COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE OF THE URBAN LOCAL BODIES IN WEST BENGAL : (1981-1991)

Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

ARITRA CHAKRABORTY

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI – 110 067
2006

CERTIFICATE

I, Aritra Chakraborty, certify that the dissertation entitled " COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE OF THE URBAN LOCAL BODIES IN WEST BENGAL: [1981-1991]" for the degree of MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY is my bonafide work and may be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

[ARITRA CHAKRABORTY]

Forwarded by

[PROF. ATIYA HABEEB KIDWAI]

SUPERVISOR

[PROF. SARASWATI RAJU]

CHAIRPERSON

Chairperson
Centre for the Study of Reg. Dev.
School of Social Sciences,
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi - 110 067

I DEDICATE THIS HUMBLE EFFORT TO MY PARENTS AND

TO MY MOTHERLY   GUIDE PROF. ATIYA HABEEB KIDWAI

Acknowledgements:

CONTENTS:

List of Tables:

CHAPTER: 1

INTRODUCTION

According to Albert Einstein, everything is relative in this universe; so also the performance of one with respect to other. In the context of development also, nothing is absolute in nature and one can only talk about comparative development. In the present study the same concept has been applied to observe the relative development of urban local bodies in West Bengal which differentiate the well developed from the less developed towns.

In Bengal, cities have existed from the ancient times when places like Rangamati, Sonargao and Satgao developed. In medieval age many towns like Dhaka, Nabadwip, Gour and Murshidabad flourished all over. In 1757, after defeating the Nawab in 1757, British East India Company took the charge in Bengal; from then onwards Kolkata emerged prospered and became the capital of British India.

From the end of the 19th century many older cities started declining at the cost of the emerging new ones. These includes old Malda in Malda district; Murshidabad, Jangipur, Kandi, Jiaganj, and Azimganj in Murshidabad district; Suri, Dubrajpur and Rampurhat in Birbhum; Dainhat, Kalna and Katoa in Bardhaman; Ranaghat; Santipur, Nabadwip Birnagar and Krishnanagar in Nadia; Gobardanga and Jainagar-Mazilpur in 24 Parganas; Bansberia and Hugli – Chinsura in Hugli; Sonamukhi in Bankura; Jhalda in Puruliya and Kharar, Khirpai, Ramjibanpur and Chandrakona in Medinipur district, majority of these cities either became stagnant or grew at a very feeble pace.

On the other hand cities like Darjeeling in Darjeeling district; English Bazar in Malda; Baharampur in Murshidabad; Assansol and Raniganj in Bardhaman and Kharagpur in Medinipur as well as Kolkata started emerging.[1]

Municipalities were established in Bengal since the British period. In the census of 1901, one can identify as many as seventy four municipalities in West Bengal.

After independence more new cities started prospering. Due to the influx of refugees Habra and Ashoknagar grew in North 24 Parganas while Siliguri prospered in Darjeeling; satellite towns like Kalyani emerged in Nadia while due to new industrialization, Durgapur emerged in Bardhaman district.

The Left Front Government after coming in power at 1977; encouraged local self-governance by making 'Panchayati Raj' and municipalities both effective and vibrant.[2] They in real sense started grass root level democracy by introducing regular elections in these local bodies and defined the functional as well as financial domains of these local bodies in a more pronounced way. They introduced 'Mayor in Council' type of governance in Kolkata, which was a revolution in itself.[3] The 'Calcutta Municipal Corporation act 1980'; can serve as a model for the whole nation. It clearly defined all obligatory as well as discretionary functions of the municipal corporation quite clearly. It gave more power to the elected representatives than to the municipal commissioner who is only an agent of the state government. The left front made an effort to make popular representation more perceivable.

[1] Gupta, S and Som, N ;(1997); "Economic and Spatial Growth Process in Calcutta Metropolitan Area"; Spatio Economic Development Record; Vol.4: No.5: pp.19-25.
[2] Bhattacharya; "Making Local Democracy Work in India: Social Capital. Politics and Governance in West Bengal"; Vedams ebook Pvt .Ltd.: New Delhi: Year2002.
[3] Sivaramakrishnan K.C.: "Power to the People? The Politics and Progress of Decentralisation"; Konark Publisher Pvt.Ltd: New Delhi: Year2000.

All these local level efforts were later legalized throughout the nation where 74th Constitutional Amendment was passed in 1992. This legalized the constitution, composition, duration, seat reservation, authorities, functional and financial domains of the municipalities; created state finance commission (SFC) and made elections compulsory in a specific manner. Article 243p to 243zg gave all these accounts while the 12th schedule of the constitution gave the list of areas where municipalities can show their authority. Accordingly in 1993, The West Bengal Municipal Act was passed which gave heart and soul to the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Not much work has been done as far as comparative development of the municipalities is concerned. Still some related studies can be mentioned which pertains to the urban scenario and its various dimensions in the state. These studies can be divided into three sections. First, the methodological studies, which relate to the indicators of development, preparation of composite index as well as methods pertaining to regional variation and comparative performance. Second are studies regarding the urban systems in West Bengal and give the general overview of the trend and pattern of urbanization in the state. The third group addresses the question of planning, governance, municipal development along with their functional as well as financial domains.

We have reviewed the studies which have used indicators of regional development, because in the work to show the performance of the municipalities, we also used such indicators. Chattopadhay and

Raza's[4] seminal work in formulating an analytical framework in regional development must be mentioned. They are the one who differentiated between disparity and diversity.

Sharma[5] studied the spatial disparity in Rajasthan. He developed indicators for agriculture, manufacturing, and public service sectors and eventually computed the composite index by Kendal's method. According to him, this method is more suitable for disparity analysis than traditional factor analysis as far as Indian context is concerned.

Kundu[6] has discussed the nature of social indicators, how a variable is different from an indicator and then as a methodological tool he used seven parameters where he placed the various indicators. He also emphasized that indicators might not always succeed in articulating the forces underlying the phenomenon in its totality. According to him the main danger in using a large number of indicators is duplication. He proposed a very unique methodology. He first made the indicators scale free; then gave weightages. Another important fact is that, the negative indicators were made positive. Incorporating all these methodological issues, the method by which he made a composite index was called the modified principal component analysis.

Krishnaiah and Ranga Reddy[7] gave an account of economic disparity in Andhra Pradesh. They pointed out that difference builds up "due to large unequal natural endowment and lack of infrastructure facilities". They also formulated some indicators pertaining to

[4] Chattopadhyay, B and Raza. M :(1975): "Regional Development: An Analytical Framework and Indicators"; Indian Journal of Regional Science: Vol.2: No.5; pp11-34.
[5] Sharma, K.L. ;(1975) "Spatial Disparities in Rajasthan: Comparative Study of Levels of Development between Two Points of Time"; Indian Journal of Regional Science; Vol.2: No.5; pp88-98.
[6] Kundu, A.;" Measurement of Urban Process: Study of Regionalisation"; Popular Prakashan; Bombay: Year 1980.
[7] Krishnaiah,K and Ranga Reddy.A; "Regional Economic Disparities in Andhra Pradesh" taken from Mohapatra,A.C. and Routray.J.K.(ed): "Regional Development and Planning"; Rawat Publication: Jaipur;Year1998.

agricultural, industrial, infrastructure, as well as socio-cultural development and made a composite index with them. Finally they generated some kind of rankings of the districts with reference to their state of development.

In the context of general urban scenario in West Bengal, various authors have done important studies. Buch[8] found that, the growth of the main city of Kolkata has slowed down, but the periphery is expanding fast. Kolkata has its own autonomous character while there is an enormous growth around the Assansol-Durgapur area. He stated that the pace of growth in other towns was slow probably due to the slow marketing functions, at the same time it indicated a growing agrarian stabilization which at least permits the rural folk to make a reasonable living in the villages.Buch does not believe that urbanization in India has a trickle down effect, stating that some of the poorest rural regions are around the city like Kolkata. In West Bengal the differences between the growth rate of urban and rural areas was low. This was due to the stagnation of small and medium towns because of low interaction between the producer villages and the market towns.

· Buch[9] mentioned that some districts around Kolkata like Nadia and 24 Parganas were backward; thus enabling new industries to locate in those districts, which are near Kolkata. Thus some towns which were situated in KMDA regions, was developing very fast, leading to further regional imbalance. According to the Buch, banning of industrial activities in Kolkata was counter productive because new industries were set up at the vicinity of the city while there were no replacement of old technologies as well as industries in the core of the city. It leads to a distorted picture because it is not possible to categorically say whether

---

[8] Buch, M.N.; "Planning the Indian City", Vikas Publishing House Pvt.Ltd. New Delhi. 1987.
[9] Buch, M.N.ibid.

Kolkata is undergoing economic expansion or stagnation. The only thing which can be concluded is that the core city is stagnating while periphery is expanding rapidly.

Mitra[10] indicate that in 1981, out of 291 towns, only 96 had municipalities, 5 have town committees and one was a cantonment. The remaining towns enjoyed no municipal management or amenities. 107 of those towns fell within the Kolkata urban agglomeration with a population of 91.7 lakh. Of those 30 were old fashioned municipalities with very limited amenities, three were corporations, one was a cantonment and two were Notified Areas. The remaining 72 municipalities outside that region were no more than over populated villages bursting at the seams without noticeable urban attributes but experiencing very high rates of growth. As far as West Bengal is concerned, out of 12 urban agglomerations with a population over 1 lakh, only 5 had industrial complex of any sort.

Roy[11] found that in West Bengal urbanization acted as a catalyst of economic development. According to the 1991 census, there were 382 urban units in West Bengal out of which 116 were statutory towns. He indicated the problems related to housing which led to increased slum population in cities like Assansol, Durgapur, Kolkata, Chandannagar and Konnagar.

According to CMDA[12] in 1971 the Kolkata Metropolitan Area accommodated 75% of West Bengal's urban population. For dispersal of urban activity, KMDA proposed to develop small and medium towns especially in the Kolkata Metropolitan Area. According to them future development strategy should be to utilize reserve capacity of the existing

[10] Mitra. A.; "Calcutta on the Eve of Her Tercentenary"; Abhinav Publication; New Delhi; Year1990.
[11] Roy.P.N; (1997); op.cit.
[12] CMDA ;(1997); "Calcutta Metropolitan Area: Future Development Policies, Strategies and Directions"; Spatio Economic Development Record; Vol.4 No.5; pp.27-32.

towns. C.M.D.A. does not agree with the basic development plan, which has argued for a bi cantered metropolis. Instead they are for a poly-centred growth in the region with Kolkata- Howrah (which contains nineteen percent of total K.M.A. land and forty five percent of its population) as the main centre.

Gupta and Som[13] found that the economic ruin of Bengal was a reflection of decay of about 25 small and medium towns at the end of 19th century. According to these authors, the process of 'de industrialization', which is a characteristic of colonial economy, resulted in the decrease in the productive activities in the small and medium towns leading to their decay.

Guha[14] has discussed about the Siliguri town and its extra ordinary growth, from a little settlement to a large town. Darjeeling town in late 19th and early 20th century grew only because of its status as a summer resort of the British Government .On the other hand Siliguri town grew mainly after independence when a large number of refugees came into the city. Population growth though directly is not a function of development, but still it is an aspect of prosperity of a town because only if a town acts as a growth centre then only can it attract immigrants due to its economic viability. This has been the case for Siliguri after 1947.

As far as the third aspect i.e. planning and municipal development as well as urban governance are concerned, Maheshwari[15] has vividly discussed the various tiers of urban governance like that of Municipal Corporations, Municipal Councils, Notified Area Committees, Town Area Committees, Cantonment Boards and Townships. These are all statutory

---

[13] Gupta, S and Som, N (1997); "Economic and Spatial Growth Process in Calcutta Metropolitan Area;" Spatio Economic Development Record; Vol.4: No.5; pp.19-25.

[14] Guha, S.B.; "Medium Towns or Future Cities: Populating or Depopulating? A Case Study from West Bengal"; taken from "Indian Medium Towns: An Appraisal of Their Role as Growth Centres"; Diddee, J(ed); Rawat Publication; New Delhi; Year 1997.

[15] Maheshwari, S; "Local Government in India". Lakshmi Narain Agarwal: Agra; Year1984.

urban units which are governed by various municipal acts and have some sort of local self governance especially in the sphere of housing, public health, transport, education etc. The author has given the list of obligatory as well as discretionary functions in each category and has mentioned the sources of their income. As far as West Bengal is concerned, out of 102 local urban units, 90 were municipalities, 3 municipal corporations, 4 town committees, 4 Notified Areas and 1 cantonment board in 1981.The schedule has also discussed the process of administration in each of these local tiers. He has also given an account of the various agencies responsible for urban development, town planning, personnel administration, and most importantly the financing system for the developmental activities in these local bodies.

Bakshi[16] has written about the various constitutional provisions which were taken for local level decentralization. Article 40 of the Directive Principles of State Policy has asked the state to organize village Panchayats; but it never gave any reference to urban bodies. After the 74th Constitutional Amendment, Article 243P to 243ZG has elaborately mentioned the forms and functions of municipalities and other urban local bodies. Article 280 has discussed the finance commission. Entry 5 of the list 2 of 7th schedule had given state government the power to have control over local bodies. Again by 74th CAA, 12th Schedule have been inserted into the constitution pertaining to Article 243W which has given an elaborate list of the functional domain of the urban local bodies.

Sachdeva[17] started his book by giving the definitions of local government. According to Encyclopaedia Britannica it is "an authority to determine and execute measures within a restricted area inside and smaller than the whole state. The variant local self government is

[16] Bakshi, P.M.; "The Constitution of India"; Universal Law Publishing Co.Pvt.Ltd; Delhi; Year 1991.
[17] Sachdeva, P.; "Urban Local Government and Administration in India"; Kitab Mahal; Allahabad; Year1993.

important for its emphasis on the freedom to decide and act".[18] Sachdeva mentioned that a local government should have civic amenities, local area, authority, autonomy, finances, popular participation, leadership, development and local accountability. Therefore, urban local government must possess municipal legislation, management, finance, town planning etc. spheres. Sachdeva[19] also discusses on the structure of urban local governments as well as on their functions and performance. As far as Kolkata Municipal Corporation is concerned, the author has vividly given the main features of the Kolkata Municipal Corporation Act 1980 which includes the administrative set ups, various functions performed, specific committees, financial considerations etc. He has also given the description of various taxes and mode of financing of the schemes which is the backbone of any developmental activity.

As far as urban politics in West Bengal is concerned, Chatterjee[20] mentioned that development and provision of services in urban areas are clearly not issues on which the left front government in West Bengal can afford to congratulate itself. In urban constituencies CPI (M)'s campaign is the most vulnerable because there, unlike in rural Panchayats, it has not managed to successfully open up a new institutional space for daily transaction of public demand.

Sivaramakrishnan[21] gave a detailed account of urban local bodies and the process of decentralization. According to him, West Bengal showed a brilliant path of democratic decentralization. Women reservation of seats was there before the constitutional amendment. So also they have made state election commission responsible for conducting such local level elections. The question of planning and

[18] Encyclopedia Britannica; London; Vol.14; pp.261-262.
[19] Sachdeva (1993); op.cit.
[20] Chatterjee, P.; "The Present History of West Bengal-Essays in Political Criticism"; Oxford University Press; New Delhi; Year 1997.
[21] Sivaramakrishnan, K.C. op.cit.

decentralization has been taken care well by the West Bengal Government. Sivaramakrishnan states that, West Bengal has made considerable progress towards meaningful decentralization. District Planning Committees there address the question of urban development via urban development sub committees. Though left front is strong in West Bengal; but still 30% local bodies are controlled by opposition and CPM always has a hard time in dealing with Kolkata. He also appreciates the unique Mayor in Council form of urban governance which was adopted well before 74th constitutional amendment in Kolkata which is similar to the parliamentary form of government.

Balachandran[22] has discussed the nature of decentralization in West Bengal. He thinks that after 1977 i.e. in the period of Left Front the civic administration improved to a certain extent. He gives a history of urban decentralization in West Bengal from pre independence to post 74th constitutional amendment era. He also discusses the parameters which lead to the success of such decentralization in West Bengal. He indicates that in 2001 there were six municipal corporations, one hundred and fifteen municipalities and three notified areas. Corporations were governed by a separate Municipal Corporation Act while municipalities through the West Bengal Municipal Act 1993.

Bhattacharya[23] has given an account of the grass root level democracy which operates in West Bengal. He has discussed the various definitional concepts of good governance. Accordingly he states "West Bengal since 1978 represents a successful case of regeneration of democracy and rebuilding of institutions". Kohli[24] also states that "In spite of its many problems, West Bengal under the CPI-M is probably

[22] Balachandran 92001); "Urban Decentralisation: Case Study, West Bengal: Spatio Economic Development Record; pp.18-24: Vol.8; No.5.
[23] Bhattacharya op.cit.
[24] Kohli, A. (1997); "From Breakdown to Order: West Bengal" in Chatterjee, P.Col; "State and Politics in India."

India's best governed state". Bhattacharya[25] also holds that West Bengal globally is known for its grass root level democracy more than that of Marxist regime. He gave the history of self- governance in the state. As case studies, he has given the picture of urban governance in West Bengal by citing the vivid scenario of Bardhaman and Uttarpara municipalities.

As far as functional and financial domains are concerned, Sivaramakrishnan[26] indicates that West Bengal Municipal Act 1993 contains elaborate listing of obligatory functions like public works; health and sanitation; administration and town planning. They have some discretionary functions as well like that of education, public distribution etc.This act covers all the items listed in 12th schedule of constitution and have also added some. The author also mentioned that West Bengal has allocated 40% to 50% of state plan to urban and rural local bodies through State Finance Commission.

Finance and revenue situations are the most important issue as far as municipal development is concerned. Maitra[27] states that municipal revenues form a very insignificant proportion of total government budget. Thus their resource base is very small. Therefore the expenditure budget is determined not by actual requirement but by the flow of revenue realized during the year. It resulted in low revenue generation, which eventually is the reason for widening the gap between supply and demand of civic services. She also mentioned that Bengal Municipal Act (1932) was amended in 1980 in order to strengthen the administrative and financial base of the local bodies.

[25] Bhattacharya. (2002) op.cit.

[26] Sivaramakrishnan, K.C. op cit.

[27] Maitra, A. (2001); "Financing Urban Development: Flow and Fund from External Sources"; Economic and Political Weekly; December 15; pp. 4647-4655; vol.36; No. 50.

Twelfth Finance Commission[28] vividly discussed the urban local bodies. According to the views of Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation urban local bodies should be assigned a separate list of taxes and any exemption from levy of property tax should be avoided. So also unproductive taxes should be abolished and new sources of revenue should be sought after such as municipal bonds etc. Cost of public utility services also should be charged. All transfer of grants and taxes between various tiers of government should be formula based. The criteria which was used for allocation of inter state grants was 40% for population, 10% for area, 20% for the distance from the highest per capita income; 20% for revenue effort and remaining 10% for index of deprivation. The commission also recommended that the states should avoid delays in the constitution of State Finance Commissions and its report should be readily available to the Central Finance Commission; State Finance Commissions must have eminent persons and they should follow normative approach as far as finance is concerned.

Annual Report of Urban Development Ministry 2003-04[29] mentioned the scheme of Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns. The salient features of the revised 1995 scheme would be implemented only in towns with elected local bodies having population of 5 lakh. Revision of finance pattern was also suggested.

---

[28] Report of the Twelfth Finance Commission.
[29] Annual Report2003-04; Ministry of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation; Government of India.

PROBLEMATISATION AND HYPOTHESIS

Existing literature leads to two hypotheses.

- Towns near Kolkata are better developed in terms of infrastructure than those away from it.
- Similarly, larger towns are more developed than the smaller ones with respect to infrastructure.

In the present study an attempt has been made to prepare a ranking system to show the position of each statutory town taking all the available indicators of infrastructure development showing the degree of liveableness in each of these towns. The problem of providing urban basic amenities and solving urban social problems can only be done through the joint participation of state government and the local units. The performance of these towns also reflects the state government's attitude towards these urban units.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- What are the levels of infrastructure development in the towns of West Bengal?
- Do the local bodies in Kolkata Metropolitan Area perform better than other urban units outside it?
- Is there any kind of relationship between the population size of a town and its performance?
- Which districts of the state have better urban infrastructure development compared to others?

DATABASE

Data for all these indicators which are taken into consideration are secondary in nature. This entire collection of data has been taken from census of India's West Bengal units. Specific tables of West Bengal which have been used are:

- Town directory
- District census hand book
- Tables on house and house hold amenities
- Final population table.

All the data have been taken for both 1981 as well as 1991.

METHODOLOGY

The work has been done by using fifteen different indicators. These indicators vary much as far as their scales are concerned. Moreover, weightages must be given to them according to some established norm. Therefore, to prepare one composite index the following steps have been taken.

i) First the negative indicators have been made positive. There is one such indicator which move to the opposite direction with respect to others. That is:

- Number of person residing in each residential house.

In this case, indicator move in the negative direction i.e., lower the number of person living, better is the developmental scenario. To make it positive,the indicator was subtracted from a constant which was pre determined.In case of person living in house, the value was subtracted from 10 people. Thus they it became positive in nature. The constant was chosen with reference to the highest

value of the series.Maximum number of people resided in a house was well below 10.

ii) In the next step the series were made scale free. This was done by dividing each of the columns by their mean. In this way scale free data matrix was obtained.

iii) Third step is to give the indicators weightages according to some principal. Weightages can be given by various ways like equal weightages to all indicators; weightages by virtue of subjective judgment of the researcher or by any mathematical method. In this case the method which was followed is modified principal component analysis. The method is as follows:

After preparation of scale free data matrix; the matrix was transposed and the transposed matrix was multiplied with the scale free data matrix. There after the resultant matrix was divided by the number of observations which in this case was 101. This gave a projection matrix.

