

Urban Government in India: Origin and Growth

Dr .Y. Ramaiah¹

¹ Dr .Y. Ramaiah, Academic Consultant, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Yogi Vemana University, Kadapa, Andhra Pradesh, India

Abstract

Indian municipalities are as old as civilization. Indian cities, towns, and villages had democratic institutions like the Greek city-states did millennia before. The history of municipal government in Andhra Pradesh helps us comprehend its present and future and reshape municipal institutions. Political or administrative institution studies are theoretical without historical evidence. Thus, understanding and appreciating municipal administration requires studying its genesis and development. This article examines ancient, mediaeval, and modern urban government in India.

Key words: Urban Government, 74 Constitution Amendment Act, history of municipal government

Introduction

Even though it may sound strange, ancient India, which was known for its village republics, was also a country with large, well-run cities. Our ancient writings provide numerous and vivid references to an Indian city administration structure that was formed along walls. Excavations of the cities of Mohenjadaro in lower India and Harappa in the Montgomery District of Punjab, which is now a part of Pakistan, revealed that the early Indians of the Indus Valley civilization, which dates to 3000 BC, lived on well-planned brick-built cities, with comfortable houses that had baths, water supplies, and good drainage. (S.K. Sharma and U.N.Chaula, 1957: 1). They were actually considerably more advanced than any modern towns. Well-designed roadways and a superb drainage system that is regularly cleaned up are reflections of some regular municipal government's vigilance. Its power allowed it to ensure that town planning, byelaws, and established lines for streets and homes were maintained over multiple flood-related reconstruction projects (Pandt Jawaharial Nehru, 1966: 74). Local government had a lot of autonomy in the Vedic period of ancient Indian history, when sovereignty had not yet crystallised (Rajdhyakasha N.D., 2008: 1).

Mediaeval and Ancient Ancient India gave birth to municipal governance. According to historical documents, excavations, and archaeological examinations, local governance existed in the distant past (Singh, U.B., 2001: 10). The Rigveda mentions the "Punapati," a word similar to "city father," who Manu describes as Superintendent of all affairs and a mighty planet amid the stars (Hugh Tinker, 1954: 18). Paura Guild, Nigama, Puga, and Gana, local

¹ Dr .Y. Ramaiah, Academic Consultant, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Yogi Vemana University, Kadapa, Andhra Pradesh, India

self-governments in the Ramayana and Mahabharata, performed administrative and legislative duties and collected taxes and levies from diverse sources (U.B.Singh, 1977:39). 'Gosthis' and 'Mahajan Samitees' town committees preserved local self-government under Hindu authority (Benzamin Backer, 1956: 38).

The monarchs recognised these samitees' representation (S.K.Sharma & Dashrath.P, 1966: 11). Kautiyya planned a municipal administration plan to address typical metropolitan issues. In his view, the city's mayor, "Nagarika," performed several administrative duties. Like 'Nagarika', the city's administration had a chief executive officer who maintained the drainage system and roadways (Pradeep Sachdeva, 1991: 19). 'Stanika' (ward member or councillor) oversaw the town's four wards. A "Gopa" official oversaw 10 to 20 families in each ward.

By Meghasthenes Indica, a thirty-member Municipal Board with six committees governed the capital city. The first committee maintained city order. The second committee was responsible for city births and deaths and censuses. The third committee oversaw trade and weights and measures. The fourth committee oversaw production, while the fifth collected sales taxes. The sixth committee oversaw craftsmen and manufacturers.

Urban culture peaked in Mauryan and Guptan cities like Patiliputra, Ujjain, and Takshila. Gupta rule solidified town governance. The Parishad ran the towns, and elected administrative officers were vital to city governance (Venkatarangaiya M. and M. Pattabhiram, 1969: 109).

Muslim Period

During the Mughal era, an officer known as a "Kotwal" was in charge of running a town. He or she was also the supreme authority in all matters pertaining to justice, law enforcement, and finances (Maheswari, S.R., 2004:12). He was given duties like maintaining the peace and order in the city, running the markets, disposing of heirless property, stopping crime and social abuses, regulating funerals and slaughterhouses, keeping a ward-by-ward registration of the populace, and running the spy system. The Kotwal received sufficient administrative support to carry out these tasks. He thus held a high position in the Muslim Indian government and performed social as well as municipal and state tasks.

British Period

During the Muslim era, the traditional institutions declined; under the East India Company, they were compelled to go quickly. The current structure of local self-governance is based on the local government system in England. Ramayan Prasad has noted this (Mohanthly L.N.P., 1999: 29). Despite their initial reluctance, the British eventually decided that the introduction of municipal institutions was worthwhile, mostly for financial considerations. Instead of starting the pattern of native institutions that had hitherto been the norm, they were to borrow primarily from their own institutions in doing so. Thus, democracy was not an exotic development in India, where the emphasis was on corporate life and institutions of self-government centuries before the arrival of British or Mughal control (Pradeep Sachdeva, 1991: 29). "Local government in India in the sense of a representative organisation, accountable to a body of electors, enjoying broad powers of administration and taxation, and functioning both as a school of training in responsibility and a vital link in the chains of

organisms that make up the government of the country is a British creation," says one scholar (Ramayan Prasad, 1963: 2). On September 28th, 1687, a local self government authority was established for the city of Madras under a Charter Act granted by James II, the then-British Monarch, marking the commencement of local self government in India (Singh U.B., 1997:12). A mayor, an alderman, and residents of Madras made up the municipal council. This municipal organisation was permitted to collect taxes for the upkeep and improvement of the city (Hugh Tinker, 1954: 25). The East India Company established the council in the belief that the Indian populace would be more ready to pay "five shillings for the public good being taxed by themselves than six pence raised by our dispotical power" than they would to pay six pence (Maheswari, S.R., 2004:15).

