds (1 to 4)				0.01	0.27	0.01	0.02	0.16	1.48	1.55
IX Deposits and Advances (1 to 4)				7.97	7.52	4.36	2.16	3.43	2.48	2.50
X Suspense and Miscellaneous (1 to 4)				66.34	67.08	86.50	92.21	88.43	80.51	76.78
XI Appropriation to Contingency Fund				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
XII Remittances				2.97	2.98	2.68	1.94	2.66	1.12	1.05
A. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Capital Account	149.19	89.51	87.61	11.29	4.33	3.20	0.34	-0.76	-3.70	-0.61
B. Surplus(+)/Deficit(-) on Revenue Account	-111.34	-97.75	-92.90	-11.29	-4.17	-0.42	0.79	0.71	1.82	0.66
C. Overall Sur. (+)/Def. (-) (A+B)	37.85	-8.24	-5.29	0.00	0.16	2.78	1.12	-0.06	-1.87	0.05
D. Fin.Sar(+)/Def(-) Increase (+)/Decr.(-) in cash Balances	-0.01	2.67	-5.29	0.00	0.32	0.08	-0.02	0.05	-1.87	0.05
E. Withdr. from (-)/Add.to (+) cash bal. Inv. A/c	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.10	-0.14	2.69	1.14	-0.10	0.00	0.00
F. Increase (-)/Decr.(+) in ways Means Adv. And overdrafts from RBI (net)	37.86	-10.91	0.00	0.00	-0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