Projection matrix A = $\dfrac{X'X}{n}$ where

X Is the scale free matrix and 'n' = number of observation. This resulted in to a square matrix.

Eigene values of this projection matrix have been calculated. Eigene vector associated with the largest Eigene value of this projection matrix is the weight.

Now the values of this Eigene vector (weight) has been multiplied column wise to the scale free data matrix and then they have been added up to get the composite index. The Eigene vector has the same number of values as that of the number of indicators. Each value was multiplied with their corresponding indicator column wise and finally each row was added up to get the final score.

XW = Y where

X= scale free data matrix

W = Eigene vector associated with the largest Eigene value of projection matrix

Y = Composite index.

This method is known as modified principal component analysis.

The main difference between modified and normal principal component are as follows:

- Normal P.C.A. uses correlation matrix where some times negative sign comes up which destroys the whole scenario. In modified P.C.A. since projection matrix has been used, the problem of negative signs was eliminated.

- In projection matrix the coefficient of variation is maintained in the main diagonal but the information regarding variance is destroyed in correlation matrix.

- In modified P.C.A. indicators having higher disparity have been given higher weightages which is not done in normal P.C.A.

- Explanatory power of modified P.C.A. is more than that of normal P.C.A.

Over all, the principal component analysis is a mathematical method of giving weightages and it also maximises the sum of squared correlation.

iv) To see the nature of relationship among the indicators, correlation matrix was prepared which shows the relative influence of the indicators and also the nature in which the indicators were behaving among them selves.

v) For studying the nature of relationship between the size class of the town and their development status, Spearman's rank correlation method has been applied where index of rank correlation is

$$p = 1 - (6\sum di^2/n^3-n)$$

Where 'n' is the total number of observation 'di' is the difference in the ranks of the two variables (in this case rank according to population and rank according to developmental status) in the 'i'th observation.

vi) Simple percentage method has been applied to compare the developmental status among the towns of Kolkata municipal development area and the towns outside that premises.

CHAPTERISATION:

There are six chapters is this dissertation. The first chapter is introduction, which includes the review of literature, objectives, data base and methodology .In the second chapter there is a discussion on choice of indicators as well as the study area. In the third chapter the ranking of towns is done. Correlation between the populations of the towns versus the rank of the towns has been shown in the fourth chapter. Fifth chapter will give a comparison between the towns of Kolkata Metropolitan Area with towns outside the region. Final chapter will be the concluding chapter which will sum up the results and give some general overview of the whole situation prevailing in urban scenario of West Bengal.

CHAPTER: 2

CHOICE OF INDICATORS AND STUDY AREA.

INDICATORS

To determine the level of development of the towns 15 indicators have been selected cutting across various parameters. These include social, economic as well as demographic indicators. They are:

1. ROAD LENGTH PER SQUARE KILOMETER :

This indicator shows the level of infrastructural development. It includes all kinds of roads, kutcha or pukka.In modern cities, connectivity are essential and only proper roads can ensure such connection. Thus it is an important indicator of development. Making roads are a work to be done both by the government (state and central) as well as local authorities. Thus it is also an indicator of the efficiency of the local bodies. National highways are a responsibility which central government looks after; state highways are created and maintained by the state government while all the remaining kutcha and pukka roads are taken care off by the local bodies.

2. ROAD LIGHTING POINTS PER KILOMETER OF ROADS:

Road lighting is also a work primarily to be done by the local urban bodies. This infrastructure is also essential from the developmental perspective and symbolizes the performance of the municipal bodies.

3. HOSPITAL BEDS PER 5000 POPULATION:

This is an important indicator of social infrastructure. In case of emergency patients have to be transferred to nearby hospitals as early as possible; thus more the number of hospital beds available in a town, more it's level of development improves. This facility is given by the state government and thus local bodies have no role to play. Here the indicator taken signifies the proportion of hospital beds to population living in that city.

4. TOTAL NUMBER OF MEDICAL INFRASTRUCTURAL FACILITY PER 5000 POPULATION:

This category consists of hospitals, health centres, clinics, dispensaries etc. All these amenities are essential for a city and without these services; developed modern cities can not be imagined. Health is a joint subject of state as well as local bodies. State creates larger hospitals, but smaller health centres are often created or maintained by the municipalities. It is the lifeline of the city and one of the most important social indicators.

5. TOTAL NUMBER OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE PER 5000 POPULATION:

Education like health is another important indicator of social and human development. This is another subject, jointly taken care of by the state government as well as the local bodies. Here as a part of educational institute, all kinds of schools,

Colleges, politechniques, universities, engineering and medical colleges have been taken into account. Adult literacy centres have not been taken into account because in most of the towns in consideration, adult literacy centres are absent. This aspect is more needed in rural areas and

not much in urban areas. All kinds of educational institutes have been clubbed because the variation is mainly due to schools, and higher educational institutes are more or less even in numbers in most of the cities. Therefore it is of not much use to consider them as a separate category. More over since the higher educational institute are restricted and very few in number thus a small variation of one higher study centre can make a lot of difference in two similar sized towns. Finally, if we consider primary schools separately, then generally speaking, it will cater the need of a particular age group of population and not the whole set of it. Since data on particular percentage of school going population table is not available, therefore as an indicator pertaining to the whole population, it is better to consider the total number of all educational institutes.

6. TOTAL NUMBER OF CULTURAL AND RECREATIONAL INSTITUTES PER 5000 POPULATION:

This is an indicator which has essentially an urban characteristic. It include libraries, reading rooms, stadiums, auditorium , cinema halls etc.These facilities though are not essential in nature but, urban units in modern times should have these aspects as a part and parcel of their political sphere. Thus these things have become essential facilities of a city.

7. DECADAL VARIATION OF POPULATION:

This indicator has been taken because it shows the economic viability of a city. If a city has much larger growth rate than other, then it symbolizes that the city must have some character of being a growth centre which attracts people from all over its surrounding regions. Often it has been seen that new industrial area, growth pole or notified areas show larger growth rate; it is just because of their centripetal force of

population attraction. Thus the indicator reflects the change in population with reference to the previous decade. It is a very strong positive indicator of development and depends on varied reasons of social, economic and political characteristics. Therefore population growth rate symbolises a dummy variable for infrastructure development because generally speaking; people agglomerates in those regions which have better infrastructure and economic development.

8. PERCENTAGE OF LITERATES TO TOTAL POPULATION:

Literacy is an indicator of human development. Many social problems can be solved through widespread literacy development drive. In urban areas of India, literacy rate generally are higher than that of rural areas in their surrounding regions, but still considerable variation among the urban units are often noticed.Theoriticaly speaking literacy should not be an indicator of development in a very developed society where almost everyone is literate; but a country like India where a bulk of the population are illiterate, indeed it is a very important developmental indicator, both in rural as well as in urban areas. Here the indicator which has been used is not literacy rate because there was a definitional change between 1981 and 1991 as far as literacy rate is concerned. In 1981 whole population was taken into consideration for calculating the literacy rate while in 1991 age group of 0 to 6 was omitted from the consideration. Thus to avoid such definitional problem, here in both the cases whole bulk of population has been taken into consideration and therefore instead of naming literacy rate; percentage literates to total population term has been used. Spreading of literacy is a joint venture of all the tiers of political hierarchy from central government to local level authorities. Higher literacy rate signifies high level of social infrastructure development. Thus this indicator also to some extent indicates the performance of the urban local bodies.

9. PERCENTAGE OF MAIN WORKERS TO TOTAL POPULATION:

This indicator shows the economic competitiveness of a city. It symbolizes the availability of jobs and employment situation of the region. The value of this indicator is quite low throughout because it consist of total population figures which includes women, aged and children as well, most of whom do not work... This does not affect the overall scenario to a greater extent because the whole series consist of all such groups. Since age wise figure of working population in each city can not be found due to non availability of data, therefore, this limitation can not be rubbed out.

10. PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS HAVING TOILET FACILITY:

This is an indicator which projects the availability of an essential element of city life, i.e. toilet facility. This facility is again though provided by the higher governmental agencies, but local authority facilitates the process of delivering the amenity. This infrastructure is also important because indirectly it affects the health situation of a city and controls the prevalence of diseases in an urban area.

11. PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLD HAVING ELECTRICITY FACILITY:

This is again another important household amenity essential in urban areas. Local urban authority does not have any hand in providing this service to the people because it is a job of central and state government as well as state electricity boards and other private electric supply agencies like Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation. Without energy, development has no meaning; therefore electricity is essential for developmental perspective.

12. PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS HAVING SAFE DRINKING WATER FACILITY:

Like the previous two indicators of toilet facility and availability of electricity; this indicator also gives the household level picture. Here safe drinking water includes water taken from taps and hand pumps / tube wells only. Both within and outside premises have been taken into consideration as far as availability is concerned, because census did not gave the data regarding the distance up to which people travel to fetch water. Therefore the assumption which is taken here in case of outside premises is that those sources which are outside the house are also reachable quite easily and thus that water also can be considered as available safe drinking water. Water which is taken out of the well has not been considered as safe because often wells are not protected and they don't have shades on their top, not cleared regularly and people spoil the water. So also other sources like river, canal and pond water etc. are also not safe because they can very easily be polluted by various agents and thus disease can be spread rapidly from these sources.

13. PERCENTAGE OF WORKERS ENGAGED IN NON AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY TO TOTAL MAIN WORKERS:

Here non agricultural workers mean any worker except cultivators and agricultural labourers. Female workers were considered while calculating percentage of main workers to the total population. Here also females have been taken into accounts by sticking to the premises that females also should work, since in all the towns female workers have been considered thus the data would not show abnormal change because

24

every where female non agricultural workers are miniscule, similarly since age was not considered while calculating percentage of main workers, thus here also age has not been taken into account.

14.   NUMBER OF PEOPLE LIVING PER RESIDENTIAL HOUSES:

This is again a negative indicator because more the number of people living in the same house; less be the developmental status of the town. Therefore to make the indicator positive, the values have been subtracted from 10, which is a constant.

15.   NUMBER OF BANKS PER 5000 POPULATION:

Financial transaction is essential in modern day's urban area. Without proper monitory exchange, cities lifeline get stumbled. There fore banks are essential in modern day's urban area. Agricultural and non agricultural credit societies have not been taken because these sorts of activities are not that important in urban areas and are more tangible in rural areas. In urban region they are not that much important as that of the banks.

STUDY AREA

In the present thesis we have taken into consideration only statutory towns. It means that all these cities have some form of local self- governance. Statutory towns include Municipal Corporation, Municipalities. Town Committees, Cantonment Boards and Notified Area Authority in West Bengal. In 1981, there were 102 statutory towns in West Bengal, out of which 90 were Municipalities, 3 were Municipal Corporations (Kolkata, Howrah and Chandannagar); 4 Notified Areas (Durgapur, Sainthia, Kalyani and Gayeshpur), 4 Town Committee (Mathabhanga, Mekliganj, Haldibari and Tufanganj) and 1 Cantonment Board (Barrackpur Cantonment). The distinction between a municipality

and municipal corporation in West Bengal was rather vague. Though it was known that larger municipalities were designated as municipal corporations; but in reality; often this convention was not followed. Dabgram in Jalpaiguri district got class I status, but still it is not even a municipality till date.[30] Chandannagar was a municipal corporation, but Bhatpara, South Dum Dum, Bardhaman, Kharagpur and many other urban units larger than it were treated as municipalities. Town committees were meant for still smaller towns, which were governed by separate act where district controller was given much power. In 1991 this category of local bodies was ceased to exist from West Bengal. On the other hand notified areas were created for newly developing towns. The formation of this committee was notified by state government gazette. Cantonment Board was unique in the sense that it was directly administered by ministry of defence in the central government. Therefore except for the cantonment board; all other local bodies were created by state government and their status accordingly was also given by the same. In 1991 all town committee became municipalities, Sainthia also become a municipality and many new municipalities and notified areas emerged directly from the Panchayat status.

As has been mentioned, the observations have been taken for 101 towns in West Bengal. In 1981, there were 103 statutory towns in West Bengal of them 3 towns i.e., Gardenreach, Jadavpur and South Suburban had been incorporated into Kolkata in 1991. Thus their isolated existed before, ceased to continue later on. Since they don't have any data in 1991 separately; thus these town have been clubbed with the figures of Kolkata in 1981 and has not been shown separately. In 1991, the data of Kolkata also includes the figures of these units.

---

[30] Roy, P.N.; (1997) "Urban Planning in West Bengal: Suggested Approach and Strategies"; Spatio Economic Development Record: Vol.4: No.5: pp.5-12.

One cantonment town i.e., Barrackpur Cantonment was also a statutory town; but since data for the unit was not available in 1981, thus Barrackpur cantonment has to be dropped out from the total coverage of all urban areas.

There were some new addition at 1991 in the list of statutory towns and many towns' municipal status also changed. Since 1981 has been taken as the base year; therefore the towns which were not statutory one in 1981; have not been considered for any analysis. To make the number of municipalities same in both 1981 as well as in 1991, new entrants in the list of statutory towns in 1991 has been excluded from the study.

In 1981 these towns constituted around 80% of total urban population of West Bengal. In 1991 it had slightly gone down to about 75% of total urban population in West Bengal. Actually the share of statutory town's in urban population of the state have been increased in 1991 due to inclusion of several new towns into the fold of statutory one, but since these new towns have not been considered in this study, therefore the percentage has been reduced to some extent. Moreover the amount of urban population in the same time period also has increased in the state due to inclusion of several rural units into urban field, thus these towns are showing reduced percentage of population in 1991 as compared to 1981 with respect to total urban population of the state.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND INFRASTRUCTURE

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TOWNS:

COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

The main purpose of this dissertation is to generate a ranking system among the towns, which would reflect the performance with respect to socio economic and infrastructure development of these urban local bodies. Here he discussion o the towns have been done first district wise and then each individual town's performance have been elaborated.

. DISTRICT WISE PERORMANCE IN 1981:

In this analysis, the maximum numbers of municipal bodies are in North Twenty Four Pargana (24), followed by Hugli (12) and Medinipur (9), Nadia had 8, while Murshidabad and Koch Bihar had six each. They were followed by Bardhaman and Birbhum (5 each), Darjeeling and South Twenty Four Pargana (4 each), Puruliya and Bankura (3 each) & Malda, West Dinajpur, Haora and Jalpaiguri (2 each). Only the Kolkata district consists of a single urban local body i.e. The Kolkata Corporation

Koch Bihar District: This district's urban units performed better in 1981. All the six municipalities of this district stood in the first twenty

positions in the ranking. Haldibari got the first position while Tufanganj, Dinhata, Mekliganj, Koch Bihar and Mathabhanga got seventh, eighth, nineth, fifteenth and seventeenth positions respectively. Another interesting thing was that except Dinhata and Koch Bihar, all other urban units of the district were basically Town Committees in administrative status. The performance of these four small town committees is also a fact, which is astonishing. Koch Bihar and Dinhata had municipalities and only Koch Bihar was a class II town. The result shows the great achievement of the small towns. Both Dinhata and Mathabhanga was class IV town, Haldibari; a class V town and Mekliganj as well as Tufanganj were class VI town (only class VI local bodies of West Bengal). This is really a contrary result of the general belief that large town are more developed than the smaller ones.

Jalpaiguri District: Only two municipalities were there. The capital Jalpaiguri held the sixteenth rank while Alipur Duar was far behind in forty- fifth ranks.

Darjeeling District: Four municipalities were there. This district also performed brilliantly. Three municipalities were at top 20 positions, naming Kurseong (2nd), Darjeeling (5th) and Kalimpong (11th). All three towns are Gorkha infested and the only municipalities, which are located in Himalayan terrain. Moreover they were controlled by GNLF (Gorkha National Liberation Front), were facing constant political turmoil. Still they were able to perform well as far as their development scenario is concerned. On the other hand Siliguri, which was the largest town of North Bengal; predominantly a Bengali refugee infested region and a citadel of the ruling party, performed worse compared to the other towns in the district; clinching 38th rank. This result also confirmed that smaller town of Himalaya was doing well than the big towns situated in the Terai.

West Dinajpur District: Undivided West Dinajpur district had two municipalities. Here also the larger Balurghat with seventy ranks performed worse than the smaller Raiganj town that got fifty- second ranks. Overall performance of this district was worse, because none of its municipalities could achieve a place among the first 50 towns.

Malda District: Here also two municipalities were present. The capital English Bazar municipality achieved 6th rank where the small Old Malda municipality got 46th rank. Here the disparities between the two adjacent municipalities are really striking which truly reflects the inequality between the large and small towns.

Murshidabad District: Here seven municipalities were present. The largest and the capital town Baharampur performed well by getting the nineteenth rank. Nearby towns Beldanga also performed quite well by getting thirty- third position. The district as a whole was one of the worst performers, because all other five municipalities, got rank below forty- five. Two of its towns, Jiaganj – Azimganj and Dhulian gave a shocking performance by achieving eighty- seventh and ninety- seventh ranks respectively. Jangipur, Murshidabad and Kandi, three sub divisional headquarter towns performed in between. This district showed a pathetic picture of inequality, where the large capital is moving ahead, leaving other towns far below. Ironically, this was the only district of West Bengal, where Muslims were in majority.

Birbhum District: Altogether five urban local bodies were present here. Astonishingly, Sainthia, which was a notified area, was the best performer with twelfth rank. The capital Suri also did well by getting the eighteenth rank. Rampurhat wasn't far behind, which took twenty - seventh rank. On the other hand the same district had two poor performers also. Rabindranath Tagores Bolpur got seventy- eighth position while Dubrajpur was one of the worst performers and had

ninety– sixth rank. The towns which are situated at the central or northern part of the district, performed better than that of the two towns of southern region.

Bardhaman District: The district had seven urban local bodies. Among them three, i.e., Durgapur, Raniganj and Assansol were in the western industrial region's belt; while the remaining four were in eastern agriculture dominating belt. Though the district is considered to be a very prosperous one; but its urban local bodies performed miserably compared to the other towns of West Bengal. Only Kalna town, which got twenty-first position, performed well. The capital Bardhaman itself performed average by clinching forty-second rank. All the three town of the Assansol industrial belt also showed very average result, which is reflected on their rankings. Raniganj, Durgapur and Assansol town got forty-fourth, fiftieth and sixty-fifth ranks respectively. Towns as big as Bardhaman, Durgapur and Assansol performing so dull; itself is a note worthy phenomena indeed. Still the worst performer was Katwa, which got seventy-sixth rank and is neighbouring Dainhat fell back at very dismal ninety-eighth rank.

·Bankura District: The district has three municipalities. There three are situated for apart from each other. Capital Bankura is in thirtieth position, Sonamukhi on sixty-seventh while Bishnupur far below at ninety-first position. Therefore this district's urban scenario was also · very dismal.

Purulia District: It also has three towns and like Bankura, this district also puts three towns in three different groups as far as development is concerned; thus indicating a huge amount of disparity among them. Jhalda town did extremely well and achieved the fourth rank; while capital Purulia was far below at fifty third position. The third

town i.e., Raghunathpur still much below at ninety-fourth place confirmed this situation of high-level intra urban disparity.

Medinipur District: Undivided Medinipur, which was the largest district of West Bengal; performed the worst among all. None of its municipalities could manage to capture a single position in top twenty while six of them slipped below in the bottom twenty one municipalities. The municipalities of this district also captured the last three positions. The best performer was Tamluk (capital of modern East Medinipur) with twenty-eighth rank. Medinipur town the capital of the erstwhile-undivided district got thirty-sixth rank. The third town, which was able to get some development, was Contai town with fifty-fourth rank. All other towns failed miserably in developmental activities. It is astonishing that a town like Kharagpur was down below at eightieth position. All the five municipalities of Ghatal subdivision were even worse performers and portrayed a disastrous picture for the entire district. Apart from the last three, both Chandrakona and Ghatal also could not develop much of infrastructure.

Hugli District: The district consists of twelve urban local bodies; out of which ten were in Kolkata metropolitan area. Only Arambagh and Tarakeshwar were out of it. The best performer of the district was Konnagar with thirteenth position. In general towns of this district performed quite well than some other district's towns. Only Bansberia, which got eighty-fourth place, was a poor performer. Bhadreshwar (68th) and Champdani (73rd) also were less developed. Four largest towns of the district did quite well which include capital Hugli-Chinsurah (24th), Uttarpra Kotrung (26th); Chandannagar, the only municipal corporation of the district (31st); and Serampur (39th). Along with the two towns outside the Kolkata metropolitan area; Rishra and Baidyabati also performed in average position.

Nadia District: This district has eight urban local bodies; out of which two areas Notified area (Kalyani and Gayeshpur), who are also a part of Kolkata Metropolitan Area. Kalyani did an exceptionally good performance by getting the third rank. Ranaghat (32nd), and capital Krishnanagar (37th) were way behind. Other five towns performed miserably. Santipur was the worst performer with ninety-second position. Four other town i.e., Nabadwip (61st), Birnagar (69th), Gayeshpur (83rd) and Chakdah (89) also showed large amount of disparity. Thus overall the district projected an enormous inequality among its urban units.

Kolkata and Howrah Districts: Both the towns of Howrah district fall in the Kolkata metropolitan area. Howrah, the second largest city of West Bengal showed an average development record, which can be identified from its fortieth rank. Bally municipality performed even worse with seventy-first rank.

