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The earlier major studies related to regional imbalances in economic development of Maharashtra may be briefly reviewed as follows:

2.1] The Third Five Year Plan Document of Maharashtra state (1961-66) stated few indicators to show the regional levels of development during 1960. This plan discussed for the first time, by using eight indicators of development, the relative levels of development of the then four divisions of the state i.e. Mumbai, Pune, Nagpur and Aurangabad.

The divisionwise information on eight indicators presented in the plan document is given in Table No. 2.1.

**TABLE NO. 2.1**

**DIVISION WISE INFORMATION ON EIGHT INDICATORS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Type of Indicators</th>
<th>Revenue Divisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Total agricultural production per acre-average for 1955-56 to 1958-59.</td>
<td>130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Percentage of irrigated area to gross – cropped area</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Railway mileage per 100 Sq. Miles</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Road mileage per 100 Sq. Miles</td>
<td>32.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Electricity consumption Kwh (P.C.)</td>
<td>391.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Number of factory workers per ‘000’ population</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Number of Primary School students per ‘000’ population</td>
<td>119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Number of Secondary School students per ‘000’ population</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 2.1 shows the relative levels of development as regards the indicators related to agriculture, industry, transport and education sectors.

As regards the agriculture sector the total agricultural production per acre-average (1955-56 to 1958-59), for Mumbai Division was the highest (i.e. 130.00), whereas it was very low for Aurangabad Division (74.00). The percentage of irrigated area to gross-cropped area was relatively high (9.90 percent) in Pune Division, the corresponding percentage for Aurangabad Division was very low i.e. 3.20 percent.

The Railway mileage per 100 Sq.miles was near about the same in Mumbai (2.60 miles), Pune (2.70 miles) and Nagpur (2.70 miles) Divisions, but in respect of Aurangabad Division the Railway mileage per 100 Sq.miles was 2.10 which was comparatively low.

The road Mileage per 100 Sq.miles was 32.90 miles in Mumbai Division and 29.20 miles in Pune Division, whereas it was very low in Aurangabad Division i.e. 7.40 miles.

In respect of per capita electricity consumption, there was the highest per capita electricity consumption (391 kwh) in Mumbai Division. It was less than the half for Pune (110 kwh) and for Nagpur (142 kwh) Divisions as compare to Mumbai Division and for Aurangabad Division per capita electricity consumption was very low i.e. 3 kwh.

As regards the number of factory workers per thousand population the corresponding number was near about the same for Mumbai Division (7.30), Pune Division (8.90) and Nagpur Division (7.70) but for the Aurangabad Division it was very low i.e. 2.30.

The number of Primary School students per thousand population was higher in Mumbai and Pune Division i.e. 119 and 124 respectively. For Nagpur Division it was 82 and the lowest for Aurangabad Division i.e. 54.

As regards the number of Secondary School students per thousand population Nagpur Division accounted the highest (21),
followed by Pune Division (15) and Mumbai and Auragabad Divisions were at the same level i.e. 12 in each Division.

Thus the data related to above cited eight indicators indicate that in respect of most of the indicators, Mumbai Division and Pune Division showed a high level of development as compare to Nagpur and Aurangabad Divisions.

Aurangabad Division was at the fourth rank in the level of development. The data indicate the remarkable imbalance in the levels of development of the four regions around 1960.

Out of eight indicators two indicators (1 and 2) were related to agriculture sector, three of them indicators (3,4, and 5) were mostly related to infrastructure. The 6th indicator was related to industrial sector and rest of the indicators (7 and 8) were related to social sector.

The data presented in the Table No.2.1 showed that there was a regional imbalance in the levels of development of the four divisions during 1960.

The plan document has used the word “backlog” for the first time and has made a policy statement that the regional development backlog will be removed by additional allocations in the Third plan and future Five Year plans.