Kolkata the only million plus city of the state showed a much better result by getting the tenth rank.

South Twenty Four Pargana District: Four municipalities were there and except Jaynagar – Mazilpur; all others were included in Kolkata Metropolitan area. In general the district was among the best-performed regions of the state. It is interesting to note that the solitary municipality which is outside the Kolkata Metropolitan area i.e., Jaynagar- Mazilpur, performed the best by achieving fourteenth rank. Baruipur also did well by getting twenty fifth rank. Rajpur (43) and Budge Budge (55) also performed in average fashion. Therefore not a single municipality in the district performed in a much disastrous way.

North Twenty Four Pargana District: The district has largest number of municipalities, totalling twenty-four in count i.e., almost one

fourth of the total urban local bodies in West Bengal. Out of them, seventeen were in Kolkata metropolitan area. The remaining seven municipalities were Bangaon, Basirhat, Baduria, Taki, Gobardanga, Ashoknagar and Habra. In sharp contrast with South Twenty Four Pargana; majority of the municipalities in North Twenty Four Pargana were less developed. Only the district head quarter Barasat (20) could feature itself in the top twenty positions. Worst performer was Baduria (95). All the seven municipalities, which were outside the Kolkata metropolitan area, performed poorly, and none of them could manage a position among the first fifty municipalities. In fact only one third (eight in count) municipalities of the district could find out a place among the top fifty municipalities of the state, which includes Barrackpur (22) Panihati (23), Dum Dum (29), New Barrackpur (34), Baranagar (35), Khardaha (41) and Kamarhati (49) apart from Barasat.

DISTRICT WISE PEROMANCE IN 1991:

Koch Bihar district: Like 1981; in 1991 also this was the best-performed district. First, third, fourth and sixth rank were obtained by Tufanganj, Mathabhanaga, Haldibari and Dinhata towns. Though performance of Mekhligang (22nd) and capital Koch Bihar (30th) slipped a few steps; but still in comparison to other district; the performance of the towns in this district was quite commendable. Here again the smaller towns did well than that of the larger over.

Jalpaiguri District: In this district Jalpaiguri town performed well by getting eighteenth rank while Alipur Duar also bettered its position by registering thirty-seventh rank.

Darjeeling district: The result of this district was almost a repeat of the previous decade. Again the three hill municipalities did extremely well and Kurseong maintained its second rank, which is highly appreciable. Kalimpong also performed well and got eighth rank, while Darjeeling slipped a few steps by getting nineteenth rank. Siliguri also remained the same by virtue of its thirty-sixth position. The disturbance caused by the Gorkhland agitation movement did not hamper the development of these towns while Siliguri, being the most important city of North Bengal, still could not progress either. Overall situation of the district like Koch Bihar and Jalpaiguri was quite good as compared to the few other districts.

West Dinajpur: Two municipalities of this district again showed very average result, but still better than 1981. Raiganj climbed up to thirty-fifth rank while Balurghat shot up to sixty-first position.

Malda: This district also showed an average result. Old Malda through improved slightly to get forty-first rank; but the district lead quarter English Bazar suffered a heavy loss and slipped back to twenty-sixth position.

Murshidabad District: in this district, the result was quite mixed. District head quarter Baharampur though came down few steps and got twenty ninth rank; but on the other hand towns like Murshidabad (33rd) and Kandi (39th) improved in huge spectrum. The most dismal situation was in Dhulian, which filled up the last position in the series. Jangipur's position also came down to sixty fifth place. All the three towns of Jangipur subdivision were the worst performers. In this district the northern municipalities were worse performers, but the southern municipalities did quite well.

Nadia District: Nadia showed a great inequality as far as urban development is concerned. Gayeshpur ranked eleventh and made a huge improvement while Kalyani shipped back to sixteenth spot Both of these towns are a part of Kolkata Metropolitan Area, and have performed better than the other towns of the district. On the other hand Santipur (100th), Nabadwip (89th) and Chakdaha (85th) got place only in last twenty towns thus justifying this huge inequality. Ranaghat featured in fortieth position, and capital Krishnanagar at forty-fourth place small town Birnagar finds itself at fifty-fourth position, performed quit average in this scale.

Birbhum district: This district performance did improve slightly as Santhia featured in tenth position and Rampurhat improved its situation to come up to the fourteenth rank. District head quarter Suri also was not far back and settled at twenty first position. The two southern municipalities continued to perform dull which is reflected by Dubrajpur's dismal position of ninety-eighth; and Bolpur recovered quite well by coming up to fifty fifth rank.

Bardhaman District: The districts performance did not changed much. Kalna municipality did great job and jot the nineth place while its nearby town Katwa (82) and Dainhat (99th) showed the worst result. The four major tows delivered very much average quality of facilities, which is reflected by Raniganj's forty-second, Bardhaman's forty-sixth, Assansol's fifty-sixth and Durgapur's sixty-second position. Though these towns are quite large and important; but as far as development is concerned, they could not do well in this decade also.

Bankura district: This district head quarter Bankura showed a tremendous performance by running up to fifth position. The large amount of inequality still persists, which is reflected by Sonamukhi's sixtieth positon and Bishnupur's worse ninety- first rank.

Puruliya Distinct: Again in this district also, the situation did not change much in over all perspective. some improved and other retarded Jhalda town could not deliver its previous spectacular result and thus came down to twenty-fifth rank while capital Puruliya showed slight improvement and stool at forty-fifth position. Despite showing little improvement, Raghunathpur town also featured back at eighty-seventh rank.

Medinipur District: Through improved a lot, but still this district was one of the worst performers in this decade also. Tamluk municipality the future capital of East Medinipur made long strides and forged ahead up to thirteenth place while Contai town also made huge improvement and got thirty-eighth position. On the other hand the district head quarter Medinipur municipality came down to forty-eighth rank. Railway town Kharagpur further retarded to ninety-fourth rank, which is a dismal performance, but this time the town of Ghatal subdivision made huge improvements. Though Ramjibanpur was at ninety-sixth rank, but it was a lot better than the 1981's last position. Two main town of this region i.e., Ghatal (77th) and Chandrakona (50th) showed huge improvement even two smaller towns Kharar (90th) and Khirpai (74th) though was bad performer as far as overall context is concerned; but their performance were lot better compared to the previous decade. One regional pattern was clear this time. Two municipalities of future east Medinipur district showed better developmental scenario then that of other West Medinipur town, who continued to remain less developed.

Hugli District: The performance of this district was even worse then the previous decade Uttarpara Kotrung was the best performer at twenty-fourth place; but both Konnagar and capital Hugli – Chinsura heavily lost the ground when they fall back to twenty-eighth and thirty-fourth position respectively. Seven out of twelve towns were below fifty

ranks where Bansberia again was the worst performer with ninety-second rank. Both the town situated out side Kolkata Metropolitan Area i.e., Tarakeshwar and Arambagh could not show which improvement and got fifty-third and seventieth position respectively. The only Municipal Corporation Chandannagar (49) and another large town i.e., Serampur (47) performed better compared to other four comparatively smaller town i.e., Champdani (63rd), Baidyabati (75), Bhadreshwar (68) and Rishra (73) in Kolkata Metropolitan area. Expect for the Champadani municipality, all other local bodies of the district worsen this position or remained almost the same as far as ranks are concerned, compared to their positions in the previous decade.

Kolkata and Howrah District: The situation of Kolkata deteriorated and it got the twentieth rank. Its counterpart Haora also did worse and further went down to fifty-ninth ranking. Even Bally municipality also came down at 79th position. All these symbolize that the heart of West Bengal actually was not performing well at all and their performance were constantly degrading.

South Twenty Four Pargana District: The district shows an unequal scenario with two municipalities performing better while other two worse. The only town outside Kolkata Metropolitan Area i.e., Jaynagar – Mazilpur consolidated its position and got twelfth rank while Baruipur (the new district head quarter) also featured itself in the top twenty position by clinching seventeenth rank. On the other hand both Rajpur (57th) and Budge Budge (76th) came down in the ranking, thus creating a scenario of infra district urban inequality.

North Twenty-Four Pargana: The district having largest number of municipalities. It is also one of the districts, where the performance of the urban local bodies dipped down compared to the 1981 census. Dum –Dum (7th), New Barrackpur (15th) and Khardaha (23rd) improved quite a

good deal. On the other hand, there were as many as eight towns, which were featured in the last twenty-one municipalities. All the seven municipalities, who were out side Kolkata metropolitan area, could not manage a single spot in the first 50 rankings. Baduria at ninety -seventh place was the worst performer while Basirhat (95), Bangaon (93), Habra (83), Taki (71), Ashoknagar (64) and Gobardanga (66) also could not do well in this category. Four towns of Kolkata Metropolitan area also performed poor, which were Bhatpara (81), North Dum-Dum (84), Kanchrapara (86) and Halishahar (88). Though Kolkata's immediate neighbour south Dum-Dum improved its tally by a huge margin (34th) but district head quarter Barasat suffered a huge set back for non-performance and went down at fifty-eight rank. Barrackpur municipality also performed worse (32nd) compared to the previous decade to a large extent. Other municipalities remained almost at the same position like 1981 figures with minor adjustments

Haldibari's amazing performance was because it was the best performer as far as educational, cultural & recreational facilities are concerned. It also did pretty well in hospital beds (12th), Medical facilities (9th), population growth (18th), percentage of main workers (22nd), percentage of household having electricity facility (15th), people living per house (25th) as well as in banking facility (30th). Only in case of drinking water, its performance was poor (100th rank).

Kurseong, which was in 2nd rank as far as overall positions are concerned, did very well in availability of hospital beds (2nd). It also did well in medical infrastructure (17th), cultural and recreational facility (8th), literacy rate (12th), household having electricity facility (2nd), percentage of workers engaged in non agricultural activity (14th), person living per house (19th) and banking facility (17th). Its performance was rather poor in road lighting (99th) and population growth (98th).

Third best performer was Kalyani. It was the best achiever in case of population growth and hospital beds. It did quite well in road length (20th), percentage of main workers (11th), household having safe drinking water (11th), and person living per house (8th). Its poor performance was in the fields of literacy rate (100th) and cultural and recreational facility (94th).

If we see the other aspects, then we can find out that Konnagar town in Hugli district was the best performer in case of road length, while in overall ranking, it got 15th position. Barrackpur in North Twenty Four Pargana done extremely well in road lightings, while on overall ranking, it

stood at 24th position. Sainthia, in Birbhum district was the best performer as far as medical infrastructure is concerned, while in overall performance, it was the 10th rank holder. New Barrackpur municipality, also in North Twenty Four Pargana district, performed best in the field of literacy, but due to poor performance in other fields, it stood at 35th rank. The nearly city of Titagarh, performed very well as far as percentage of main workers to total population is concerned; while in overall ranking, it was far behind at 82nd position. This town also was the best performer in the aspect of person living per house, this depict the sad picture of the very dismal performance of this place in the field of other indicators. Dum Dum in the same district, showed excellent performance in the field of household having toilet facility as well as percentage of population engaged in non-agricultural activity. In overall ranking, it registered 29th place. Old Malda municipality was the topper in electricity facility, while getting 48th position of overall scenario Khirpai, a small town in Medinipur, was among the worst performer in almost all the criteria, which is reflected from its rank of 97; but still with respect to household having safe drinking water facility, it was the best. Jhalda town in Puruliya had the maximum number of banks per five thousand population, and also it was a decent performer in most of the indicators which is reflected from it final rank of 4th.

Town wise worst performance in 1981:

Ramjibanpur's dismal performance was because; it performed worst as far as percentage of household having toilet facility is concerned. It also did worse in road length (97th), road lighting point (89th), cultural and recreational facility (79th), population growth (80th), literacy (98th), electricity (95th), percentage of household having safe drinking water facility (84th), percentage of non-agricultural workers (99th), and also number of person living per house (90th). Except in educational

infrastructure, where it registered 13th rank, this municipality did very ordinary performance as far as other indicators are concerned.

Kharar municipality got the last rank in providing road lighting points as well as in medical infrastructure. It is interesting to note that, this municipality was the second best performer in the field of safe drinking water provision; but did extremely poor in other spheres like hospital beds (100th), population growth (92nd), literacy (85th), households having toilet facility (99th), electricity (97th) and non agricultural workers (97th).

The third worse performer was Dainhat. It managed to achieve some results in the area of education infrastructure (12th), household having safe drinking water (5th) and number of person living per house (31st). On the other hand of the scale we can see its limitation in some indicators such as in case of road length (88th), road lighting points (84th), hospital beds (97th), cultural and recreational facility (90th), literacy (92nd), household having toilet facility (87th) as well as in case of person engaged in non agricultural activity (92nd).

If we consider each individual indicator, then Raghunathpur in Puruliya district was the worst performer as far as road lengths are concerned, it also was among the poor performers in overall ranking, and got 94th position.

Baranagar and Ashoknagar, both in North Twenty Four Pargana district, was the worst performer in educational infrastructure and cultural & recreational facility respectively; but of we see the overall performance, then Baranagar lies in 36th position while Ashoknagar was in 78th rank. It shows the better result in other indicators by the former than the later town, Sonamukhi in Bankura had the lowest growth rate of population, which pulled it down to 66th rank.

On the other hand Dhulian in Murshidabad had the lowest literacy rate, so also it was among some of the backward municipalities as far as development is concerned; which is being reflected by its 95th rank. Baharampur, the district headquarter of Murshidabad, was a decent performer and registered 22nd rank in overall picture, but in one indicator, i.e. percentage of main workers engaged in no agricultural activity, it was lagging behind among all others. Katwa in Bardhaman, was the least performer with respect to percentage of main workers and also in the indicator concerning with person living per house. Still it managed to get a decent place of 61st, which symbolizes its appreciable performance in other indicators. Baduria, the worst performer as far as household-having electricity is concerned, also did very ordinary in other aspects and thus had to contend with 96th position. Jhalda town in Puruliya district though did extremely well in most of the indicators, which is reflected by its 44th rank; but it is an amazing thing, that the municipality was the worst performer in the area of household having access to safe drinking water. Khirpai in Medinipur did not have any bank, thus it was the worst performer in that respect, but it clocked 48th rank, with respect to composite score, which suggests that this small municipality did really well in other aspects.

Town wise best performances in 1991:

Tufanganj's amazing performance was because it was the best performer in road length and population growth; it also performed well in educational infrastructure (9th), cultural & recreational facility (14th), literacy (20th), toilet facility (5th), electricity (13th) and banking (13th). Only in the aspect of safe drinking water, it could not do well (82nd).

Kurseong though was not topper in any of the aspects, but still its overall decent performance in most of the indicatory made it the second rank holder. It was 17th in road lighting, 19th in medical infrastructure

43

and educational infrastructure as well, 8th in cultural and recreational facility, 13th in population growth, 10th in literacy, 4th in electricity, 9th in non agricultural workers and 21st in banking. Only in workforce participation, its failure was remarkable (97th).

Mathabhanga's performance was even more remarkable because it gave attention in all the aspects, thus it do not have much higher value in any indicator, but interestingly, in none of the indicators, it performed too badly. It was 21st in road length, 11th in hospital beds, 22nd in educational infrastructure, 7th in cultural and recreational facility, 8th in population growth, 10th in persons living per house and 6th in banking infrastructure.

In the discussion of other best-performed towns with respect to various indicators, Bankura was a prominent name. It performed best in road lighting points and was 5th in overall position. Gayeshpur in Nadia was 12th ranker while performing best as far as hospital beds are concerned. Sainthia, in Birbhum, like the previous decade, again was the best performer in medical infrastructure and also got 10th rank in overall performance like the previous decade. Jhalda town in Purulia performed excellent in the field of educational infrastructure, but in composite score, in this decade, this town slipped way down to 21st rank. Like previous decade, again Haldibari of Koch Bihar was the best performer in cultural and recreational facility but in this decade, in overall position the town slipped to 4th rank. Panihati of North Twenty Four Pargana because the town having the highest percentage of literate population and got 27th rank in overall status while nearby Dum Dum municipality in the same district had the highest percentage of households with electricity facility and also did very well in other indicators by registering 8th position. Birnagar in Nadia was the best performer in the arena of safe drinking water, but it could not do well in other aspects and thus

got 53rd rank as far as composite score is concerned. Konnagar municipality in Hugli district made amazing performance in many aspects and was the best performer in toilet facility, per living per house as well as workers engaged in non agricultural activity but dismal performance in other activities made it to stay back at 28th rank with respect to others. Dinhata in Koch Bihar had the maximum number of banks with respect to population and in final rankings also it performed well by registering 7th position. It is interesting t note that the worst performer in the ranking i.e. Dhulian town of Murshidabad had the maximum workforce participation.

Town wise worst performances in 1991:

Dhulian was the most backward municipality. Except in main worker's workforce participation, this municipality failed in other aspects and especially it performed miserably in hospital beds (83rd), cultural and recreational facility (91st), percentage literates to total population (100th), toilet facility (98th) and number of person living per house (88th). It was the worst performer with respect to household having electricity facility.

Dainhat in Bardhaman district had the lowest road length. It also was a low performer with respect to road lighting points (88th), hospital beds (99th), literacy (93rd), electricity (96th), non-agricultural workers (92nd) and banking infrastructure (81st). Only in case of educational infrastructure (26th) and safe drinking water (11th), this small municipality had some success.

Santipur of Nadia was the worst performer in percentage literates to total population, percentage of main workers to total population as well as number of person living per house. It also could not do well as far as banking facility (89th) and medical facility (97th) as well. It only did some works as far as road lighting points (27th) are concerned.

Other worst performers include Katwa in Bardhaman district which was the worst performing municipality as far as road lighting points are concerned while getting 78th rank in overall scenario. Kharar town of Medinipur could not improve in health sector and was lagging at the bottom in both hospital beds and medical infrastructure but with respect to previous decade, this municipality improved a lot by registering overall 82nd position. Nearby town Khirpai had the minimum non-agricultural workers with respect to total workers; but in composite ranking it was able to get 68th position. Four municipalities in north twenty four Pargana, i.e. Garulia, north Dum Dum, south Dum Dum and Halishahar were the worst performers in educational infrastructure, cultural and recreational facility, population growth and banking infrastructure respectively and in final position they were able to catch 70th, 86th, 52nd and 91st positions respectively. Dubrajpur in Birbhum did worst in aspect of toilet facility, also was not a good performer in other aspects either which is reflected from its disastrous ranking of 9ninety eight.

Mekhliganj in Koch Bihar district though got an impressive rank of 22nd as far as overall situation in concerned, but with respect to household having access to safe drinking water, it was the worst performer.

STUDY OF THE VARIATION

In order to study the level of consistency on performance of the towns, coefficient of variation of the scale free data matrix had been

taken. More the variation, greater is the level of inconsistency. It means if the variation is more for a particular place, then it would suggest that the place performed very well in some indicator while could not do anything at all on others.

In 1981, there were three urban local bodies that had huge level of inconsistency. They were Barrackpur (North Twenty Four Pargana), Sainthia (Birbhum) and Kalyani (Nadia). In some indicator they were very well while on others they could do nothing. On the other hand in case of Puruliya, Raiganj (West Dinajpur) and Jiaganj-Azimganj the variation was little, therefore suggesting that in all the indicators they performed almost equally good or bad. This symbolises that a very high growth rate of population was the root cause of Kalyani's decent performance.5th ranker Darjeeling on the other hand got it's rank by doing well in almost all the indicators.

In 1991 Gayeshpur in Nadia had the highest variation which symbolised that the high change in rank by the town was mainly because of a singe indicator, which was nothing but increased hospital beds due to creation of a new hospital at that time. Tufanganj, which had a very low variation in the previous decade, suddenly showed a large level of inconsistency. Sainthia, like 1981, this time also had a very high value of coefficient of variation. Alipur Duar (Jalpaiguri), Jiaganj-Azimganj and Bolpur (Birbhum), had low level of variation in this year

CHANGES IN THE RANKS:

TABLE:

Changes in ranks in level of development of the urban local bodies in West Bengal (1981-1991)

Groups	Rank improved between 1-10 points within the group	Rank improved between 11-20 points within the group	Group changed due to rank improvement between 1-10 points	Group changed due to rank improvement between 11-20 points	Group changed due to rank improvement above 20 points	Rank unchanged
A	5	1	1	4	3	1
B	4	1	1	2	2	0
C	3	0	2	1	3	0
D	3	0	1	2	1	1
E	5	0	0	0	0	1

Groups	Rank deteriorated between 1-10 points within the group	Rank deteriorated between 11-20 points within the group	Group changed due to rank deterioration between 1-10 points	Group changed due to rank deterioration between 11-20 points	Group changed due to rank deterioration above 20 points	Total number of urban local bodies
A	3	2	0	0	0	20
B	3	0	1	5	1	20
C	3	2	3	2	1	20
D	3	1	2	5	1	20
E	7	1	4	2	1	21

The local bodies according to their ranks have been categorized into five different classes. These classes have been derived with reference to the performance of these towns in 1991.The changes in the ranks of the municipal bodies have been shown in each class of towns in 1991 with reference to their previous performance in 1981. They are as follows:

I) Class A towns: These towns are the top twenty towns.'

II) Class B towns: Consists of those towns are ranked between 21 to 40.

III) Class C towns: Lie between ranks 41 to 60.

VI) Class D towns: Lie between ranks 61 to 80

V) Class E towns: Are the worst performers, which are at the bottom twenty-one positions (81-101).