2.2] In 1963, a Techno Economic Survey of Maharashtra State, was under taken by ‘The National Council of Applied Economic Research’, New Delhi. It was clearly mentioned in this report that, “Marathwada is industrially backward”. There are very few facilities for internal communication and the regions contact with outside is negligible. Again ‘The National Council of Applied Economic Research’ (NCAER), also published a report on Inter District and Inter State Income Differentials (1955-56) with district wise break up of national income separately for primary, secondary and tertiary sectors in the same year 1963.

2.3] A report on “Levels of Regional Development in India” was published by Shri Ashok Mitra (the then Census Commissioner)
in 1964. He classified all the districts, in the country by using 35 socio-economic indicators, in to four levels of development.

The classification of the then 26 districts of Maharashtra were given as follows:

(The levels of development were denoted as Fourth level is the highest level of development and Third level means the level of development next to the fourth level and so on ... Thus the First level means the lowest level of development)

A) Eleven districts were classified in the Fourth or the highest level of development i.e. Brihan Mumbai, Thane, Nashik, Dhule, Jalgaon, Ahmednagar, Pune, Solapur, Akola, Amravati and Nagpur.

B) Seven districts which were classified in third level were, Satara, Sangli, Aurangabad, Nanded, Buldhana, Yeotmal and Wardha.

C) Seven districts which were classified in the second level were, Kulaba (now Raigad), Kolhapur, Parbhani, Beed, Osmanabad, Bhandara, Chandrapur.

D) And the Ratnagiri district was included in the First level or the lowest level.

Shri Ashok Mitra later made an attempt to identify the disparities in development for the year 1971 and found that the disparities in development have increased during the decade 1961-71.²

2.4] Pande Committee:

In 1968, the Government of India has taken a concrete step by setting up two working Groups to examine the nature of backward areas and incentives which could be extended to promote their industrial growth.

The First Working Group on “Identification of Backward Areas” commonly known as Pande Committee and the second one was ‘Wanchoo Working Group’ to recommend fiscal and financial incentives for starting industries in backward areas.

The Pande Working Group recommended that the following criteria be applied in aggregate for the purpose of identification of industrially backward states and Union Territories in the country.
a) Per capita income; b) Per capita income from Industry and
Mining; c) Number of workers in registered factories; d) Per capita
annual consumption of electricity; e) Length of surfaced roads in
relation to population and the area of the state; and f) Railway
mileage in relation to the population and the area of the state.

On the basis of these criteria, the Pande Committee
recommended and the Government of India approved that, the
following industrially backward states and Union Territories should
qualify for the special treatment by way of incentives for industrial
development:

i) States:
Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Jammu and Kashmir, Madhya
Pradesh, Nagaland, Orissa, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh.

ii) Union Territories:
All Union Territories except Chandigarh, Delhi and
Pondicherry. Subsequently, Meghalaya, Himachal Pradesh and
Sikkim states and Union Territory of Pondicherry were added
to the above list.

The Pande Committee also recommended the following
indicators of backwardness, for identification of backward districts
in backward states/Union Territories;

a) Districts which are outside a radius of about 50 miles from
larger cities and large industrial projects.

b) Poverty of the people as indicated by low per capita income
starting from the lowest to 25 percent below the state average.

c) High density of population in relation to utilization of
productive resources and employment opportunities as
indicated by:

i) Low percentage of population engaged in Secondary
and tertiary activities (25 percent below the state
average may be considered as backward);

ii) Low percentage of factory employment (25 percent
below the state average may be considered as
backward);
iii) Non- and/or under utilization of economic and natural resources like minerals, forests etc.

iv) Adequate availability of electric power or likelihood of its availability within the next one or two years,

v) Availability of transport and communication facilities or likelihood of their availability within the next one or two years; and

vi) Adequate availability of water or likelihood of its availability within the next one or two years.

Subsequently, the Planning Commission, in consultation with the National Development Council, recommended the following criterias for identification of industrially backward districts:

i) Per capita food grains/commercial crops production depending on whether the district is predominantly a producer of food grains/cash crops;

ii) Ratio of population to agricultural workers;

iii) Per capita gross industrial output;

iv) Number of factory employees per lakh of population or alternatively, number of persons engaged in secondary or tertiary activities per lakh of population;
   a. Per capita consumption of electricity; and

vi) Length of surfaced roads in relation to population or railway mileage in relation to population.