I) GROUP: A

In 1991, Tufanganj town in Koch Bihar became the the most developed in terms of infrastructure, climbing six places from its seventh rank of previous decade. While in 1981, it could only manage to do well in providing banking infrastructure,securing high level of literacy, medical infrastructure as well as cultural and recreational facilities, but its growth of population was very low and also it could not provide safe drinking water to a large number of households. On the other hand in 1991, though it failed in providing road lighting points, continued poor performance in providing safe drinking water, but it became the best performer in road infrastructure.It also registered the highest growth rate of population.It also performed well in the indicators related with cultural and recreational facilities, literacy, banking infrastructure and educational establishments.

In 1981, Haldibari town of Koch Bihar district had the first rank in terms of infrastructure and socio economic development. It performed first in providing educational as well as cultural and recreational facilities. It also did well as far as provision of hospital beds; medical infrastructure, population growth and electricity are concerned. Only in the indicators related with safe drinking water and non-agricultural workers, it could not show good results. In 1991, though it still was a town which performed well, but it lost three ranks and came down to the fourth position. It continued to be the first in providing cultural and

recreational facilities, so also it performed well in population growth, residential density, banking, road infrastructure as well as medical and educational infrastructure (2nd best). On the other hand its failure continued in providing safe drinking water as well as indicator concerne with percentage of workers engaged in non-agricultural activity.Its literacy rate too became a matter of concern.

There are twelve towns, which were in the category of best performeing towns in both 1981 as well as in 1991. Kurseong town proved to be a very consistent performer and claimed second rank in both the decades. In 1981, it was the second best performer as far as providing electricity is concerned and also in the case of hospital beds. It also did well in the indicators of medical infrastructure, cultural and recreational facilities, literacy, as well as in banking infrastructure. In 1991, it remained second best in indicators of hospital beds, while also performed well in cultural facility, population growth, literacy, electricity, non agricultural workers, road lighting points, medical and educational infrastructure related indicators.

·Other nine towns (barring Tufanganj,Haldibariand Kurseong), which were there in this group in both the decade are Kalyani (Nadia), Mathabhanga and Dinhata (Koch Bihar), Kalimpong and Darjeeling (Darjeeling), Jaynagar- Mazilpur(South Twenty Four Parganas), Jalpaiguri (Jalpaiguri), and Suri, as well as Sainthia (Birbhum). Kalyani was the third ranker in 1981, by virtue of its good performance as far as hospital beds are concerned. It also registered the highest growth rate of population. It performed quite well as far as road infrastructure, work participation rate; safe drinking water, banking infrastructure and residential density are concerned. In 1991, it slipped twelve positions and went to the sixteenth rank. Only in four indicators pertaining to growth rate, safe drinking water, residential density and hospital beds; it

performed well compared to previous decade, but its performance3 in other aspects was average.

On the other hand, Mathabhanga town had the third position in 1991, gaining fourteen ranks from previous decade. While in 1981, only in three indicators of banking, main workforce participation and medical infrastructure, it performed well; but in 1991, it performed quite well in the areas of road infrastructure, hospital beds, medical and educational infrastructure, cultural and recreational facility, population growth, banking infrastructure as well as in residential density.

Among the towns which were best performers in both the decades, only Darjeeling town went down fourteen steps to register nineteenth rank in 1991 as compared to fifth place which it had in the previous decade. In most of the indicators, its position went down drastically in 1991 with respect to the previous decade. Darjeeling's position particularly deteriorated in the aspects of workforce participation, safe drinking water provision as well as in recreational and cultural infrastructure development and also in number of persons living per residential house.

There were eight new towns, in 1991 in this list. Among them Gayeshpur improved its position to a great extent. It climbed up seventy-two ranks and got eleventh position in 1991. Its amazing result was because of its phenomenal development in road infrastructure, huge increase in hospital beds and major jump as far as percentage of household having electricity was concerned.

Bankura fifth Dum Dum seventh in terms of development also improved to a great extent in 1991 as compared to 1981 when they had the thirtieth and twenty ninth rank respectively. Improvement of Bankura was mainly due to its huge achievement in providing cultural

and recreational facilities as well as for the development in providing street lighting points In case of road lighting points, cultural and recreational facility, population growth, safe drinking water and residential density,both of the town's performance improved significantly. In both the decades, Dum Dum performed well as far as toilet facility, electricity services and road infrastructures was concerned. The basic difference between these two municipalities is that while Dum Dum did exceptionally well in some of these indicators while doing equally poor in others (Like street lighting points, medical infrastructure and population growth);Bankura was had average results in majority of these indicators.

Five towns, Kalna of Bardhaman district, Tamluk (Presently district head quarter of East Medinipur), Rampurhat of Birbhum, New Barrackpur and Baruipur in North Twenty Four Pargana district got entry in this category in 1991 by improving marginally from class B towns and obtained 9th, 13th, 14th, 15th and 17th ranks respectively. Among them only New Barrackpur town improved a lot by climbing nineteen places. Its success was because of improvement in roads and electricity development as well as providing cultural and recreational facilities.

II) GROUP: B

There are only seven towns in this category, which were also there in the same category in 1981. None of these urban bodies faced a major change as far as their rankings are concerned. Four of them are situated in Kolkata Metropolitan Area region which are Uttarpara-kotrung, Panihati, Barrackpur and Hugli-Chinsura (head quarter of Hugli district). Other three towns are Ranaghat (Nadia); Siliguri (largest town in North Bengal at Darjeeling district) and Beldanga (Murshidabad).

Among the remaining towns, seven were demoted from class A. The state capital Kolkata, Konnagar (Hugli), Mekliganj and Koch Bihar (Koch Bihar district) as well as Baharmpur (district head quarter of Murshidabad) had a marginal decline between ten to fifteen positions.

There are two municipalities which performed very well in 1981, but slid down drastically in 1991 and could not maintain their position in this list of best performers. These are Jhalda in Puruliya which was the fourth ranker in 1981, but lost twenty-one ranks and was thrown out of the list of group A towns to register twenty fourth ranks in group B. Another town English Bazaar(district head quarter of Malda), which had the sixth position in 1981, came down twenty ranks and went down to twenty fifth place. Jhalda's deterioration was due to its poor performance in recreational facility; workforce participation, less proportion of non agricultural workers and poor banking infrastructure. Another interesting thing of this town was that in some indicators it performed very well, while in others it did very badly. In indicators like medical and educational infrastructure as well as cultural and recreational facility, the town did exceptionally well. It also did performed well in banking infrastructure (1981) and electricity development (1991).It could not deliver at all as far as road infrastructure, fire fighting services, literacy, person living per residential houses, and toilet facilities are concerned in both the decades and also showed very poor record in. workforce participation (1991) and population growth (1981). On the other hand English Bazar did not have such inequality in indicator wise performance; its declining rank was due to its poor show in road infrastructure development, hospital beds, educational and banking facilities in 1991, as compared to the previous decade.

Six towns were promoted to the higher positions. Among them Raiganj (district head quarter of modern North Dinajpur), Contai

(Medinipur) and Alipur Duar(Jalpaiguri) had marginal improvement between eight to seventeen ranks and achieved 35th, 38th and 37th positions. So also Khardaha(North Twenty Four Pargana district), improving eighteen ranks, and got the 23rd position. Murshidabad town did very well and went up thirty-one steps to achieve 33rd rank. Its phenomenal improvement was because of its better performance in road construction, providing better cultural and recreational facilities as well as because of its population growth rate. Another town of the same district also improved considerably.It is Kandi municipality, which improved twenty-three ranks to get 39th position. With respect to 1981, this town bettered its position in the indicators related with street lighting points, hospital beds, educational infrastructure, recreational and cultural facility, population growth, and workforce participation as well as in banking infrastructure.

III)GROUP : C

These are the towns which ranked in between 61 and 80 in 1991. There are eight such towns which performed moderately well both in 1981 and 1991. Among them Haora (second largest town of west Bengal) lost nineteen place to secure 59th rank in 1991. This city dwindled because of its failure to maintain the progress related with lighting, electricity as well as banking. Other seven towns of this block did not change much.These local bodies include old Malda (41st), Raniganj(42nd) and Bardhaman (46th) in Bardhaman district, North Barrakpur in North Twenty Four Pargana (52nd), Tarakeswar in Hugli district 53rd, Asansol 56th (third largest city in West Bengal), and Rajpur 57th in South Twenty Four Pargana district.

Five towns were demoted from the previous group in 1991. Among them Chandannagar, the former French Colony, suffered heavily as it came down eighteen ranks and registered 49th position. Compared to

1981, its performance has gone down in cultural and recreational facility, population growth, electricity as well as safe drinking water facility to a large extent. Other four towns in this regard lost marginally. They were Barangar 43rd and Serampur 47th in Kolkata Metropolitan Area and two district head quarters of Medinipur 48th and capital of Nadia i.e. Krishnanagar 44th.

The town Barasat, which in 1981 was among the top twenty towns, is the one which deteriorated the most in the entire series. In one decade it lost thirty-eight ranks and went straight to fifty-eighth position in 1991 compared to twentieth in the previous decade. The pathetic situation was because the municipality performed worse in all the twelve other indicators except in electricity, non agricultural workforce and person living per house.

There are five towns on the other hand which got promoted. Among them Chandrakona, a small town in Medinipur district was the most prominent one. It improved thirty six ranks. It improved tremendously in the indicators related with person living per residential house, as well as in workforce participation and also in hospital beds. Like Dum Dum, the neighboring South Dum Dum municipality also improved to a large extent. It went ahead by thirty four ranks to get the 51st position. Its improvements were in the fields of road lighting, cultural and recreational facilities, and electricity provision and in banking infrastructure.

Bolpur, the site of Tagore's Shantiniketan, also increased its position by twenty three steps to register at the fifty fifth rank . It also performed better compared to the previous decade as far as road lighting points, cultural and recreational facility, population growth and electricity facilities are concerned. Remaining two small towns i.e.

Birnagar in Nadia and Sonamukhi in Bankura gained marginally and registered 54th and 60th ranks respectively.

IV) GROUP : D

Only seven municipalities in this group maintained their status both the decades in 1981 and 1991.None of them showed any major changes also. These municipalities are Balurglat capital of previous west and modern south Dinajpur district 61st, Champdani in Hugli 63rd, Bhadrekwar also in Hugli 68th, Taki 71st, Naihati 72nd and Titgarh 78th all in North Twenty Four Paragana as well as Bally 79th in Howrah.

Nine such towns, were demotied from the group in this decade. Two of them very significantly.Budge Budge of South Twenty Four Paragana lost twenty one ranks and thus came down to 76th position. Its performance reflects that it had done badly in cultural and recreational facilities, population growth rate, electricity facility, as well as person living per house in 1991 than that of 1981. Another town Kamarhati in North Twenty Four Pargana district came down twenty positions and got 69th rank in 1991. Compared to previous decade, its performance went down in aspects of road lighting points, population growth, literacy, non agricultural workers and person living per residential house. Other seven towns did not show much variation. These include Durgapur at 62nd, Jangipur of Murshidabad 65th,Gobardanga 66th and Garulia 67th of North Twenty Four Pargana, and Aranbagh 70th· Rishra 73rd & Baidyabati 75th of Hugli district.

Only four municipalities improved from the last group to ensure a place in this cluster. Some of them achieved substantial infrastructure development. The maximum gainer was the small town of Khirpai. In 1981, it was at 99th position, but in 1991 it improved twenty five ranks

and obtained the 74th ranks. It improvement was in person living per residential house, banking infrastructure and workforce participation.

Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh of North Twenty Four Pargana improved eighteen ranks while Ghatal of Medinipur improved sixteen ranks to achieve 64th and 77th position in terms of development respectively. Marginal gain was recorded by Jiaganj- Azimganj municipality of Murshidabad district, which got the 80th rank.

V) GROUP :E

There are twenty one towns in this group. Two third of them performed badly in both the decades. None of them showed any change in their ranks .

Dhulian in Murshidabad district was the worst performer. In 1991, the town performed the least in terms of electricity supply; it was the second worst performer in literacy. However, it was the best performer in workforce participation, but did miserably in areas like hospital beds, cultural facility, toilet facility and residential density.In 1981 also it could not do well and was the worst performer as far as literacy is concerned. Its marginal poor performance in some of the indicators, made it the worst performeing town in socio economic and infrastructure development.

CONCLUSION

1.As far as individual indicators are concerned, except for hospital beds, medical infrastructure, cultural & recreational facility, population growth and residential density, situation of all other indicators have improved in 1991 compared to 1981. Most prominent

improvement was seen in respect to the number of household having electricity facility. These are evident from their changed means in 1991 with respect to the previous decade. In absolute term, except for population growth, all the other variable has gone up in 1991.

2.If we see the variation then we would see that in 1981 Barrackpur and in 1991 Gayeshpur had the maximum variation of indicator wise performance , which means that those two in their respective decades either have done very well in some indicators , or did drastically bad in others

3.Performance of Gayeshpur in Nadia improved maximum in 1991 (72 ranks up) followed by Chandrakona in Medinipur (36 ranks) and South Dum Dum in North Twenty Four Parganas (34 ranks) as well as in Murshidabad town(31 ranks). On the other hand Barasat in North Twenty Four Parganas had the maximum down slide (38 ranks) followed by Nabadwip in Nadia (28 ranks).

4.In general majority of these urban local bodies performed better in 1991 as compared to the previous decade in absolute terms. The rankings which emerged are only due to their relative development with respect to one another. The enhanced development can be proved by the fact that overall mean of the composite scores in 1991 was more than that of 1981 so also the maximum and the minimum scores of 1991 were greater than that of 1981.

5.It is interesting to note that fifty four local body's ranks came down in 1991 compared to 1981. On the other hand forty four local body's ranks went up in the same period. Ranks of the remaining three remain unchanged. Therefore those who went up, improved in greater extent compared to those whose ranks came down as far as magnitude in the change of ranks are concerned.

CHAPTER: 4

COMPARISN BETWEEN POPULATION SIZE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TOWNS:

The relationship between the size of the population and the infrastructure development index of each municipality has been done through Spearman's rank correlation by ranking the municipal bodies with respect to their population size and also according to level of infrastructure development. The deviations in both the ranks have also been analysed.

SITUATION OF 1981:

Positive Deviations:

In the following analysis it signifies that the municipalities have better ranks with respect to their level of development than with their population size. Haldibari municipal body has the maximum positive deviation of ninety eight units, because according to the level of infrastructure development it has the first rank while according to population, it stood in the ninety nine positions. It was closely followed by some nearby municipalities of the same Koch Bihar district like Tufanganj and Mekliganj, both having deviation of ninety four units. Tufanganj had a development rank of six and population rank of one hundred, while Mekliganj had the development rank of seven but ranked one hundred in terms of population. All these smaller municipalities of Koch Bihar district show an interesting inverse relationship between population size and level of the development, which is against the prevailing hypothesis that bigger is the town, more will be development. Other notable positive deviation includes Jhalda in Puruliya District (88),

Kurseong in Darjeeling (81), and Mathabhanga (80) and Dinhata (81) of Koch Bihar district.

Negative Deviations:

The analysis shows that the population ranks of the urban local bodies are better than that of the developmental ranks. Only two civic bodies had high negative deviation. South Dum Dum municipality in North Twenty Four Parganas district had a developmental rank of eighty five, but according to population, it was the fifth largest civic body of west Bengal. Thus the deviation was (-80). Bhatpara municipality in the same district ranked seventy sixth according to composite score, but it was the 4th largest municipality in the state, thus the deviation was (-72 units).

Only thirteen urban local bodies had a deviation below ten, (either positive or negative) and among them only two small neighbouring towns Kharar and Khirpai in Medinipur had deviation as small as (-2), they also were among the bad performers. Here the hypothesis regarding smaller towns having lesser development potential is true.

Out of hundred and one towns, only forty five had positive deviation and the remaining fifty six had negative deviations. This means that the towns, which show a positive deviation, have a higher degree of difference between the two sets of ranks than the towns having negative deviation.

Correlation Coefficient between the composite index of performance and city size in 1981 was-0.0638672.It shows that though very week, but still population has a negative correlation with level of development i.e. more the population, lesser be their level of development - though this relationship is very feeble. Therefore, it counters the existing hypothesis

that large towns are more developed. In this case we can see that generally larger the population size of the town lesser is its composite index.

SITUATION OF 1991:

Both in 1981 as well as in 1991; the most populated cities were Kolkata, Haora, Durgapur and Bhatpara (first, second, third, fourth largest cities in terms of population).

Positive Deviations:

Like previous decade, this time also Haldibari in Koch Bihar district had the maximum positive deviation of ninety five. Though in developmental ranking, its position slightly dwindled from first to fourth position, but as far as population is concerned, it still held the ninety nine ranks. Similarly Tufanganj town in Koch Bihar had a deviation of ninety five. This time it became the most well performing municipality. According to population, it was at ninety fourth positions. Mathabhanga in the same district had a deviation of eighty eight; which is because of its third rank in development, while ninety first rank in population. Similarly Dinhata had a deviation of eighty three and Kurseong in Darjeeling district had eighty. It is interesting to note that those towns, which had high positive deviation in the previous decade, also had the same in 1991. This signifies that not only the population of these towns changed much with respect to others, but also they were able to maintain the same tempo of development.

Negative Deviations:

In this category, the scenario changed quite significantly in this decade with respect to the previous one. This time, Santipur in Nadia district had the maximum negative deviation of (-85), because it was

fourteenth largest city, while according to composite score, the city was at ninety-ninth position. Kharagpur in Medinipur had a deviation of (-82) while Bhatpara in North Twenty Four Parganas had a rank difference between population and developmental status as huge as (-79). In 1991 fourteen urban local bodies had a deviation below ten. Among them Arambagh in Hugli district and Rajpur in South Twenty Four Pargana district had the same rank for both the parameters. They stood at the sixty sixth and fifty sixth ranks respectively. Ghatal in Medinipur district had a deviation of two.

In this decade there were forty six urban local bodies with positive, and fifty three with negative deviations; while, as has been mentioned before; the remaining two bodies had no deviation. Thus the gap between number of bodies having positive deviation with that of negative ones has been reduced a little from the previous decade.

The correlation coefficient (-0.2131043) this time became more negative than the previous decade. It shows that the tendency of larger city becoming less developed in terms of infrastructure is getting more and more accentuated. This means that the hypothesis regarding the city size and infrastructure development (i.e. larger the city, more will be its infrastructure development, has been neglected to a greater extent in 1991 than in 1981. In this study, the relationship between city size and development is getting inverse, thus challenging the existing belief regarding the backwash effect.

CONCLUSION

1. The hypothesis that large cities are more developed in terms of infrastructure is not true in West Bengal. There is a weak relationship between city size and level of infrastructure development.

2. This inverse situation is more pronounced in 1991 than in 1981.

3. The numbers of local bodies with Negative deviations are more than that with positive deviations.

CHAPTER: 5

REGIONAL ANALYSIS

In the third chapter, we worked out the ranks of the urban local bodies with respect to their level of infrastructure development. We can now test the second hypothesis which states that the municipalities which are situated in the Kolkata Metropolitan Area are more developed than those situated outside that region.

Positions of the districts in terms of their municipal development:

In this analysis, all the municipal bodies have been clubbed together with respect to their districts and then analysis has been done district wise. That is to say, there are three municipalities in Puruliya district, these municipal body's data have been clubbed together to ascertain the urban development index of the whole Puruliya district. This gave the comparative picture of these districts and ranked them according to their municipal development.

TABLE: 2

Performance of the districts according to the performance of their urban local bodies.: (1981-1991)

Districts	Composite score in 1981	Districts	Composite score in 1991
Kolkata	4.6845342	Koch Bihar	4.6917395
Koch Bihar	4.6464122	Kolkata	4.3986021
Malda	4.6277643	Darjeeling	4.3202503
Darjeeling	4.3114851	Malda	4.2942789
Jalpaiguri	4.1387792	Jalpaiguri	4.2900803

S.24 Pargana	3.9198986	Bankura	4.1162720
Birbhum	3.8190948	S.24 Pargana	3.8036669
Haora	3.7787686	Puruliya	3.7952450
Hugli	3.7021542	Birbhum	3.7508844
Puruliya	3.6537277	Murshidabad	3.7030179
Murshidabad	3.5938932	Haora	3.6726269
Bankura	3.5787608	Hugli	3.6413683
Nadia	3.5446223	West Dinajpur	3.6237910
N.24 Pargana	3.5306897	Nadia	3.5586793
Bardhaman	3.5210424	N.24 Pargana	3.5074106
West Dinajpur	3.4655061	Medinipur	3.3973398
Medinipur	3.3429906	Bardhaman	3.3073408

In 1981, Kolkata was on top if we consider the district as a unit instead of towns as unit. In literacy rate, main workforce participation, toilet, electricity, road lighting, safe drinking water facility; the city was on top. It also did well in person engaged in non agricultural activity (2nd) and banking sector (3rd). Only in population growth rate, it was the last district, and also could not do well with respect to cultural and recreational facility.

It was followed by Koch Bihar district, which had the overall top ranked town in its fold (Haldibari). Five out of its six municipalities were among the first 15 ranked urban local bodies. With them, as a district; Koch Bihar was the best performer as far as cultural and recreational facilities are concerned. The district also showed good performance in hospital beds, literacy, toilet, electricity and banking facilities. In none of the indicators, it was too bad.

Malda was the third best performer and had the maximum road length with respect to area as well as had maximum number of hospital beds. On the other hand, it performed worst as far as main workforce participation is concerned. It was followed by Darjeeling, which had the best medical infrastructure.

On the other end, Medinipur district was lagging at the bottom which also had the two most ill performed towns (Ramjibanpur and Kharar) in its geographical boundary.

In 1991, Koch Bihar district replaced Kolkata in the top slot, pulling the later down to second rank. On the other hand, Bardhaman district became the worst performer instead of Medinipur. The first five districts remained the same in both the decades, with only the mutual rank change between Kolkata and Koch Bihar, as well as between Malda and Darjeeling. Bankura district improved its position to a greater extent by climbing up 6 ranks from 12th in 1981 to 6th in 1991. Position of other districts did not change much.

Region wise performance of the urban local bodies:

To analyse the performance of the local bodies among the units of Kolkata Metropolitan Development Area and outside it. The urban local bodies of the state have been classed into three different regional fronts. The first one includes all the municipal bodies of North Bengal and also two districts of Central Bengal (i.e. Birbhum and Murshidabad). This region has twenty seven urban local bodies. The region has the maximum concentration of Muslim population as well as majority of SC and ST population in the state. It also is a strong hold of Congress, Revolutionary socialist party as well as All India Forward Block. This part of the state is the most backward region of the state.

The second region consists of the Kolkata Metropolitan Area, which spreads across six districts of Kolkata, South Twenty four Pargana, North Twenty Four Pargana, Haora and Hugli. Altogether it has thirty five urban local bodies and it is supposed to be the most developed region. According to the current hypothesis, this region should be the most well developed and advanced region in the whole state with respect to socio-economic and urban infrastructure development. This region is a stronghold of Trinamool Congress.

The third region has the maximum number of municipal bodies i.e. thirty nine. This is the region of South Bengal, excluding the Kolkata Metropolitan Area. The region should be between the other two regions as far as developmental scenario is concerned because, though these municipal bodies are situated mostly in the regions surrounded by vast rural hinterland and often they behave like rurban region; but still industrially developed regions like Kharagpur and Durgapur-Assansol are situated here. Traditionally these municipal bodies are strongholds of ruling communist party of India (Marxist).

If we see the composite performance of these regions, then an extra ordinary result emerges. Both in 1981 as well as in 1991, the North and Central Bengal region had best performance which in overall development is relatively backward. In both the decade, Kolkata Metropolitan Area came second while South Bengal came at the bottom. In 1981, though the difference between North Bengal and Kolkata was very small; but it increased quite significantly in the following decade, suggesting a consolidation of position by the urban local bodies of North and Central Bengal. South Bengal was far below the other two regions on both the occasions. Therefore it contradicts the hypothesis that urban local bodies which are situated at Kolkata Metropolitan Area are more developed than other regions.

TABLE: 3

Region wise performance of the towns: (1981-1991)

Regions	Number of urban local bodies	Composite scores in 1981	Composite scores in 1991
North and Central Bengal	27	4.065797	4.230832
Kolkata Metropolitan Area	35	4.052679	3.915966
South Bengal (Excluding Kolkata Metropolitan Area)	39	3.500264	3.450201

Some Important Observations:

A) Old verses new municipalities:

It is interesting to note that in 1981, older municipalities were performing worse than that of the newer ones. Notified areas like Kalyani and Sainthia, town committees like Haldibari, Tufanganj Mekliganj and Mathabhanga or newer municipalities like Dinhata performed well, as compared to the old municipalities like Ramjibanpur, Kharar, Khirpai or Dainhat. However, in 1991 no such distinction can be made as far as old and new municipalities are concerned. New municipalities of Koch Bihar

district along with older Kurseong, Bankura and Dum-Dum got almost equal representation in best ten.

B) District Headquarters:

An important aspect of 1981 was that, district headquarters performed well. Except Balurghat and Puruliya; all of them were among the first fifty municipalities. It is obvious that the infrastructure of the district head quarters will be better than that of other general towns. Development activities which have a manifestation over the performance of these capital towns put their imprints on the rankings which have been calculated.

It we see the district headquarters in 1991, then again we would see that Balurghat continued to be at the bottom fifty municipalities; while in stead of Puruliya, this time it was joined by Barasat and Haora while all other district head quarter remained in the best fifty lists of municipalities. It symbolizes the degrading result of the Kolkata Metropolitan Area because two important district head quarters of the region featured in the bottom fifty list of municipalities, while except Balurghat (which it self improved its ranking) all other District Headquarters outside from the Kolkata Metropolitan Area were among the best fifty municipalities of West Bengal.

TABLE: 4

Rank of the District Headquarters: (1981-1991)

DISTRICTS	HEADQUARTERS	RANKS IN 1981	RANKS IN 1991
Kolkata	Kolkata	11	23
Koch Bihar	Koch Bihar	16	30
Darjeeling	Darjeeling	5	18

Malda	English Bazar	8	26
Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri	17	19
S.24 Pargana	Kolkata	11	23
Birbhum	Suri	20	20
Haora	Haora	40	58
Hugli	Hugli-Chinsura	26	35
Puruliya	Puruliya	55	46
Murshidabad	Baharampur	22	29
Bankura	Bankura	31	5
Nadia	Krishnanagar	37	47
N.24 Pargana	Barasat	23	59
Bardhaman	Bardhaman	43	48
West Dinajpur	Balurghat	71	61
Medinipur	Medinipur	34	50

C) Situation of some important towns:

Assansol, a huge city in the industrial belt of Bardhaman, performed in a very average manner in both the decades. In 1981 it was 68th, while in 1991 its position slightly improved to 57th.The nearby town of Durgapur was 51st in 1981; but came down to 62nd in 1991.Raniganj, the famous coal town in the same district, also was unable to do better either. In 1981 and in 1991 its ranks were 46th and 43rd respectively. Kharagpur in Medinipur district, which is famous for Indian Institute of Technology, as well as its railway platform; performed even worse. In 1981 it was 84th, which further slipped down to 95th in 1991.Haora, the second largest city of the state, also was very average. It was at 40th in 1981, while it's performance came down drastically when it reached at 58th position in 1991.Siliguri, the largest town of North Bengal, was

slightly better, which is reflected from its ranks of 38th and 37th respectively in both the decades. The nearby town and the hill resort of the state, Darjeeling, was a better performer and was 5th in 1981 and 18th in 1991. The state capital Kolkata also was not a bad performer either, because it was at 11th in 1981 while 23rd in the following decade. Its two neighbouring municipalities Dum Dum and South Dum Dum improved their positions quite significantly in between two decades. The former came up from 29th to 8th while the later improved from 85th to 52nd place. Chandannagar, a former French colony and a municipal corporation itself was another mediocre [performer which is reflected from its ranks of 32nd and 51st in 1981 and 1991 respectively. All these analysis shows that famous and large important towns are not the ones who are performing better than the small and relatively unknown remote small towns. This is an important findings because it deviates the hypothesis about more large are more developed ones, but on the other hand it proves that the smaller towns performed more as far as municipal development s are concerned. With this if we combine the environmental and stress related hazards in large metropolitan towns, then surely the smaller peaceful towns will be a better place to live.

D) Left verses opposition ruled areas:

If we see the scenario of 1991, then we would see that Left Front ruled municipalities were performing slightly better than the opposition ruled ones. Among first ten municipalities, Tufanganj, Dinhata, Mathabhanga, Kalna and Dum Dum were left while Kurseong, Haldibari, Kalimpong and Sainthia were stronghold of the oppositions. Bankura had almost equal representation of both. On the other hand in the bottom ten urban local bodies we had Ramjibanpur and Dubrajpur as left citadel while Dainhat, Santipur, Baduria and Kharagpur were predominantly known for their opposition inclinations. The remaining

four had both the voices. Since the difference is so small between left and opposition in the level of performance, therefore we can not out rightly say that left rule is better for a civic body. We also cannot say that the state government only helps the urban local bodies which are ruled by the ruling left front.

CONCLUSION

1. The second hypothesis stating that the towns in Kolkata Metropolitan Area are more developed is fallacious, because North Bengal towns are more developed than municipalities situated near Kolkata.

2. In general the district head quarters were performing well. In 1981 only Balurghat (West Dinajpur) and Puruliya; where as in 1991, the same Balurghat and Barasat (North Twenty Four Parganas) were the only district head quarters who were below the first fifty rank holders.

3. Smaller Town committees and Notified Areas were performing better in general compared to the larger municipal corporations.

4. Local bodies of Koch Bihar and Darjeeling did exceptionally well; on the other hand in general, municipalities of Medinipur district performed the worst.

5. Famous cities are not doing well while the smaller less renowned towns have performed better.

6. Left ruled municipalities were doing slightly better than the opposition ruled ones.

72

CHAPTER : 6

CONCLUSION

The work had some inherent limitations which are as follows:

1. Due to unavailability of data of 2001, the work could not incorporate the most recent information. Till date The District Census Handbook containing The Town Directory has not been published for 2001. Data is available only for five out of the fifteen indicators used here in the analysis.

2. Research has some subjectivity inherent in it. Therefore, whatever results have come, are solely because of the indicators used for this purpose. If other indicators were used, then results may have differed. Here only those indicators are used for which data are available in a secondary format. Due to unavailability of data, environmental, political developmental, crime related indicators could not be incorporated.

3. In current day's West Bengal, there are more then 125 municipal bodies, but since here the base year is 1981, therefore we had to use data for only 101 urban local bodies which were there at that time. Therefore analysis of some regions like Salt Lake(Bidhan Nagar), Halidia etc. could not be done.

4. Due to unavailability of data, Barrackpur Cantonment had to be omitted from the analysis.

With all it's inherent shortcomings, the work does validate that both the hypothesis which were considered to be true regarding municipal development in West Bengal are fallacious. Our present study reveals that in West Bengal till 1991, the smaller municipalities were more developed than the larger ones and also the municipalities which were

nearer to Kolkata or more precisely situated in Kolkata Metropolitan Area, were less developed then most of the small municipalities of North Bengal.

There is immense scope for further analysis by incorporating the current data, which would reveal the present scenario.

In conclusion the following facts can be summarised:

1. The hypothesis that urban local bodies around Kolkata are more developed than the rest of the state does not hold true because we have seen that the municipalities of North Bengal are better than others in terms of socio-economic and infrastructure development.

2. Urban local bodies of Koch Bihar district are most developed in general. In both the decades the top position has been taken by the local bodies of that district.

3. Region wise, the municipalities of North and Central Bengal are the best, followed by those of the Kolkata Metropolitan area. South Bengal other than the Kolkata Metropolitan Area is the worst performing region.

4. The district wise analysis reveals that urban local bodies of Koch Bihar, Kolkata, Malda, Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri are doing well but on the other hand those of Medinipur, Bardhaman, West Dinajpur and North Twenty Four Pargana are lagging behind.

5. The important and famous towns are not performing as well as the less known ones. It is evident from the fact that cities like Haldibari, Mekliganj, Tufanganj, Jhalda, Kurseong, Dinhata and Sainthia have performed well in both the decades while, Assansol, Durgapur,

Chandannagar, Siliguri, Kharagpur and Haora could not do as well as expected.

6. Left ruled municipalities have done slightly better than the opposition ruled ones, though the difference is not very high.

7. The maximum improvement between two decades has been shown by Gayeshpur municipality while the least was shown by Barasat. Lesser number of municipalities improved their ranks in 1991 while majority have deteriorated. Therefore the magnitude of the improvement is more than that of magnitude in deterioration.

8. Most of the district head quarters have performed well, except Balurghat of West Dinajpur and to some extent Haora, Puruliya and Barasat (North Twenty Four Pargana.).

9. Performance of Kolkata, the state capital has deteriorated in 1991 compared to the previous decade. According to this study, Kolkata is not the most developed urban local body of West Bengal.

10. If we see the variation then we would see that in 1981 Barrackpur and in 1991 Gayeshpur had the maximum variation in indicator wise performance , which means that those two in their respective decades either have done very well in some indicators , or very badly in others .

11. The second hypothesis regarding the direct relationship between sizes of the urban settlements with their developmental status has also been proved erroneous in this study, because this work reveals that smaller the size of the city, better are its chance of development. This trend accentuated more on 1991 with respect to the previous decade. Though this negative correlation was very small in 1981, but it increased in 1991.

12. The inverse correlation between city size and its level of development was maximum in the small municipalities of Koch Bihar district like Haldibari, Tufanganj, Mekliganj, Mathabhanga and Dinhata and some other places like Jhalda in Puruliya. All of them had high developmental values. On the other hand in case of Kharagpur, Santipur and Bhatpara, the situation was completely opposite and these large cities had very low development values.

13. As far as individual indicators are concerned, except for hospital beds, medical infrastructure, cultural & recreational facility, population growth and residential density, situation of all other indicators have improved in 1991 compared to 1981. Most prominent improvement was seen in respect to the number of household having electricity facility. This is evident from their changed mean value in 1991 with respect to the previous decade. In absolute terms, except for population growth, all the other variables have gone up in 1991.

14. In general majority of the urban local bodies performed better in 1991 as compared to the previous decade in absolute terms. The rankings which emerged are only due to their relative development with respect to one another. The enhanced development can be proved by the fact that overall mean of the composite scores in 1991 was more than that of 1981 so also the maximum and the minimum scores of 1991 were greater than that of 1981.

15. It is interesting to note that the ranks of fifty four local bodies came down in 1991 compared to 1981. On the other hand the ranks of forty four local bodies went up in the same period. Ranks of the remaining three remain unchanged. Therefore those which went up, improved to a greater extent compared to those whose ranks came down as far as

magnitude in the change of ranks is concerned. This inverse situation was more prominent in 1991.

16. Negative deviations with respect to population size and level of socio-economic and infrastructure development are more than the positive deviations.

The better performance of the smaller and remote towns supports the 74th constitutional amendment act, which radically changed the political and administrative scenario of our nation. In this respect West Bengal surely can be regarded as the path finder, and in the future if this trend continues, then the population in smaller urban centres would be self sufficient in terms of urban development and will not put pressure on the larger cities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ansari, J.H. (2001); "Changing Role of Planning Agencies and Local Bodies: Implications for Good Urban Governance"; Spatio- Economic Development Record; Vol.8; No.4; pp.19-28.

2. Arrow, K. et. al; "Readings in Welfare Economics"; Homewood; Irwin; Year 1969.

3. Ashraf A.; "Government and Politics of Big Cities: An Indian Case Study"; Concept Publishing Company; Delhi; Year 1977.

4. Bagchi, S.; (December 2000); "Financial Implications of Decentralisation: Issues Concerning Resource Mobilisation by Urban Local Bodies"; Artha Vijnan; Vol.X L II; No.4; pp.367-384.

5. Balachandhran, G.; (Oct. 2001); "Urban Decentralisation: Case Study West Bengal"; Spatio-Economic Development Record; Vol.8; No.5; pp.18-24.

6. Basu, D.D; "Introduction to the Constitution of India"; Wadhwa & Company; Nagpur; Year 1960.

7. Bhattacharya, H.; "Making Local Democracy Work in India: Social Capital, Politics and Governance in West Bengal"; Vedams ebook pvt. ltd.; New Delhi; Year 2002.

8. Calcutta Metropolitan Development Authority; "Calcutta Metropolitan Area: Future Development Policies, Strategies and Directions"; Spacio-Economic Development Record; Vol.4; No.5; Year 1997; pp.27-32.

9. Case, A.; (1994); "Taxes and the Electoral Cycle: How Sensitive Are Governors to Coming Elections?"; Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Business Review; pp.17-26.

10. Dasgupta, B.; "Constructing Urban Patterns: West Bengal, Punjab and Kerala"; taken from "Inequality, Mobility and Urbanisation: China and India"; Kundu A. (ed.); ICSSR; Manak Publisher; New Delhi; Year 2000.

11. Dutta, C.R.; (Sept-Oct. 1997); "Calcutta Megacity Project: Its Implications"; Spacio-Economic Development Record; Vol.4; No.5; pp.45-48.

12. Guha, S.B.; "Medium Towns or Future Cities: Populating or Depopulating?: A Case Study From West Bengal"; taken from "Indian Medium Towns: An Appraisal of Their Role as Growth Centres"; Diddee J (ed.); Rawat Publication; New Delhi; Year 1997.

13. Gupta, S. and Som, N.; (Sept.-Oct.1997); "Economic and Spatial Growth Process in The Calcutta Metropolitan Area"; Spacio-Economic Development Record; Vol.4; No.5; pp.-19-25.

14. Jain R.K. (Mar.-Apr. 2002); "Massive Urbanisation and Urban Governance: Some Issues", Spatio Economic Development Record; Vol.9; No.2; pp.25-27.

15. Jha, G. et. al. (ed.); "Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns: Problems and Strategic Policy Issues"; IIPA; New Delhi; 1983.

16. Kundu, A. et. al., (Dec. 2002); "Dichotomy or Continuum: Analysis of Impact of Urban Centres on Their Periphery"; Economic and Political Weekly; Vol.37; No.50; pp.5039-46.

17. Kundu, A.; (1999); "Empowerment of Urban Local Bodies in India: A Search Without A Perspective"; Spatio-Economic Development Record; Vol.6; No.6; pp.15-20.

18. Kundu, A.; "Measurement of Urban Processes: A Study in Regionalisation"; Popular; Bombay; 1980.

19. Lall, V.D.; (Jan. 2005); "Making New Institutions in Urban Governance Effective"; Seminar on "New Forms of Urban Governance in Indian Megacities"; CSRD; New Delhi.

20. Maheshwari, S.; "Local Government in India"; Lamkshmi Narain Agarwal; Agra; Year 1984.

21. Mohan, R.; "Urban Economics and Planning Models: Assessing the Potential for Cities in Developing Countries"; World Bank; Baltimore.

22. Proceedings of A Seminar; (1958); "Improving City Government"; IIPA; New Delhi.

23. Port, S.S. et. al.; (Sept. 2000); "State Economics, Metropolitan Governance, And Urban Suburban Economic Dependence"; Urban Affairs Review; Vol.36; No.1; pp.46-60.

24. Roy, P.N.; (Sept.-Oct. 1997); "Urban Planning in West Bengal: Suggested Approach and Strategies"; Spatio-Economic Development Record; Vol.4; No.5; pp.5-12.

25. Sachdeva, P.; "Urban Local Government and Administration in India"; Kitab Mahal; Allahabad; Year 1993.

26. Saha, A.K.; (1995); "On The Urban Growth and Prospects of West Bengal: 1981-1991"; Indian Journal of Regional Science; Vol.XXVII; No.1 & 2; pp.93-103.

27. Shaw, A.; (2005); "Peri Urban Interface of Indian Cities: Growth, Governance and Local Initiatives"; Economic and Political Weekly; Vol.XL; No.2; pp.129-136.

28. Singh, K. (Sept.-Oct. 2001); "Urban Governance in India: Trends and Issues in Decentralisation After Constitution (74th) Amendment Act 1992"; Spatio Economic Development Record; Vol.8; No.5; pp.4-17.

29. Sivaramakrishnan K.C.; "Power To The People? The Politics and Progress of Decentralisation"; Konark Publisher Pvt. Ltd.; New Delhi; Year 2002.