The Pande Committee identified the 13 districts in Maharashtra as industrially backward according to the criteria laid down by the planning commission:

The list includes two districts (Ratnagiri and Raigad) from Konkan, two districts (Dhule and Jalgaon) from Western Maharashtra, all the (then 5) districts of Marathwada and four districts (Buldhana, Yeotmal, Bhandara and Chandrapur) of Vidarbha region. Planning commission approved this classification and Government of India introduced subsidies and incentive schemes on that basis. The State Government does not appear to have approved that classification or acted upon it.
2.5] Chakravarty Committee:

The Government of India appointed High Level National Committee on the Development of Backward Areas in 1978 under the Chairmanship of Shri Shivraman. The report of the committee is available in eleven volumes. In one volume, Dr. Shivraman referred to a district wise study undertaken by Shri Sukhomay Chakrawarti, who was then chairman on the Economic Advisory Committee to Government of India.

The Chakravarty Committee on Backward Areas (1980) examined the problem of identification and classification of backward areas more methodically. Its Draft Report was extracted by the National Committee on the Development of Backward Areas (NCDBA); (Report on General Issues Relating to Backward Areas Development, November 1981, Annexure 4.1)

Fourteen indicators were selected by the Chakravarty Committee. Those were:

1) Density of population per sq.k.m. of area; 2) percentage of agricultural workers to total working force; 3) Gross value of output of food grains per head of rural population; 4) Gross value of output of non food grains per head of rural population; 5) Gross value of output of all crops per head of rural population; 6) percentage of total establishments using electricity to total number of establishments (manufacturing and repair); 7) percentage of household establishments using electricity to total household establishments; 8) percentage of non-household establishments using electricity to total non-household establishments; 9) Number of workers in registered factories per lakh of population; 10) length of surfaced roads per 100 sq. k.ms. of area; 11) length of surfaced roads per lakh of population; 12) percentage of female literates to female population; 13) percentage of male literates to male population; and 14) percentage of total literates to total population. Thus the indicators were related to agriculture, industry, infrastructure and social sector of the economy.
By applying Ranking Method, Chakravarty Committee, classified 164 districts (out of 326 districts taken for analysis) as backward districts. With the help of index method the committee identified 206 districts as backward.

Chakravarty committee used the method of Principal component Analysis also to identify backward district. The districts were classified on the basis of first component which accounted for only 45 percent of the variation of the set of fourteen indicators chosen. 181 districts were classified as backward. From these districts 155 districts were classified as backward by all the three methods. The committee considered these common districts to constitute "the hard core of backward areas in the country" only two districts of Maharashtra state were listed in this category i.e. Beed and Chandrapur.

2.6] National Committee On Development Of Backward Areas:

The National Committee on Development of Backward Areas (NCDBA) appointed by the Government of India in 1978, under chairmanship of Shri. Shivraman, observed that, from the operational stand point, a composite index of backwardness, does not classify district in to problem categories and in fact further analysis is required in order to do this. The NCDBA also examined whether “instead of using an overall index, it may be easier to define sectoral indices to identify backwardness with respect to specific sectors of development, e.g. agricultural, industrial, educational backwardness etc.” The committee observes: “Such indices may be of use in the monitoring of regional inequalities at the sectoral level. In particular, the concept of industrial backwardness may have some validity. But as general answer to the problem of identifying backward areas, the sectoral index approaching is not very promising.”

Thus, the NCDBA, instead of using an overall index to identify backward areas; it recommends that the following problem areas should be recognized as backward;
i) Chronically drought prone areas; ii) Desert areas; iii) Tribal areas; iv) Hill areas; v) Chronically flood-affected areas; and vi) Coastal areas affected by salinity.

Besides these six types of fundamental backwardness, the NCDBA recognizes two other handicaps: one is the prevalence of feudal elements in production relations and social structure. The second is lack of administrative presence.

2.7] The Ghokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune published a regional study on Marathwada in 1975 in which it also discussed the relative levels of development of Greater Mumbai and four Revenue divisions of Maharashtra i.e. Mumbai, Pune divisions, Marathwada and Vidarbha regions.

In this study 31 indicators were used to determine relative levels of development of Greater Mumbai and four revenue divisions of Maharashtra. Out of 31 indicators only selected six indicator’s data is given in Table 2.2. These indicators are mostly related to the industrial sector.

### TABLE NO. 2.2
**FINDINGS OF THE GOKHALE INSTITUTE ON SELECTED INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mumbai Division Excluding Gr. Mumbai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Percentage of workers working in secondary sector (1971).</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Percentage of workers in factories (1969).</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Contribution out of secondary sector production (in %) (1969)</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Percentage share of value (1969)</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Percentage proportion of electric consumption (1970).</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Percentage proportion of Bank credit (1972).</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data given in table 2.2, it is observed that there was a high level of disparity in the level of industrial development between the Greater Mumbai, Pune, Marathwada and Vidarbha regions in the corresponding period. The industrial activities were highly concentrated in Mumbai, Mumbai division excluding Greater Mumbai and Pune.

The findings of the Gokhale Institute on selected indicators depicts the picture that Mumbai region accounts more than 60 percent share in respect of the most of the indicators. Which indicate the high level of development in this division.

2.8] Shri Narottam shah who was a member of the State Planning Board and also a member of the Fact Finding Committee – 1984, published a study called “Levels of Economic Development in Districts of Maharashtra – 1981”

Dr. Shah used several indicators of production and infrastructural facilities. Later he attempted to construct a composite index to show districtwise levels of development in Maharashtra. He has assigned the values to the then existing 26 districts. All the values are with reference to India average of 100 and Maharashtra average of 163.

The study revealed that around 1980, the districts like Greater Mumbai, Pune, Thane were above the all India average (100) and also above the state average (163). The districts Ahmednagar, Nagpur, Kolhapur, Raigad (Kulaba) were below the state average (163) and above the national average (100). The Rest of the 18 districts (out of then 26 districts) were below the All India Average i.e 100. Ratnagiri district accounted the least (47)

2.9] Fact Finding Committee:

In 1983, a Fact Finding Committee (FFC) was appointed under the chairmanship of Dr. V.M. Dandekar. The committee presented its report in April 1984.

The FFC clearly mentioned its purpose of the study in chapter III of its report that “our main purpose is to, what the NCDBA calls,
“monitor regional inequalities” and this as the NCDBA point out has to be done at “sectoral level”. Even in relation to the sector, our purpose is not to construct indicators to identify broad sectoral backwardness such as agricultural backwardness, industrial backwardness, educational backwardness etc. We propose to examine disparities in development and measure the backlog of the districts lagging behind in each sector in much greater details, so that the disparities are identified in operationally meaning full terms”.

The Fact Finding Committee (FFC) has covered 09 major sectors and identified districtwise level of development in respect of those sectors relative to the state average. The nine sectors chosen by the ‘FFC’ were: 1) Irrigation, 2) Roads, 3) General Education, 4) Technical Education, 5) Health Services, 6) Drinking water supply, 7) Energization of agricultural pumps, 8) Animal husbandry and 9) Land Development. It, however, covered and calculated districtwise physical backlog in the sectors covered and calculated their Capital Cost on the basis of 1983 prices.

All the districts below the state average in each sector, were given backlog funds for the development of that sector. The districts above the state average, were excluded, and were not considered for backlog funding. Thus, the Dandekar committee adopted the sectoral approach for the measurement of regional disparities in Maharashtra.

The committee (FFC) considered district as the unit for the measurement of backlog. Only in the case of irrigation sector, the committee made an exception and drought affected talukas were taken as a unit of measurement. This was highly criticized by many economists.

Again, the FFC estimated the backlog relating to State Government expenditure incurred on the above nine sectors of the state economy. Private sector was completely excluded.