30. Twelfth Finance Commission Report; Chapter on Local Bodies; Ministry of Finance; Government of India.

TABLE: 5 THE COMPOSITE SCORE AND RANKS
OF THE URBAN LOCAL BODIES IN WEST BENGAL (1981-1991)

Ranks of the urban local bodies in 1981	Name of the urban local bodies	Composite score in 1981	Ranks of the urban local bodies in 1991	Name of the urban local bodies	Composite score in 1991
1	Haldibari	6.62804	1	Tufanganj	7.27772
2	Kurseong	5.81959	2	Kurseong	5.96407
3	Kalyani	5.77543	3	Mathabhanga	5.71342
4	Jhalda	5.54243	4	Haldibari	5.63393
5	Darjeeling	5.40141	5	Bankura	5.55739
6	English Bazar	5.17558	6	Dinhata	5.44753
7	Tufanganj	5.15218	7	Dum Dum	5.43976
8	Dinhata	5.11139	8	Kalimpong	5.40803
9	Mekliganj	5.07102	9	Kalna	5.29774
10	Kolkata	5.06626	10	Sainthia	5.24162
11	Kalimpong	5.04192	11	Gayeshpur	5.20296
12	Sainthia	4.99956	12	Jaynagar Mazilpur	5.14846
13	Konnagar	4.83870	13	Tamluk	5.14399
14	Jaynagar Mazilpur	4.82207	14	Rampurhat	4.98735
15	Koch Bihar	4.78645	15	New Barrackpur	4.80549
16	Jalpaiguri	4.76981	16	Kalyani	4.80152
17	Mathabhanga	4.75554	17	Baruipur	4.75871
18	Suri	4.61214	18	Jalpaiguri	4.73550
19	Baharampur	4.59284	19	Darjeeling	4.73287
20	Barasat	4.58730	20	Suri	4.70013
21	Kalna	4.58652	21	Kolkata	4.70006
22	Barrackpur	4.57080	22	Mekliganj	4.56666
23	Panihati	4.55306	23	Khardaha	4.46698
24	Hugli Chinsurah	4.54988	24	Uttarpara-Kotrung	4.46465
25	Baruipur	4.54206	25	Jhalda	4.42721
26	Uttarpara-Kotrung	4.50452	26	English Bazar	4.42678
27	Rampurhat	4.48040	27	Panihati	4.39137
28	Tamluk	4.45378	28	Konnagar	4.37312
29	Dum Dum	4.38575	29	Baharampur	4.34430
30	Bankura	4.33971	30	Koch Bihar	4.31377
31	Chandannagar	4.32552	31	Beldanga	4.24135
32	Ranaghat	4.31760	32	Barrackpur	4.23874
33	Beldanga	4.29739	33	Murshidabad	4.22705
34	New Barrackpur	4.28324	34	Hugli Chinsurah	4.19099
35	Baranagar	4.27314	35	Raiganj	4.17724
36	Medinipur	4.24591	36	Siliguri	4.13192
37	Krishnanagar	4.19786	37	Alipur Duar	4.12975
38	Siliguri	4.13749	38	Contai	4.12523

#	Name	Value	#	Name	Value
39	Serampur	4.12671	39	Kandi	4.12262
40	Haora	4.11438	40	Ranaghat	4.11112
41	Khardaha	4.10412	41	Old Malda	4.08637
42	Bardhaman	4.08002	42	Raniganj	4.08082
43	Rajpur	4.07191	43	Baranagar	4.07839
44	Raniganj	4.04790	44	Krishnanagar	4.02951
45	Alipur Duar	4.00848	45	Puruliya	4.02547
46	Old Malda	3.97411	46	Bardhaman	4.01570
47	Tarakeswar	3.95827	47	Serampur	3.99997
48	Jangipur	3.93764	48	Medinipur	3.98930
49	Kamarhati	3.93566	49	Chandannagar	3.98715
50	Durgapur	3.93519	50	Chandrakona	3.96370
51	North Barrackpur	3.91536	51	South Dum Dum	3.96204
52	Raiganj	3.89299	52	North Barrackpur	3.94351
53	Puruliya	3.86141	53	Tarakeswar	3.92958
54	Contai	3.83260	54	Birnagar	3.92593
55	Budge Budge	3.80538	55	Bolpur	3.92408
56	Arambagh	3.79450	56	Asansol	3.85684
57	Garulia	3.75159	57	Rajpur	3.85228
58	Baidyabati	3.70209	58	Barasat	3.83114
59	Gobardanga	3.69847	59	Haora	3.83026
60	Rishra	3.68020	60	Sonamukhi	3.71213
61	Nabadwip	3.68011	61	Balurghat	3.66614
62	Kandi	3.65683	62	Durgapur	3.64786
63	Naihati	3.65163	63	Champdani	3.61308
64	Murshidabad	3.6473	64	Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	3.56767
65	Asansol	3.64028	65	Jangipur	3.53414
66	Taki	3.62343	66	Gobardanga	3.52161
67	Sonamukhi	3.61383	67	Garulia	3.52156
68	Bhadreshwar	3.60829	68	Bhadreshwar	3.46283
69	Birnagar	3.59917	69	Kamarhati	3.45726
70	Balurghat	3.59706	70	Arambagh	3.45402
71	Bally	3.5855	71	Taki	3.44646
72	Halishahar	3.58149	72	Naihati	3.44461
73	Champdani	3.57403	73	Rishra	3.43809
74	Bhatpara	3.55681	74	Khirpai	3.43681
75	North Dum Dum	3.55131	75	Baidyabati	3.42415
76	Katwa	3.54282	76	Budge Budge	3.42288
77	Bangaon	3.54076	77	Ghatal	3.40670
78	Bolpur	3.51884	78	Titagarh	3.40400
79	Kanchrapara	3.51686	79	Bally	3.36542
80	Titagarh	3.50186	80	Jiaganj-Azimganj	3.33844
81	Kharagpur	3.47213	81	Bhatpara	3.31232
82	Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	3.46907	82	Katwa	3.30384
83	Gayeshpur	3.40406	83	Habra	3.27059
84	Bansberia	3.39882	84	North Dum Dum	3.26264
85	South Dum Dum	3.39863	85	Chakdaha	3.25477
86	Chandrakona	3.37680	86	Kanchrapara	3.19992
87	Jiaganj-Azimganj	3.27184	87	Raghunathpur	3.18357

88	Basirhat	3.24689	88	Halishahar	3.15521
89	Chakdaha	3.20822	89	Nabadwip	3.14609
90	Habra	3.20246	90	Kharar	3.06800
91	Bishnupur	3.17506	91	Bishnupur	3.06027
92	Santipur	3.12831	92	Bansberia	3.05743
93	Ghatal	3.04385	93	Bangaon	3.02361
94	Raghunathpur	2.85631	94	Kharagpur	3.00473
95	Baduria	2.83041	95	Basirhat	2.99244
96	Dubrajpur	2.79625	96	Ramjibanpur	2.90636
97	Dhulian	2.73209	97	Baduria	2.90296
98	Dainhat	2.66282	98	Dubrajpur	2.78216
99	Khirpai	2.65740	99	Dainhat	2.78111
100	Kharar	2.56920	100	Santipur	2.75496
101	Ramjibanpur	2.31629	101	Dhulian	2.67410

TABLE : 6 . THE AREA, POPULATION AND NUMBER OF ODCCUPIED
RESIDENTIAL HOUSEHOLDS IN DIFFERENT URBAN LOCAL BODIES
IN WEST BENGAL: YEAR 1981

Urban local bodies	Area	Population	No. of occupied residential households
Alipur Duar	9.36	45324	7543
Arambagh	19.04	34205	6192
Asansol	20.02	183375	32278
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	7.56	55176	10235
Baduria	22.43	32519	5413
Baharampur	16.19	92889	14808
Baidyabati	9.06	71573	12253
Bally	11.81	147735	32426
Balurghat	6.37	104646	16000
Bangaon	15.57	69885	11879
Bankura	19.06	94954	15788
Bansberia	10.94	77967	15510
Baranagar	7.12	170343	33109
Barasat	20.77	66504	11902
Bardhaman	22.68	167364	30209
Barrackpur	11.65	115253	21601
Baruipur	9.07	26229	4550
Basirhat	22.01	81040	13469
Beldanga	3.98	15778	2837
Bhadreshwar	6.48	58858	12101
Bhatpara	11.96	265419	52845
Birnagar	5.52	14581	2376
Bishnupur	20.01	47529	8259
Bolpur	13.13	38436	6908
Budge Budge	9.06	66424	14336

Chakdaha	15.54	59308	10225
Champdani	6.47	76138	16648
Chandannagar	9.66	101925	18010
Chandrakona	16.58	13410	2224
Contai	14.25	35780	6084
Dainhat	10.36	15843	2908
Darjeeling	10.57	57603	10550
Dhulian	7.77	25466	3734
Dinhata	3.26	14536	2405
Dubrajpur	16.83	20381	3632
Dum Dum	3.11	33604	6141
Durgapur	154.20	311798	69281
English Bazar	4.63	84665	12790
Garulia	6.48	57061	11992
Gayeshpur	30.00	41667	7766
Ghatal	10.36	35443	5464
Gobardanga	10.36	27033	4975
Habra	17.52	74434	12711
Haldibari	1.45	7130	1330
Halishahar	8.28	95579	19148
Haora	51.74	744429	145424
Hugli Chinsurah	16.06	125193	22113
Jalpaiguri	10.08	61743	11016
Jangipur	7.77	43795	6929
Jaynagar Mazilpur	5.18	16343	2816
Jhalda	3.88	13194	2367
Jiaganj-Azimganj	11.66	32725	5010
Kalimpong	8.68	28885	5192
Kalna	6.47	35023	6122
Kalyani	21.91	38334	7979
Kamarhati	10.96	234951	44314
Kanchrapara	9.07	88798	16118
Kandi	12.95	32581	5654
Katwa	8.82	44430	5887
Kharagpur	90.65	150475	25939
Kharar	10.36	8369	1447
Khardaha	4.71	50202	8134
Koch Bihar	8.29	62127	10425
Kolkata	187.33	4126846	741132
Konnagar	4.33	51211	10630
Krishnanagar	15.80	98141	16497
Khirpai	11.65	9552	1604
Kurseong	5.05	18008	3462
Mathabhanga	1.89	11053	2031
Medinipur	10.36	86118	14688
Mekliganj	3.88	4534	845
Murshidabad	12.95	21341	3676

Nabadwip	11.66	109108	18678
Naihati	4.35	114607	19271
New Barrackpur	17.17	46530	7750
North Barrackpur	8.42	81758	15667
North Dum Dum	19.42	96418	17209
Old Malda	3.24	8579	1496
Panihati	19.40	205718	39171
Puruliya	13.93	73904	12287
Raghunathpur	12.95	15606	2406
Raiganj	10.64	60343	10000
Rajpur	20.98	43985	7747
Ramjibanpur	10.36	12308	1994
Rampurhat	5.10	34593	6101
Ranaghat	7.72	58356	10336
Raniganj	4.79	48702	7890
Rishra	6.48	81001	17260
Sainthia	7.88	24081	4356
Santipur	24.60	82980	14222
Serampur	5.88	127304	25593
Siliguri	15.54	154378	28235
Sonamukhi	11.65	19890	3456
South Dum Dum	15.49	230266	44930
Suri	9.48	40783	6598
Taki	15.54	24673	4430
Tamluk	10.36	29367	4996
Tarakeswar	3.90	16518	3160
Titagarh	3.24	104534	24580
Tufanganj	0.88	4906	830
Uttarpara-Kotrung	7.25	79598	15542

TABLE :.. 7 _ THE AREA, POPULATION AND NUMBER OF ODCCUPIED RESIDENTIAL HOUSEHOLDS IN DIFFERENT URBAN LOCAL BODIES IN WEST BENGAL: YEAR 1991

Urban local bodies	Area	Population	No. of occupied residential households
Alipur Duar	9.36	65241	10289
Arambagh	19.04	45211	8291
Asansol	25.02	262188	44455
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	18.44	96747	18699
Baduria	22.43	41762	7392
Baharampur	16.19	115144	22089
Baidyabati	9.06	90081	17434
Bally	11.81	184474	38013
Balurghat	6.37	119796	22074
Bangaon	15.57	79571	14401
Bankura	19.06	114876	20345
Bansberia	10.94	94698	18678
Baranagar	7.12	224821	44725
Barasat	20.77	102660	20413
Bardhaman	23.04	245079	46081
Barrackpur	11.65	133265	26717

Baruipur	9.07	37659	7192
Basirhat	22.01	101409	18944
Beldanga	3.98	20249	3672
Bhadreshwar	6.48	72474	14646
Bhatpara	11.96	315976	57064
Birnagar	5.52	20015	3480
Bishnupur	22.01	56128	10151
Bolpur	13.13	52760	10035
Budge Budge	9.06	72951	15607
Chakdaha	15.54	74769	13867
Champdani	6.47	101067	18959
Chandannagar	9.66	120378	23529
Chandrakona	16.58	16804	3136
Contai	14.25	53484	7186
Dainhat	10.36	20349	3744
Darjeeling	10.57	73062	13230
Dhulian	7.77	33191	5534
Dinhata	3.26	17697	3294
Dubrajpur	16.83	26983	4672
Dum Dum	3.11	40961	7807
Durgapur	154.20	425836	91184
English Bazar	13.63	139204	26912
Garulia	6.48	80918	14384
Gayeshpur	30.00	52158	9831
Ghatal	10.36	43770	7034
Gobardanga	10.36	35939	7068
Habra	18.44	100223	18284
Haldibari	1.45	10870	2194
Halishahar	8.28	114028	22945
Haora	51.74	950435	186437
Hugli Chinsurah	16.06	151806	29250
Jalpaiguri	10.08	68732	13363
Jangipur	7.77	55981	9255
Jaynagar Mazilpur	5.18	20217	3500
Jhalda	3.88	17217	2727
Jiaganj-Azimganj	11.66	42104	8085
Kalimpong	8.68	38832	6860
Kalna	6.47	47229	8307
Kalyani	21.91	55579	11833
Kamarhati	10.96	266889	49335
Kanchrapara	9.07	100194	18506
Kandi	12.95	39652	7439
Katwa	8.53	55541	10555
Kharagpur	90.65	177989	30182
Kharar	10.36	10314	1687
Khardaha	6.87	88358	14487
Koch Bihar	8.29	71215	13513

Kolkata	185.00	4399819	848085
Konnagar	4.33	62200	13441
Krishnanagar	15.96	121100	22362
Khirpai	11.65	12199	2237
Kurseong	5.05	26758	4525
Mathabhanga	1.89	17336	3518
Medinipur	14.78	125498	21810
Mekliganj	3.88	8205	1209
Murshidabad	12.95	30327	5756
Nabadwip	11.66	125037	21811
Naihati	4.35	132701	20855
New Barrackpur	17.17	63795	11466
North Barrackpur	8.42	100606	19927
North Dum Dum	19.42	149965	26548
Old Malda	3.24	13021	2482
Panihati	19.40	275990	50445
Puruliya	13.90	92386	15330
Raghunathpur	12.95	19187	3018
Raiganj	10.64	151045	18601
Rajpur	20.98	60175	11784
Ramjibanpur	10.36	14904	2643
Rampurhat	5.10	43275	8006
Ranaghat	7.72	62532	11996
Raniganj	4.79	61997	10382
Rishra	6.48	102815	21129
Sainthia	7.88	30024	5593
Santipur	24.60	169956	20371
Serampur	5.88	137028	28666
Siliguri	15.54	216950	39650
Sonamukhi	11.65	24640	4396
South Dum Dum	15.49	232811	47207
Suri	9.48	54298	10262
Taki	15.54	30421	5616
Tamluk	10.36	38688	6739
Tarakeswar	3.90	22632	4005
Titagarh	3.24	114085	24540
Tufanganj	0.88	16418	3112
Uttarpara-Kotrung	7.25	101268	21517

TABLE: 8

Deviation Between Rank According to Population and Rank According to Development Index of Urban Local Bodies in West Bengal:1981

Urban Local Bodies	Population in 1981	Rank According to Population	Rank according to Development Index	Deviation in ranks
Alipur Duar	45324	57	45	12
Arambagh	34205	69	56	13
Asansol	183375	8	65	-57
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	55176	51	82	-31
Baduria	32519	73	95	-22
Baharampur	92889	26	19	7
Baidyabati	71573	39	58	-19
Bally	147735	13	71	-58
Balurghat	104646	19	70	-51
Bangaon	69885	40	77	-37
Bankura	94954	25	30	-5
Bansberia	77967	35	84	-49
Baranagar	170343	9	35	-26
Barasat	66504	41	20	21
Bardhaman	167364	10	42	-32
Barrackpur	115253	16	22	-6
Baruipur	26229	77	25	52
Basirhat	81040	32	88	-56
Beldanga	15778	88	33	55
Bhadreshwar	58858	47	68	-21
Bhatpara	265419	4	74	-70
Birnagar	14581	90	69	21
Bishnupur	47529	55	91	-36
Bolpur	38436	63	78	-15
Budge Budge	66424	42	55	-13
Chakdaha	59308	46	89	-43
Champdani	76138	36	73	-37
Chandannagar	101925	21	31	-10
Chandrakona	13410	92	86	6
Contai	35780	65	54	11
Dainhat	15843	87	98	-11
Darjeeling	57603	49	5	44
Dhulian	25466	78	97	-19
Dinhata	14536	91	8	83
Dubrajpur	20381	82	96	-14
Dum Dum	33604	70	29	41
Durgapur	311798	3	50	-47

English Bazar	84665	29	6	23
Garulia	57061	50	57	-7
Gayeshpur	41667	61	83	-22
Ghatal	35443	66	93	-27
Gobardanga	27033	76	59	17
Habra	74434	37	90	-53
Haldibari	7130	99	1	98
Halishahar	95579	24	72	-48
Haora	744429	2	40	-38
Hugli Chinsurah	· 125193	15	24	-9
Jalpaiguri	61743	44	16	28
Jangipur	43795	60	48	12
Jaynagar Mazilpur	16343	86	14	72
Jhalda	13194	93	4	89
Jiaganj-Azimganj	32725	71	87	-16
Kalimpong	28885	75	11	64
Kalna	35023	67	21	46
Kalyani	38334	64	3	61
Kamarhati	234951	5	49	-44
Kanchrapara	88798	27	79	-52
Kandi	32581	72	62	10
Katwa	44430	58	76	-18
Kharagpur	150475	12	81	-69
Kharar	8369	98	100	-2
Khardaha	50202	53	41	12
Khirpai	9552	96	99	-3
Koch Bihar	62127	43	15	28
Kolkata	4126846	1	10	-9
Konnagar	51211	52	13	39
Krishnanagar	98141	22	37	-15
Kurseong	18008	84	2	82
Mathabhanga	11053	95	17	78
Medinipur	86118	28	36	-8
Mekliganj	4534	101	9	92
Murshidabad	21341	81	64	17
Nabadwip	109108	18	61	-43
Naihati	114607	17	63	-46
New Barrackpur	46530	56	34	22
North Barrackpur	81758	31	51	-20
North Dum Dum	96418	23	75	-52
Old Malda	8579	97	46	51
Panihati	205718	7	23	-16
Puruliya	73904	38	53	-15
Raghunathpur	15606	89	94	-5
Raiganj	60343	45	52	-7
Rajpur	43985	59	43	16
Ramjibanpur	12308	94	101	-7

Rampurhat	34593	68	27	41
Ranaghat	58356	48	32	16
Raniganj	48702	54	44	10
Rishra	81001	33	60	-27
Sainthia	24081	80	12	68
Santipur	82980	30	92	-62
Serampur	127304	14	39	-25
Siliguri	154378	11	38	-27
Sonamukhi	19890	83	67	16
South Dum Dum	230266	6	85	-79
Suri	40783	62	18	44
Taki	24673	79	66	13
Tamluk	29367	74	28	46
Tarakeswar	16518	85	47	38
Titagarh	104534	20	80	-60
Tufanganj	4906	100	7	93
Uttarpara-Kotrung	79598	34	26	8

TABLE: 9
Deviation Between Rank According to Population and Rank According to
Development Index of Urban Local Bodies in West Bengal:1991

Urban Local Bodies	Population in 1991	Rank According to Population	Rank according to Development Index	Deviation in ranks
Alipur Duar	65241	52	37	15
Arambagh	45211	67	70	-3
Asansol	262188	7	56	-49
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	96747	39	64	-25
Baduria	41762	71	97	-26
Baharampur	115144	27	29	-2
Baidyabati	90081	42	75	-33
Bally	184474	12	79	-67
Balurghat	119796	26	61	-35
Bangaon	79571	45	93	-48
Bankura	114876	28	5	23
Bansberia	94698	40	92	-52
Baranagar	224821	10	43	-33
Barasat	102660	32	58	-26
Bardhaman	245079	8	46	-38
Barrackpur	133265	20	32	-12
Baruipur	37659	76	17	59
Basirhat	101409	33	95	-62
Beldanga	20249	87	31	56
Bhadreshwar	72474	49	68	-19
Bhatpara	315976	4	81	-77
Birnagar	20015	89	54	35
Bishnupur	56128	58	91	-33
Bolpur	52760	64	55	9
Budge Budge	72951	48	76	-28
Chakdaha	74769	46	85	-39
Champdani	101067	35	63	-28
Chandannagar	120378	25	49	-24
Chandrakona	16804	94	50	44
Contai	53484	63	38	25
Dainhat	20349	86	99	-13
Darjeeling	73062	47	19	28
Dhulian	33191	78	101	-23
Dinhata	17697	91	6	85
Dubrajpur	26983	82	98	-16
Dum Dum	40961	72	7	65
Durgapur	425836	3	62	-59
English Bazar	139204	18	26	-8
Garulia	80918	44	67	-23
Gayeshpur	52158	65	11	54

Ghatal	43770	68	77	-9
Gobardanga	35939	77	66	11
Habra	100223	37	83	-46
Haldibari	10870	99	4	95
Halishahar	114028	30	88	-58
Haora	950435	2	59	-57
Hugli Chinsurah	151806	15	34	-19
Jalpaiguri	68732	51	18	33
Jangipur	55981	59	65	-6
Jaynagar Mazilpur	20217	88	12	56
Jhalda	17217	93	25	68
Jiaganj-Azimganj	42104	70	80	-10
Kalimpong	38832	74	8	66
Kalna	47229	66	9	75
Kalyani	55579	60	16	44
Kamarhati	266889	6	69	-63
Kanchrapara	100194	38	86	-48
Kandi	39652	73	39	34
Katwa	55541	61	82	-21
Kharagpur	177989	13	94	-81
Kharar	10314	100	90	10
Khardaha	88358	43	23	20
Khirpai	12199	98	74	24
Koch Bihar	71215	50	30	20
Kolkata	4399819	1	20	-19
Konnagar	62200	55	28	27
Krishnanagar	121100	24	44	-20
Kurseong	26758	83	2	81
Mathabhanga	17336	92	3	89
Medinipur	125498	22	48	-26
Mekliganj	8205	101	22	79
Murshidabad	30327	80	33	47
Nabadwip	125037	23	89	-66
Naihati	132701	21	72	-51
New Barrackpur	63795	53	15	38
North Barrackpur	100606	36	52	-16
North Dum Dum	149965	17	84	-67
Old Malda	13021	97	41	56
Panihati	275990	5	27	-22
Puruliya	92386	41	45	-4
Raghunathpur	19187	90	87	3
Raiganj	151045	16	35	-19
Rajpur	60175	57	57	0
Ramjibanpur	14904	96	96	0
Rampurhat	43275	69	14	55
Ranaghat	62532	54	40	14
Raniganj	61997	56	42	14

95

Rishra	102815	31	73	-4
Sainthia	30024	81	10	7
Santipur	169956	14	100	-8
Serampur	137028	19	47	-2
Siliguri	216950	11	36	-2
Sonamukhi	24640	84	60	24
South Dum Dum	232811	9	51	-4
Suri	54298	62	21	4
Taki	30421	79	71	8
Tamluk	38688	75	13	6
Tarakeswar	22632	85	53	32
Titagarh	114085	29	78	-49
Tufanganj	16418	95	1	94
Uttarpara-Kotrung	101268	34	24	10