The Fact Finding Committee estimated the total backlog of the state at Rs3186.77 crores. The regionwise backlog was as follows:

1. Vidarbha Rs.1246.55 Crores (39.12%)
2. Marathwada Rs. 750.85 Crores (23.56 %)
3. Rest of Maharashtra  Rs.1189.38 Crores  (37.32 %)
(The Rest of Maharashtra included a)Western Maharashtra – Rs.884.05 crores, Konkan Rs.295.62 crores, and Greater Mumbai Rs.9.71 crores.)

The Government of Maharashtra has not officially accepted the recommendations of the Dandekar Committee. However The Government started making annual provisions of certain amounts in the budgets for the removal of backlog on the basis of this report.

2.10] Recent Study By K.Seeta Prabhu And P.C.Sarker –

The study of K. Seeta Prabhu and P.C.Sarker is based on 1985-86 statistics. A total of 20 indicators covering the sectors of agriculture, industry, human resources and infrastructure were considered for the analysis. These 20 indicators were used to arrive at sectoral and aggregate development indices by each of the three methods, viz., ranking, indexing and principal components.

These scholars have classified following eleven districts as the high level of development:-

The following three districts were classified as at medium level of development:

The following 15 districts were classified as the low level of development as the backward districts:-

Brihnmumbai district was not covered by the study. Authors found that “All the districts of western Maharashtra with the exception of Dhule, were classified as belonging to medium and high level of development. In sharp contrast, all the districts in Marathwada, except Aurangabad, and six out of nine districts in Vidarbha were classified as belonging to the category of underdeveloped districts. The persistence of wide disparities in the
development of various regions in Maharashtra despite a quarter century of planned development is disconcerting and points to the need for urgent remedial measures.”

2.11] A Report Of The Study Group – 1993:

The Government of Maharashtra in consultation with the State planning Board appointed a study group under the chairmanship of Shri B.A.Kulkarni (who was the member of FFC 1984) in December 1991, to identify backward districts in the state, to identify basic causes behind their backwardness and to suggest remedies.

The study group presented its report to the State Government in June 1993.

The study group used the following 12 indicators for the measurement of districtwise levels of development:

A) **Economic Indicators:**

2) No. of workers in registered factories per lakh of population (Dec. 1990)
3) Proportion of net irrigated area to net sown area; (1989-90),
4) Credit outstanding from commercial Banks and co-operative institutions (per capit) (1991).
5) No. of agricultural labourers per lakh of population (1991).

B) **Social Indicators:**

1) Proportion of Urban population: (1991);
2) Female literacy (1991);
3) Per capita consumption of electricity (1987-88);
4) Percentage proportion of S.C. and S.T. (1991);
5) No. of dispensaries, Primary health Centers and health units per lakh of population (1988);

C) **Basic Infrastructure:**

1) Length of Roads per 100 Sq.Km. (1991);
2) Length of railway line per 10,000 Sq.Kms. (1985-86)
The study group classified the following 17 districts of Maharashtra as backward:


The study group used three alternative methods for analysis of data and identifying backward districts. From the 3rd method used, the study group had assessed the degree of development of various districts in quantitative terms.

The relative values of the 17 backward districts assigned by the study group and their ranking on the scale of backwardness are given in Table 2.3.

**Table 2.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No.</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Relative values derived on the basis of 12 indicators</th>
<th>Ranking on the scale of backwardness.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gadchiroli</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Yeotmal</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Jalna</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Osmanabad</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Buldhana</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Latur</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Dhule</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Beed</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Amravati</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Akola</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Parbhani</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Nanded</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Ratnagiri</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Bhandara</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Chandrapur</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Wardha</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Sindhudurg</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A very special feature of the Study Group Report is that it has presented descriptive profiles on each of the seventeen backward districts and five traditional sub-regions of Maharashtra.

2.12] Report Of The Indicators And Backlog Committee - 1997

In 1995 the Joint Committee of the three boards called "The Indicators and Backlog Committee", was appointed by the Governor of Maharashtra. It dealt with the assessment of relative levels of regional development in Maharashtra and the choice of appropriate indicators for measurement of levels of economic and social development.

This committee adopted the same methodology as was adopted by the Fact Finding Committee (1984) for estimating the sectoral backlog of the three regions taking district as the unit of measurement, (except the criteria of drought prone talukas as unit for estimation of backlog in the irrigation sector).

The committee also estimated backlog in nine major sectors of the state economy, as was done by the Fact Finding Committee (1984).

The 09 major sectors may be listed as follows:

Chapters 3 to 11 of the report, dealt with the relative levels of sectoral development in districts; divisions and regions of the state. These chapters have presented estimates of sector-wise physical and financial backlog. The chapter 12, presented a summary of respective sectoral estimates of financial backlog only.

The data presented in Table 2.4 depicts the comparative picture of region-wise backlog estimates by the FFC (1984) and Indicators and Backlog Committee (1997).
TABLE 2.4:
(Rs. crore)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Vidarbha</td>
<td>1246.55 (39.12)</td>
<td>6624.02 (47.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>Marathwada</td>
<td>750.85 (23.56)</td>
<td>4004.55 (28.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Rest of Maharashtra</td>
<td>1189.38 (37.32)</td>
<td>3378.20 (24.12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Western Maharashtra</td>
<td>884.05</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Konkan</td>
<td>295.62</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Greater Mumbai</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3186.78 (100.00)</td>
<td>14006.77 (100.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in brackets are percentages to total.

Source – Govt. of Maharashtra (1997) “Indicators and Backlog Committee”, Vol. I. As per revised estimates P.242

If we compare the region-wise backlog estimated for the year 1994, with the backlog of the FFC in 1984, it is found that

a) The aggregate backlog has increased between 1984 and 1994 from Rs.3186.78 crores in 1984 to Rs.14006.77 crores in 1994. Although, the latter figure has a significant element of inflation, the increase does reflect the widening disparities in the state.

b) The proportion of Vidarbha in total backlog has increased from 39.12 percent in 1984 to 47.29 percent in 1994, showed an increase of 8.17 percent over a decade.

c) For Marathwada region, its share in total backlog has increased from 23.56 percent in 1984 to 28.59 percent in 1994, showed an increase of 5.03 percent over the same period.

d) The Rest of Maharashtra’s share in total Backlog has declined from 37.32 percent in 1984 to 24.12 percent in 1994, a decline of 13.20 percent. This indicates that, relatively the sectors in the Rest of Maharashtra has improved, more than the other two regions.

The committee has also estimated region-wise per capita backlog for the year 1994 which also indicates that Vidarbha region
has the highest per capita backlog, followed by Marathwada region and the Rest of Maharashtra, the least i.e. about one fifth of the values of the other two regions.

The committee opined that, “the process of development of the two regions (viz. Marathwada and Vidarbha) and some districts seems to have got retarded because of the deficiencies of infrastructure. The removal of these backlogs is necessary to revitalise the process of development in the lagging regions and districts. We, therefore, recommend that all the backlog should be removed through a time bound programme. In the opinion of our committee removal of backlog is priority one action for balanced regional development”.

The committee also recommended the various principles for allocation and distribution of the plan funds for removal of backlog.

2.13] Sharma Committee (1997)

The Government of India has appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. E.A.S. Sharma to identify poorest districts in the country. The committee identifies “100 poorest districts” in the country. This committee identified, ten poorest districts in Maharashtra State. Out of these ten districts, seven belonged to the Marathwada (entire region) and the remaining three to Vidarbha region. This aptly proves the lopsided development of the state during the last 40 years.

In nutshell, the review of the few earlier studies on regional imbalances in industrial, economic and infrastructural development in Maharashtra may be summarized as follows:

1) Despite the differences in indicators and methodologies used by various scholars and committees, the results of these studies indicate the one thing common that the number of backward districts are relatively high in the Marathwada and Vidarbha region than that of Rest of Maharashtra.
2) The results of these studies shows that there is a wide disparity in the levels of development between the regions.

3) In respect of sector wise physical and financial backlog, it is found that aggregate backlog has increased between 1984 to 1994 for Vidarbha and Marathwada regions and for Rest of Maharashtra share in total backlog has declined over the same period.
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