TABLE: 10
Indicatorwise Performance of the Urban Local Bodies in West Bengal: (1981)

Urban Local Bodies	Road length per sq.km.	Road lighting points per km.of road	No of hospital beds per 5000 population	No.of medical institutes per 5000 population	No. of educational institute per 5000 population
Alipur Duar	7.49	4.95	24.82	0.55	4.74
Arambagh	1.55	15.05	36.54	0.44	3.36
Asansol	6.84	11.08	13.74	0.46	2.45
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	15.21	2.00	0.91	0.18	4.17
Baduria	4.09	0.88	7.69	0.31	5.54
Baharampur	4.10	32.38	37.14	0.27	4.52
Baidyabati	6.69	28.39	0.84	0.14	2.45
Bally	6.86	27.19	4.50	0.24	1.22
Balurghat	10.28	9.15	14.33	0.24	2.44
Bangaon	8.99	6.98	17.89	0.07	3.29
Bankura	4.36	17.42	33.75	0.84	4.11
Bansberia	2.62	30.63	0.00	0.06	2.82
Baranagar	17.05	22.21	4.99	0.38	0.91
Barasat	10.11	3.31	32.78	0.38	3.31
Bardhaman	3.85	51.55	18.82	0.18	3.41
Barrackpur	6.53	92.07	0.00	0.13	1.56
Baruipur	3.69	9.37	11.44	1.53	2.29
Basirhat	6.13	6.30	12.34	0.12	3.08
Beldanga	5.78	5.22	7.92	0.95	3.49
Bhadreshwar	10.45	13.49	0.00	0.34	1.95
Bhatpara	9.09	22.08	2.24	0.21	2.17
Birnagar	7.99	4.03	2.06	0.69	4.80
Bishnupur	2.50	10.96	21.04	0.11	4.63
Bolpur	4.39	12.14	8.33	0.52	3.12
Budge Budge	6.62	25.00	3.01	0.38	1.13
Chakdaha	8.61	4.06	4.22	0.17	4.47
Champdani	7.19	25.26	5.12	0.20	1.64
Chandannagar	10.84	25.97	12.26	0.20	2.70
Chandrakona	4.04	1.22	22.37	0.75	6.34
Contai	12.77	2.52	17.47	0.42	3.91
Dainhat	2.70	4.57	0.00	0.32	5.37
Darjeeling	5.77	19.68	25.52	1.13	4.60
Dhulian	3.13	5.31	2.95	0.20	2.55
Dinhata	5.46	14.89	41.28	0.34	4.47
Dubrajpur	2.38	4.85	6.13	0.49	2.70

Dum Dum	18.82	7.70	2.08	0.15	2.08
Durgapur	4.36	15.01	16.93	0.45	1.99
English Bazar	15.67	15.67	43.35	0.59	4.84
Garulia	8.02	19.52	0.00	0.44	0.96
Gayeshpur	3.33	0.00	0.00	0.24	3.24
Ghatal	6.56	2.35	18.48	0.14	3.95
Gobardanga	8.20	4.18	6.47	0.37	4.44
Habra	4.00	1.39	12.83	0.07	2.28
Haldibari	6.97	16.53	35.06	1.40	7.71
Halishahar	8.70	22.22	0.52	0.10	3.71
Haora	4.58	28.82	5.72	0.15	3.00
Hugli Chinsurah	13.42	8.36	46.17	0.12	1.56
Jalpaiguri	7.40	10.58	44.94	0.49	5.26
Jangipur	5.23	8.93	22.83	0.23	3.77
Jaynagar Mazilpur	7.92	7.56	3.06	2.14	5.20
Jhalda	2.03	23.19	9.47	1.52	6.44
Jiaganj-Azimganj	6.33	6.54	7.64	0.46	2.90
Kalimpong	2.42	23.81	60.59	1.38	2.42
Kalna	7.26	13.83	17.13	1.43	4.43
Kalyani	9.49	8.77	97.82	0.39	0.91
Kamarhati	14.19	17.00	10.28	0.11	2.06
Kanchrapara	10.75	6.57	3.38	0.11	3.32
Kandi	4.22	8.21	23.33	0.31	4.45
Katwa	4.76	12.05	11.25	0.34	2.93
Kharagpur	2.08	15.89	14.85	0.13	2.09
Kharar	4.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.38
Khardaha	12.74	20.22	11.45	0.30	2.99
Koch Bihar	8.20	17.06	36.14	0.16	5.15
Kolkata	7.07	64.29	16.65	0.33	2.81
Konnagar	26.56	9.71	1.95	0.78	3.03
Krishnanagar	10.00	13.67	25.98	0.15	4.59
Khirpai	3.00	0.89	5.23	0.52	4.71
Kurseong	4.14	0.05	96.35	0.83	3.05
Mathabhanga	6.89	11.74	11.31	0.90	3.17
Medinipur	13.13	12.50	31.93	0.17	5.81
Mekliganj	1.55	19.17	27.57	2.21	4.41
Murshidabad	4.48	5.48	30.69	0.23	5.39
Nabadwip	7.93	8.52	5.68	0.14	7.19
Naihati	8.37	29.12	0.87	0.17	2.05
New Barrackpur	3.70	3.18	2.79	1.72	3.65
North Barrackpur	16.63	10.93	0.00	0.55	3.00
North Dum Dum	4.12	18.80	0.93	0.16	3.06
Old Malda	4.91	10.05	8.16	0.58	6.99
Panihati	6.44	31.91	9.72	0.56	2.21
Puruliya	4.48	16.17	19.01	0.41	4.74
Raghunathpur	1.12	17.30	3.20	0.32	5.77
Raiganj	6.05	19.16	8.70	0.33	2.98

Urban Local Bodies	Total no. of cultural and recreational institutes per 5000 population	Decadal growth rate of population	Percentage of literates to total population	Percentage of main workers to total population	Percentage of households having toilet facility
Rajpur	3.69	15.81	5.68	0.23	2.50
Ramjibanpur	2.03	3.24	4.06	0.41	5.28
Rampurhat	7.45	12.11	18.93	0.58	3.18
Ranaghat	5.15	22.57	33.07	0.17	2.31
Raniganj	3.15	38.72	16.84	0.41	2.36
Rishra	8.02	18.46	8.33	0.19	1.36
Sainthia	2.54	11.85	24.92	2.70	1.87
Santipur	3.99	12.76	3.01	0.12	2.95
Serampur	14.93	23.78	21.05	0.12	2.16
Siliguri	7.55	17.22	10.11	0.87	1.98
Sonamukhi	2.49	14.46	7.79	0.25	6.28
South Dum Dum	7.42	18.25	0.87	0.04	1.59
Suri	4.78	22.22	49.04	0.25	3.07
Taki	1.87	10.55	10.13	0.61	5.07
Tamluk	3.03	11.37	25.20	1.53	3.75
Tarakeswar	4.87	6.74	7.57	0.61	1.51
Titagarh	10.06	22.73	1.10	0.10	1.20
Tufanganj	8.84	18.12	25.48	1.02	4.08
Uttarpara-Kotrung	7.86	34.77	12.81	0.82	2.89

Urban Local Bodies	Total no. of cultural and recreational institutes per 5000 population	Decadal growth rate of population	Percentage of literates to total population	Percentage of main workers to total population	Percentage of households having toilet facility
Alipur Duar	0.44	23.61	67.26	26.44	70.37
Arambagh	0.73	33.66	46.96	29.50	31.49
Asansol	0.35	17.57	63.41	23.52	79.22
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	0.09	31.63	76.69	22.37	78.87
Baduria	0.46	17.62	43.86	25.50	31.05
Baharampur	1.13	27.94	66.46	24.67	72.78
Baidyabati	0.14	30.38	66.78	24.22	77.30
Bally	0.20		64.41	34.01	78.65
Balurghat	0.24	55.98	68.63	24.51	74.96
Bangaon	0.43	38.28	60.47	24.18	73.60
Bankura	0.32	20.00	59.86	26.30	44.45
Bansberia	0.51	24.73	56.66	27.20	66.32
Baranagar	1.06	24.48	75.59	27.98	90.59
Barasat	1.58	55.96	62.18	26.41	77.29
Bardhaman	0.27	16.78	62.44	25.71	70.23
Barrackpur	0.39	18.95	68.92	27.72	86.59
Baruipur	1.33	27.94	70.35	24.21	74.57
Basirhat	0.80	26.99	58.15	25.10	55.00
Beldanga	1.27	61.02	54.44	25.18	50.80
Bhadreshwar	1.27	29.11	50.55	29.38	76.34
Bhatpara	0.55	27.36	48.66	32.54	84.12

Birnagar	1.03	38.08	53.15	24.98	50.63
Bishnupur	0.63	24.63	56.97	25.48	29.88
Bolpur	0.52	29.69	53.15	26.92	43.59
Budge Budge	0.30	30.14	53.34	31.53	72.08
Chakdaha	0.25	27.97	64.40	23.11	66.11
Champdani	0.79	29.94	48.11	31.55	70.57
Chandannagar	0.59	35.47	68.64	26.60	85.74
Chandrakona	1.12	369.68	45.33	26.28	12.02
Contai	0.98	30.80	59.38	24.19	43.84
Dainhat	0.32	22.76	45.58	24.77	36.54
Darjeeling	2.34	34.36	66.13	28.63	56.23
Dhulian	1.18	15.40	27.97	33.69	19.68
Dinhata	1.38	23.85	71.36	25.67	88.15
Dubrajpur	0.49	29.02	39.28	23.62	20.89
Dum Dum	1.49	7.15	71.47	28.29	91.76
Durgapur	0.37	50.89	67.76	26.65	74.32
English Bazar	0.65	38.04	61.88	23.38	79.71
Garulia	1.58	28.89	51.93	25.62	80.97
Gayeshpur	0.12	95.70	63.67	22.94	63.92
Ghatal	0.28	28.56	56.44	25.46	24.32
Gobardanga	1.29	336.93	62.32	23.87	55.52
Habra	1.01	44.71	66.96	24.29	76.06
Haldibari	6.31	39.86	58.91	28.84	52.19
Halishahar	0.21	38.71	53.97	29.68	77.39
Haora	0.93	17.23	65.07	30.37	87.11
Hugli Chinsurah	1.64	18.96	72.41	24.49	82.52
Jalpaiguri	1.62	11.94	67.94	28.98	80.04
Jangipur	2.17	46.61	38.35	26.98	45.05
Jaynagar Mazilpur	2.45	7.39	63.51	24.19	64.41
Jhalda	4.17	12.32	51.64	28.93	31.99
Jiaganj-Azimganj	0.61	23.33	54.81	24.87	46.06
Kalimpong	0.69	23.28	62.43	26.42	42.27
Kalna	1.43	22.48	59.14	25.54	62.04
Kalyani	0.26	109.36	55.98	30.14	63.39
Kamarhati	0.36	38.69	68.24	27.47	88.26
Kanchrapara	0.62	12.73	64.48	24.83	83.16
Kandi	1.07	24.24	46.59	22.96	38.59
Katwa	0.68	54.10	44.75	18.26	73.92
Kharagpur	0.47	71.34	57.93	23.28	69.26
Kharar	1.19	15.24	49.27	25.30	13.79
Khardaha	0.90	36.87	67.57	22.08	86.89
Koch Bihar	0.89	15.43	68.79	26.15	90.94
Kolkata	0.42	11.04	68.28	33.38	91.47
Konnagar	0.98	48.77	67.31	27.06	85.53
Krishnanagar	0.61	14.22	69.42	25.04	79.76
Khirpai	1.05	35.01	43.93	29.33	15.00
Kurseong	1.94	9.64	71.02	26.34	64.07

Urban Local Bodies	Percentage of households having electricity facility	Percentage of households having drinking water facility	Percentage of main workers engaged in non agricultural activity to total main workers	10 minus no of person living in each residential house	No of banks per 50000 population
Mathabhanga	1.81	20.57	68.12	29.46	75.16
Medinipur	0.35	20.74	67.01	24.81	72.72
Mekliganj	1.10	20.04	52.73	28.36	58.05
Murshidabad	0.94	24.73	49.55	22.44	49.62
Nabadwip	1.10	15.82	63.04	26.29	72.25
Naihati	0.39	39.63	54.04	27.51	79.06
New Barrackpur	1.07	43.12	78.53	22.75	86.58
North Barrackpur	0.43	23.05	75.29	23.39	90.62
North Dum Dum	0.36	50.95	73.56	24.45	88.99
Old Malda	0.58	28.22	50.66	19.98	38.72
Panihati	1.90	38.96	71.68	25.99	90.59
Puruliya	0.54	28.07	56.56	24.85	49.47
Raghunathpur	0.64	22.68	42.63	23.51	32.51
Raiganj	0.75	39.71	66.10	24.44	78.69
Rajpur	2.73	27.89	64.84	24.44	70.17
Ramjibanpur	0.41	18.76	41.92	24.72	8.73
Rampurhat	0.72	45.53	50.82	26.23	48.24
Ranaghat	0.77	22.05	70.99	26.17	86.98
Raniganj	0.51	21.44	54.86	27.40	53.77
Rishra	0.49	27.59	54.98	31.65	90.60
Sainthia	0.62	51.18	48.47	25.66	32.73
Santipur	0.66	35.66	50.19	29.16	58.85
Serampur	0.39	24.78	67.17	29.14	87.58
Siliguri	0.36	58.36	62.15	31.43	78.77
Sonamukhi	0.50	4.83	56.48	25.86	28.90
South Dum Dum	0.89	32.08	72.82	27.91	90.93
Suri	0.49	35.45	59.15	26.12	53.33
Taki	1.22	17.88	50.89	24.86	49.27
Tamluk	1.02	30.65	62.04	25.37	54.60
Tarakeswar	0.91	38.12	54.00	29.21	47.54
Titagarh	0.96	18.50	46.79	34.37	73.66
Tufanganj	2.04	16.56	70.87	26.91	79.33
Uttarpara-Kotrung	0.94	17.80	76.54	26.87	88.71
Alipur Duar	39.69	78.33	96.67	3.99	0.55
Arambagh	35.42	93.35	56.46	4.48	0.58
Asansol	64.27	42.03	95.90	4.32	0.55
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	40.33	95.13	97.95	4.61	0.27

Baduria	7.49	97.78	54.50	3.99	0.46
Baharampur	55.61	80.00	22.46	3.73	0.81
Baidyabati	53.62	90.06	94.80	4.16	0.63
Bally	36.15	75.07	99.72	5.44	0.37
Balurghat	27.75	61.60	87.40	3.46	0.33
Bangaon	31.96	91.10	85.61	4.12	0.29
Bankura	66.40	81.38	95.92	3.99	0.58
Bansberia	42.40	93.64	98.84	4.97	0.26
Baranagar	68.32	73.08	99.84	4.86	0.23
Barasat	31.60	91.31	91.59	4.41	0.53
Bardhaman	50.34	85.63	89.95	4.46	0.27
Barrackpur	52.33	83.68	99.76	4.66	0.26
Baruipur	54.46	92.72	94.43	4.24	0.76
Basirhat	25.07	85.11	79.33	3.98	0.37
Beldanga	40.18	81.59	79.89	4.44	0.95
Bhadreshwar	26.69	93.88	99.20	5.14	0.08
Bhatpara	39.64	87.71	99.80	4.98	0.08
Birnagar	29.32	90.72	65.80	3.86	0.34
Bishnupur	52.74	13.48	92.95	4.25	0.42
Bolpur	33.66	54.71	87.77	4.44	0.78
Budge Budge	73.02	86.54	99.10	5.37	0.38
Chakdaha	29.38	90.70	87.50	4.20	0.34
Champdani	26.27	94.81	99.53	5.43	0.13
Chandannagar	79.26	95.66	99.55	4.34	0.34
Chandrakona	12.24	9.07	41.17	3.97	0.75
Contai	29.64	88.92	85.93	4.12	0.70
Dainhat	19.76	96.50	68.43	4.55	0.32
Darjeeling	68.36	83.70	99.39	4.54	0.78
Dhulian	12.81	90.50	99.08	3.18	0.79
Dinhata	72.29	72.29	88.29	3.96	1.38
Dubrajpur	24.09	20.33	75.92	4.39	0.74
Dum Dum	75.77	94.05	99.99	4.53	0.89
Durgapur	67.03	67.99	95.18	5.50	0.22
English Bazar	73.22	77.53	98.00	3.38	0.65
Garulia	33.40	89.88	99.75	5.24	0.18
Gayeshpur	45.40	91.90	87.03	4.63	0.36
Ghatal	15.19	96.18	58.16	3.51	0.99
Gobardanga	27.91	95.18	85.08	4.57	0.18
Habra	28.41	90.52	87.30	4.14	0.20
Haldibari	67.15	7.66	83.07	4.64	0.70
Halishahar	43.92	89.15	97.93	5.01	0.16
Haora	60.35	77.33	99.33	4.88	0.84
Hugli Chinsurah	47.46	91.89	98.96	4.34	0.36
Jalpaiguri	50.73	34.80	96.77	4.40	0.73
Jangipur	49.89	80.82	94.73	3.68	0.23
Jaynagar Mazilpur	55.34	95.73	84.82	4.20	0.31
Jhalda	36.44	.7.20	96.96	4.43	1.89

Jiaganj-Azimganj	35.18	68.09	87.82	3.47	0.61
Kalimpong	42.47	66.47	93.54	4.44	0.69
Kalna	39.70	84.93	86.59	4.28	0.71
Kalyani	51.12	95.02	91.45	5.20	0.52
Kamarhati	56.03	83.37	99.73	4.70	0.21
Kanchrapara	69.87	90.44	99.45	4.49	0.23
Kandi	33.25	92.33	68.65	4.24	0.77
Katwa	65.84	75.96	95.58	2.45	0.45
Kharagpur	45.79	20.70	92.51	4.20	0.33
Kharar	13.45	98.62	42.28	4.22	0.60
Khardaha	58.95	80.51	99.13	3.83	0.10
Koch Bihar	81.29	93.10	99.11	4.04	0.80
Kolkata	80.41	89.67	99.20	4.43	0.87
Konnagar	53.63	82.94	99.92	5.18	0.29
Krishnanagar	64.79	84.34	95.12	4.05	0.56
Khirpai	8.13	100.00	25.80	4.04	0.00
Kurseong	85.71	85.86	99.56	4.80	0.83
Mathabhanga	60.27	75.40	96.71	4.56	1.36
Medinipur	55.58	59.82	94.57	4.14	0.58
Mekliganj	60.92	12.07	83.51	4.63	1.10
Murshidabad	31.90	75.19	68.69	4.19	0.47
Nabadwip	48.78	70.50	96.46	4.16	0.27
Naihati	47.63	82.60	99.60	4.05	0.22
New Barrackpur	40.77	82.19	98.58	4.00	0.21
North Barrackpur	49.98	84.23	99.51	4.78	0.18
North Dum Dum	46.93	82.21	98.60	4.40	0.26
Old Malda	87.54	81.48	90.26	4.27	0.58
Panihati	47.86	81.34	99.38	4.75	0.22
Puruliya	42.82	64.73	95.52	3.99	0.68
Raghunathpur	31.26	41.82	74.71	3.51	0.32
Raiganj	59.83	65.22	95.27	3.97	0.41
Rajpur	61.20	91.16	92.23	4.32	0.34
Ramjibanpur	18.20	59.85	36.29	3.83	0.41
Rampurhat	50.51	98.51	81.51	4.33	1.30
Ranaghat	62.08	81.80	98.40	4.35	0.60
Raniganj	43.89	70.43	96.70	3.83	0.82
Rishra	42.95	81.54	99.86	5.31	0.37
Sainthia	27.45	54.11	90.40	4.47	1.04
Santipur	35.23	63.93	93.50	4.17	0.36
Serampur	53.98	82.86	99.66	5.03	0.08
Siliguri	58.38	17.54	99.45	4.53	0.42
Sonamukhi	78.54	27.18	80.13	4.24	1.26
South Dum Dum	61.73	89.44	99.67	4.88	0.20
Suri	47.61	57.83	93.96	3.82	1.23
Taki	23.62	89.38	81.27	4.43	0.61
Tamluk	35.40	84.40	87.69	4.12	0.85
Tarakeswar	33.60	94.14	84.73	4.77	1.51

Titagarh	27.73	90.61	99.06	5.75	0.19
Tufanganj	58.10	67.04	95.76	4.09	1.02
Uttarpara-Kotrung	71.17	14.16	99.58	4.88	0.44

TABLE: II
Indicatorwise Performance of the Urban Local Bodies in West Bengal: (1991)

Urban Local Bodies	Road length per sq.km.	Road lighting points per km.of road	No of hospital beds per 5000 population	No.of medical institutes per 5000 population	No. of educational institute per 5000 population
Alipur Duar	12.82	7.69	17.24	0.38	3.60
Arambagh	1.58	11.47	27.65	0.33	3.43
Asansol	16.39	6.59	12.89	0.32	2.54
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	6.78	5.44	1.03	0.10	4.50
Baduria	3.97	1.12	11.97	0.24	5.27
Baharampur	5.58	39.87	26.75	0.22	5.38
Baidyabati	9.94	22.20	0.44	0.11	2.61
Bally	6.97	24.30	4.07	0.19	2.20
Balurghat	10.93	19.37	18.78	0.21	2.80
Bangaon	6.68	10.58	4.40	0.06	4.21
Bankura	2.85	110.59	36.13	0.70	4.31
Bansberia	5.27	22.43	0.00	0.05	2.96
Baranagar	17.19	24.46	4.00	0.29	2.67
Barasat	8.28	5.09	17.05	0.24	2.78
Bardhaman	3.84	52.01	12.85	0.12	3.24
Barrackpur	14.59	67.86	5.63	0.11	2.63
Baruipur	3.86	23.83	13.28	1.06	3.05
Basirhat	6.13	5.56	9.86	0.10	3.01
Beldanga	5.38	16.64	13.83	0.74	3.21
Bhadreshwar	16.92	9.27	0.00	0.28	2.41
Bhatpara	14.53	18.99	5.54	0.17	2.14
Birnagar	11.78	9.77	2.00	0.50	4.75
Bishnupur	2.73	11.60	18.71	0.09	3.92
Bolpur	6.93	24.18	6.07	0.38	3.13

Budge Budge	5.64	27.58	1.71	0.34	1.03
Chakdaha	8.60	10.26	2.01	0.13	4.15
Champdani	10.28	24.47	2.47	0.15	2.67
Chandannagar	14.38	23.90	11.63	0.17	3.49
Chandrakona	4.04	3.99	35.71	0.60	6.25
Contai	12.77	2.75	11.69	0.28	3.37
Dainhat	0.03	5.08	0.00	0.25	4.91
Darjeeling	6.05	25.78	32.03	0.89	4.79
Dhulian	4.20	10.74	2.26	0.15	3.16
Dinhata	7.36	12.50	48.03	0.28	7.06
Dubrajpur	3.09	8.37	0.00	0.37	2.96
Dum Dum	35.47	3.36	12.21	0.12	5.74
Durgapur	2.87	32.78	13.14	0.33	1.82
English Bazar	14.13	17.58	19.04	0.36	4.09
Garulia	8.35	5.55	1.73	0.31	0.93
Gayeshpur	10.50	2.23	114.56	0.19	3.07
Ghatal	13.51	3.42	14.96	0.11	4.91
Gobardanga	9.85	7.35	1.39	0.28	5.01
Habra	5.64	11.54	12.47	0.05	2.89
Haldibari	15.86	10.52	13.80	0.92	7.36
Halishahar	9.42	21.79	0.44	0.09	3.16
Haora	9.35	16.53	4.48	0.12	3.61
Hugli Chinsurah	17.06	2.53	18.77	0.10	4.05
Jalpaiguri	7.41	16.33	43.65	0.44	2.91
Jangipur	7.12	18.77	22.33	0.18	3.22
Jaynagar Mazilpur	7.92	10.98	7.42	1.73	6.18
Jhalda	4.36	12.13	4.36	1.16	7.84
Jiaganj-Azimganj	6.35	10.61	5.94	0.36	4.63
Kalimpong	2.73	40.13	52.79	1.03	5.92
Kalna	45.75	2.64	14.93	1.06	4.45
Kalyani	9.27	10.84	67.47	0.27	2.07
Kamarhati	17.86	9.45	8.99	0.09	2.64
Kanchrapara	10.72	14.39	2.99	0.10	3.39
Kandi	4.25	13.64	32.79	0.25	6.30
Katwa	6.61	0.04	13.50	0.27	3.78
Kharagpur	2.77	9.96	11.07	0.11	3.65
Kharar	4.92	2.65	0.00	0.00	6.79
Khardaha	3.42	68.51	6.51	0.17	2.49
Koch Bihar	7.00	35.90	28.08	0.14	6.11
Kolkata	9.32	6.27	15.99	0.28	3.27
Konnagar	31.18	9.07	2.41	0.64	3.22
Krishnanagar	10.20	15.35	21.97	0.12	4.54
Khirpai	3.00	11.14	4.10	0.41	5.74
Kurseong	4.14	25.86	74.74	0.56	5.42
Mathabhanga	13.76	15.27	34.61	0.58	5.19
Medinipur	13.26	12.73	24.58	0.12	4.94
Mekliganj	4.69	11.21	12.19	1.22	5.48

Murshidabad	2.11	34.40	41.22	0.16	6.76
Nabadwip	9.75	10.56	8.24	0.12	4.56
Naihati	15.38	13.33	1.88	0.15	2.68
New Barrackpur	7.03	8.29	2.04	1.25	3.68
North Barrackpur	16.63	13.55	6.21	0.45	4.03
North Dum Dum	6.18	16.67	0.63	0.10	2.70
Old Malda	5.85	12.41	5.38	0.38	7.30
Panihati	15.67	14.14	7.43	0.42	2.84
Puruliya	4.62	32.14	18.94	0.32	4.65
Raghunathpur	1.12	28.24	3.91	0.26	6.51
Raiganj	6.90	25.51	5.56	0.13	1.82
Rajpur	1.48	41.94	4.15	0.17	2.83
Ramjibanpur	2.70	3.57	3.35	0.34	6.37
Rampurhat	45.49	3.02	15.02	0.46	3.47
Ranaghat	9.07	25.71	19.27	0.16	5.04
Raniganj	3.15	52.95	12.82	0.32	2.90
Rishra	14.35	12.28	6.57	0.15	2.53
Sainthia	2.76	28.65	16.65	2.16	3.50
Santipur	4.39	23.93	3.85	0.06	1.71
Serampur	22.34	17.35	19.59	0.11	3.07
Siliguri	9.62	22.69	14.98	0.62	2.44
Sonamukhi	3.78	14.91	4.06	0.20	6.70
South Dum Dum	11.96	21.59	0.69	0.04	2.08
Suri	7.19	24.80	47.88	0.18	4.60
Taki	3.38	8.90	8.22	0.49	4.77
Tamluk	3.09	12.50	19.13	1.16	4.78
Tarakeswar	5.41	22.75	5.52	0.44	1.99
Titagarh	8.95	25.76	2.19	0.09	2.06
Tufanganj	64.77	2.63	7.61	0.30	6.40
Uttarpara-Kotrung	9.91	30.69	10.07	0.64	2.02
Urban Local Bodies	Total no. of cultural and recreational institutes per 5000 population	Decadal growth rate of population	Percentage of literates to total population	Percentage of main workers to total population	Percentage of households having electricity facility
Alipur Duar	0.54	43.94	72.39	30.33	78.22
Arambagh	0.66	32.18	53.60	29.90	33.13
Asansol	0.31	42.98	65.24	26.38	70.48
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	0.88	75.34	73.78	25.84	45.09
Baduria	0.60	28.42	52.33	28.24	29.30
Baharampur	0.39	23.96	71.71	28.01	70.23
Baidyabati	0.11	27.64	72.17	30.47	72.04
Bally	0.19	24.87	67.81	30.93	60.48
Balurghat	0.33	14.48	71.97	24.17	84.80
Bangaon	0.44	13.86	66.39	26.48	42.88

Bankura	0.48	20.98	65.07	27.64	63.10
Bansberia	0.32	21.42	62.13	26.56	54.82
Baranagar	0.47	31.98	76.44	30.88	82.47
Barasat	0.54	54.37	66.44	28.23	66.89
Bardhaman	0.31	46.43	65.73	28.57	56.75
Barrackpur	0.45	15.63	73.43	28.02	74.00
Baruipur	0.80	43.58	75.12	25.47	81.82
Basirhat	0.25	25.13	62.00	27.03	41.23
Beldanga	0.74	28.34	54.37	27.20	72.24
Bhadreshwar	0.90	23.13	58.74	28.60	39.47
Bhatpara	0.21	16.95	54.84	28.56	74.70
Birnagar	1.00	37.27	54.91	26.98	65.51
Bishnupur	0.80	18.09	60.44	29.25	51.84
Bolpur	0.95	37.27	60.33	27.22	75.48
Budge Budge	0.69	9.83	60.87	30.30	55.41
Chakdaha	0.33	26.07	72.05	26.71	72.07
Champdani	0.69	32.74	55.56	28.10	84.92
Chandannagar	0.66	18.10	72.89	28.58	76.50
Chandrakona	1.19	25.31	56.86	31.06	21.14
Contai	0.93	99.48	76.08	25.83	55.65
Dainhat	0.74	28.44	52.69	27.61	30.04
Darjeeling	0.55	26.84	74.99	24.88	78.12
Dhulian	0.30	30.33	33.70	36.27	18.18
Dinhata	1.41	21.75	72.81	29.33	81.92
Dubrajpur	0.37	32.39	46.59	28.40	49.27
Dum Dum	2.69	21.89	74.86	30.07	92.29
Durgapur	0.20	36.57	70.07	27.27	58.63
English Bazar	0.32	64.42	66.95	27.00	86.35
Garulia	1.11	41.81	62.56	24.47	88.70
Gayeshpur	0.29	25.18	70.56	23.68	77.84
Ghatal	0.69	23.49	70.27	31.55	27.84
Gobardanga	0.70	32.94	69.82	27.97	41.99
Habra	0.50	34.65	69.47	28.72	45.05
Haldibari	3.22	52.45	57.54	28.99	73.06
Halishahar	0.22	19.30	63.94	29.00	66.66
Haora	0.73	27.67	68.29	31.56	72.12
Hugli Chinsurah	1.32	21.26	75.33	26.52	80.22
Jalpaiguri	1.31	11.32	71.08	29.67	84.72
Jangipur	0.45	27.83	46.50	30.54	74.13
Jaynagar Mazilpur	1.24	23.70	65.35	25.61	77.08
Jhalda	1.16	30.49	55.81	25.71	85.87
Jiaganj-Azimganj	0.71	28.66	57.89	27.15	40.66
Kalimpong	0.77	34.44	69.88	25.73	64.60
Kalna	1.16	34.85	66.76	29.30	54.03
Kalyani	0.45	44.99	62.91	27.46	66.05
Kamarhati	0.34	13.59	67.75	28.50	73.59
Kanchrapara	0.40	12.83	66.60	25.31	67.95

Urban Local Bodies	Percentage of households	Percentage of households	Percentage of main workers	10 minus no of person	No of banks per 50000 population
Kandi	1.01	21.70	53.76	26.82	50.10
Katwa	0.63	25.01	64.44	25.74	50.09
Kharagpur	0.25	18.28	67.59	23.75	56.20
Kharar	0.97	23.24	66.24	29.37	32.77
Khardaha	0.68	76.00	76.43	25.94	75.24
Koch Bihar	0.63	14.63	70.16	27.89	85.80
Kolkata	0.37	6.61	70.18	32.84	89.32
Konnagar	0.56	21.46	75.04	28.71	75.08
Krishnanagar	0.45	23.40	72.53	28.24	80.06
Khirpai	0.41	27.71	55.92	31.94	31.10
Kurseong	1.49	48.59	75.53	24.43	89.00
Mathabhanga .	2.02	56.84	69.01	27.27	57.93
Medinipur	0.44	45.73	70.48	28.27	58.97
Mekliganj	1.22	80.97	50.94	26.89	52.34
Murshidabad	0.66	48.11	55.80	27.41	51.30
Nabadwip	0.36	14.60	67.72	30.29	51.34
Naihati	0.98	15.79	61.18	25.68	61.39
New Barrackpur	2.35	37.11	79.04	26.77	71.55
North Barrackpur	0.50	23.05	76.39	26.88	78.73
North Dum Dum	0.10	55.54	76.75	26.22	65.76
Old Malda	0.77	51.78	51.35	25.14	72.57
Panihati	1.87	34.16	79.39	27.47	70.63
Puruliya	0.60	25.01	61.12	26.32	71.44
Raghunathpur	0.52	22.95	55.40	26.28	52.64
Raiganj	0.36	150.31	69.37	26.38	84.78
Rajpur	0.50	36.81	74.55	26.79	63.76
Ramjibanpur	1.01	21.09	62.42	31.44	36.21
Rampurhat	0.58	25.10	60.21	25.88	68.79
Ranaghat	0.80	7.16	75.03	26.88	80.16
Raniganj	0.48	27.30	60.64	28.48	58.88
Rishra	0.15	26.93	63.60	29.48	66.86
Sainthia	0.67	24.68	53.02	28.21	50.86
Santipur	0.50	32.51	32.98	19.94	69.67
Serampur	0.40	7.64	71.82	29.84	72.99
Siliguri	0.48	40.53	64.80	33.32	70.93
Sonamukhi	0.41	23.88	68.19	28.02	91.12
South Dum Dum	2.26	1.11	77.79	29.75	81.02
Suri	0.55	33.14	62.84	26.67	61.08
Taki	0.82	23.30	57.68	26.77	29.39
Tamluk	1.81	31.74	69.17	28.72	74.02
Tarakeswar	0.88	37.01	63.68	30.21	45.94
Titagarh	0.88	9.14	52.08	29.81	80.89
Tufanganj	1.22	234.65	73.34	28.57	83.58
Uttarpara-Kotrung ↱	0.94	27.22	75.66	31.67	80.00

	having toilet facility	having drinking water facility	engaged in non agricultural activity to total main workers	living in each residential house	
Alipur Duar	81.92	85.86	93.92	3.66	0.54
Arambagh	36.01	97.90	57.28	4.55	0.55
Asansol	80.46	77.16	98.73	4.10	0.55
Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh	82.90	95.98	88.31	4.83	0.16
Baduria	44.83	99.46	61.38	4.35	0.00
Baharampur	78.46	96.39	97.88	4.79	0.48
Baidyabati	81.44	82.66	96.48	4.83	0.50
Bally	85.20	89.12	99.79	5.15	0.27
Balurghat	85.18	84.15	82.57	4.57	0.29
Bangaon	76.32	95.05	82.19	4.47	0.31
Bankura	49.61	89.96	96.81	4.35	0.57
Bansberia	69.50	97.72	99.45	4.93	0.26
Baranagar	94.04	83.08	99.90	4.97	0.42
Barasat	80.94	94.47	95.23	4.97	0.39
Bardhaman	70.30	92.81	92.73	4.68	0.47
Barrackpur	92.92	87.58	99.68	5.01	0.26
Baruipur	90.88	94.68	93.41	4.76	0.66
Basirhat	65.81	96.85	83.91	4.65	0.35
Beldanga	72.11	91.52	85.40	4.49	0.99
Bhadreshwar	81.67	98.04	99.22	5.05	0.14
Bhatpara	86.30	91.19	99.64	4.46	0.08
Birnagar	79.50	99.86	67.47	4.25	0.50
Bishnupur	39.45	37.27	92.20	4.47	0.53
Bolpur	53.36	65.62	88.80	4.74	0.66
Budge Budge	76.35	90.40	96.40	5.33	0.41
Chakdaha	82.21	96.14	90.57	4.61	0.27
Champdani	92.09	96.57	99.17	4.67	0.10
Chandannagar	91.11	96.11	99.81	4.88	0.33
Chandrakona	22.10	86.65	55.28	4.64	0.60
Contai	54.88	91.07	86.22	2.56	0.47
Dainhat	36.81	97.29	69.21	4.56	0.25
Darjeeling	44.82	63.84	97.53	4.48	0.75
Dhulian	30.09	94.18	97.12	4.00	0.30
Dinhata	91.04	91.19	98.81	4.63	1.41
Dubrajpur	20.23	50.84	82.33	4.22	0.56
Dum Dum	94.47	91.90	99.68	4.75	0.85
Durgapur	65.82	68.30	92.36	5.33	0.47
English Bazar	80.10	93.00	97.91	4.83	0.40
Garulia	92.19	85.32	99.82	4.37	0.19
Gayeshpur	75.71	97.46	83.38	4.69	0.29
Ghatal	33.90	99.79	67.29	3.78	0.80

Gobardanga	75.39	95.99	87.25	4.92	0.42
Habra	74.36	95.00	91.04	4.52	0.25
Haldibari	65.98	15.53	80.83	5.05	0.92
Halishahar	89.97	95.31	99.02	5.03	0.00
Haora	93.32	88.59	99.33	4.90	0.66
Hugli Chinsurah	89.30	95.95	99.87	4.81	0.46
Jalpaiguri	87.20	61.09	96.86	4.86	0.73
Jangipur	56.83	94.50	92.23	3.95	0.36
Jaynagar Mazilpur	77.73	93.54	89.34	4.22	0.74
Jhalda	41.30	77.72	91.66	3.69	0.87
Jiaganj-Azimganj	49.97	85.47	83.86	4.79	0.36
Kalimpong	59.12	57.37	85.93	4.34	0.64
Kalna	76.26	87.56	93.99	4.31	0.53
Kalyani	73.55	96.52	83.34	5.30	0.63
Kamarhati	91.45	86.89	99.67	4.59	0.24
Kanchrapara	82.10	90.22	99.59	4.59	0.20
Kandi	46.87	96.77	76.16	4.67	0.88
Katwa	72.87	92.18	92.24	4.74	0.45
Kharagpur	68.03	44.51	94.32	4.10	0.56
Kharar	54.90	99.72	58.47	3.89	0.97
Khardaha	89.99	88.48	96.93	3.90	0.28
Koch Bihar	90.92	95.97	99.45	4.73	0.21
Kolkata	94.98	94.40	99.64	4.81	0.81
Konnagar	95.78	90.26	100.00	5.37	0.24
Krishnanagar	86.52	91.97	95.62	4.58	0.58
Khirpai	35.12	99.78	39.04	4.55	1.23
Kurseong	79.30	88.67	99.86	4.09	0.75
Mathabhanga	83.66	91.34	91.47	5.07	1.15
Medinipur	65.85	73.22	95.14	4.25	0.40
Mekliganj	55.08	10.55	69.95	3.21	0.61
Murshidabad	48.70	92.53	63.87	4.73	0.16
Nabadwip	78.28	81.59	97.59	4.27	0.12
Naihati	81.69	91.71	99.01	3.64	0.26
New Barrackpur	91.72	93.43	98.77	4.44	0.16
North Barrackpur	92.56	93.42	99.19	4.95	0.15
North Dum Dum	93.60	87.83	96.60	4.35	0.17
Old Malda	52.48	92.44	89.95	4.75	0.77
Panihati	94.23	89.12	99.65	4.53	0.20
Puruliya	55.84	71.35	96.55	3.97	0.65
Raghunathpur	35.04	59.84	76.72	3.64	0.52
Raiganj	82.60	87.31	87.97	1.88	0.23
Rajpur	88.18	97.28	94.07	4.89	0.66
Ramjibanpur	25.70	93.43	40.65	4.36	0.34
Rampurhat	61.04	97.12	84.90	4.59	1.16
Ranaghat	91.53	85.33	98.60	4.79	0.48
Raniganj	55.29	86.82	97.63	4.03	0.73
Rishra	89.38	87.12	99.99	5.13	0.29

Sainthia	39.04	59.16	87.00	4.63	1.17
Santipur	63.85	84.59	93.86	1.66	0.18
Serampur	87.36	85.06	99.91	5.22	0.36
Siliguri	83.21	20.68	99.48	4.53	0.55
Sonamukhi	84.83	66.18	81.64	4.39	1.01
South Dum Dum	90.89	89.90	99.95	5.07	0.32
Suri	61.22	65.81	94.98	4.71	1.11
Taki	60.05	96.59	75.29	4.58	0.49
Tamluk	75.83	97.27	90.75	4.26	1.16
Tarakeswar	60.52	98.58	81.81	4.35	1.10
Titagarh	81.11	93.22	99.94	5.35	0.18
Tufanganj	94.15	80.81	94.22	4.72	0.91
Uttarpara-Kotrung	94.13	92.54	99.99	5.29	0.39

INDEX

SOUTH BENGAL

BARDHAMAN DISTRICT
29. Assansol
30. Raniganj
31. Durgapur
32. Katoa
33. Dainhat
34. Bardhaman
35. Kalna
BANKURA DISTRICT
36. Sonamukhi
37. Bishnupur
38. Bankura
PURULIYA DISTRICT
39. Raghunathpur
40. Puruliya
41. Jhalda
MEDINIPUR DISTRICT
42. Kharagpur
43. Medinipur
44. Ramjibanpur
45. Chandrakona
46. Khirpai
47. Ghatal
48. Kharar
49. Contai
50. Tamluk
SOUTH TWENTY FOUR PARGANA
51. Jainagar-Mazilpur
NORTH TWENTY FOUR PARGANA
52. Taki
53. Basirhat
54. Baduria
55. Ashoknagar-Kalyangarh
56. Habra
57. Gobardanga
58. Bongaon

NADIA DISTRICT
59. Krishnanagar
60. Nabadwip
61. Shantipur
62. Birnagar
63. Ranaghat
64. Chakdaha
HUGLI DISTRICT
65.Tarakeshwar
66. Arambagh

KOLKATA METROPOLITAN AREA

HUGLI DISTRICT
67. Bansberia
68. Hugli-Chinsura
69. Chandannagar
70. Bhadreshwar
71. Baidyabati
72. Champdani
73. Serampur
74. Rishra
75. Konnagar
76. Utarpara-Kotrung
HAORA DISTRICT
77. Bally
78. Haora
SOUTH TWENTY FOUR PARGANA DISTRICT
79. Budge Budge
80. Baruipur
81. Rajpur
KOLKATA DISTRICT
82. Kolkata
NORTH TWENTY FOUR PARGANA DISTRICT
83. South Dum Dum
84. Dum Dum
85. North Dum Dum
86. New Barrackpur
87. Barasat

88. Baranagar
89. Kamarhati
90. Panihati
91. Khardaha
92. Titagarh
93. Barackpur
94. North Barackpur
95. Garuliya
96. Bhatpara
97. Naihati
98. Halishahar
99. Kanchrapara
NADIA DISTRICT
100. Gayeshpur
101. Kalyani