The Madras Municipal Council was succeeded in 1726 by a Mayor's Court, which was primarily a judicial body. With the passage of the Charter Act in 1793, the municipal government was extended to the three towns of Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. The Governor General of India was given the authority to appoint Justices of Peace in these towns. The Justices of the Peace were given the authority to levy taxes on residential properties and lands in order to finance the building of roads and other infrastructure projects. In Bengal, the municipal government was formed in 1842. An Act of Permissive Type that applied to all of British India was passed in 1850. If a town's 2/3 population wanted it, the government of any province was given the authority to implement the Act there. In that situation, the government was permitted to name the magistrate and any additional citizens who might be required as commissioners to whose powers were granted. According to the 1850 Act, municipalities were founded in a significant number of towns. Municipal Committees may be formed on a voluntary basis under the terms of the Act of 1850. The Municipal Act had been implemented in 352 Indian towns and villages by 1858 (Hugh Tinker, 1954: 29). Legislative councils were established in some of the provinces as a result of the Act of 1861, which resulted in partial decentralisation of legislative power. As a result, municipal authorities operating under provincial Acts were established in every province. The post-mining financial humiliation of the Indian Government provided the immediate impetus for the growth of local institutions. According to the directive given by Lord Lawrence's Government in August 1864, all towns were allowed to manage municipal institutions but were also required to shoulder the extra responsibility of boosting the expense of their own town police reserves. Compared to the preceding government of India measures, this reorientation was more successful at boosting municipal activity (Hugh Tinker, 1954: 35). The structure of municipal councils was outlined in the Act of 1865. The governor-in-council appointed the magistrate, the head of the public works department, and five additional town residents to serve on the councils.

Despite the council's one-year term limit, the governor in council had the power to remove the commissioners. The District Magistrate served as the council's ex-officio president and had additional authority to choose a vice-president from among the commissioners (also known as councillors). The president also has the authority to name the staff required for municipal council to carry out its duties. The Act of 1865 needed to be amended soon after that, it was felt. The best method for earning money for things like illumination, sanitary inspection, immunisation, and medical relief was discovered to be basically in place, which is why such services were completely disregarded (Pillay, K.K., 1953:59).

During the Viceroyalty of Lord Mayo in the 1870s, the first significant step was made towards the formation of Municipal Government in the Presidency towns on an elected basis. In order to satisfy local needs by utilising local resources, Mayo's Resolution of 1870 called for the establishment of local organisations with local people's representatives. It implied that doing so would open the door for improved municipal government. Following is the resolution's flow: Successful management of funds allocated to local public works, education, sanitation, and medical charity depends on local involvement, oversight, and care. The implementation of this resolution, in accordance with its intent and integrity, will present chances for the growth of local self-government, the building of municipal institutions, and a larger degree than previously possible of collaboration between native and Europeans in the management of affairs (Venkatarangaiya M. and M. Pattabhiram, 1969: 109). As a result, Mayo's Resolution represents a stride forward for India's municipal administration. The establishment of municipal authorities as a practical measure of financial and administrative decentralisation on a bigger scale than previously foreseen was made possible by the central government's policy of local taxes to suit local demands (Appa Rao, T, 2000: 84).

The Magna Carta of municipal administration in India is regarded as being Lord Rippon's Resolution of 1882. Local self-government, in Lord Rippon's opinion, served as a tool for political and public education (Hussain, M.A. 1992:9). Lord Mayo's original goal of political education of the Indians in the art of governance at the lowest level of government was amended by Lord Ripon's Resolution of 1882. The revitalization and restructuring of local self government was seen by Ripon as his Viceroyalty's finest accomplishment. He is revered throughout India as the founder of local self-government. There were a number of concessions granted to municipalities through a long and steady devolution process. These accommodations showed some decentralisation. When devolution first began, there were concerns that giving power to inexperienced officials and an illiterate populace would seriously reduce efficiency. However, it was argued that taking this risk was worthwhile in order to advance the ultimate goal of encouraging political education and a sense of responsibility among the local populace (Shourie, H.D. 1963: 60).

The key goals of Lord Ripon's resolution were greater consistency, increased participation of the populace in administrative tasks, and the use of external rather than internal supervision (Venkatarangaiya M. and M. Pattabhiram, 1969: 109-110). Lord Ripon's resolution for the development of local government outlined four guiding principles: (i) increasing the number of elected, non-governmental council members; (ii) indirect rather than direct state control; (iii) providing financial resources to local bodies commensurate with their functions; and (iv) maintaining control over local employees.

Despite their good intentions, Lord Ripon's plans fell short in reality. He failed to fully transform the concepts he stated into action. The provincial administrations reduced them since they were believed to be premature. The district officers and their direct reports further diluted them in daily administration. A provision for the election of a non-official chairman was provided in the statute, but in practise the local bodies were not given financial independence. Elections were introduced, although without a broadly based franchise (Sharma, M.P. 1946:7).

The imperialist Viceroy Lord Curzon quickly enacted a law that seriously encroached into Calcutta Corporation's already curtailed authority shortly after his arrival in India in 1899.

His harsh actions that drastically limited its authority were hated by many. The eminent citizen and author R.C. Dutt commented on them by saying, "Real popular government was at an end." (Sharma, M.P. 1946:7). Lord Morley, the then Secretary of State for India, referred to Lord Curzon's centralization and officialization of administration policies as a "great mischief" since it led to a serious hazard. The Royal Commission on Decentralisation was established as a result, and its report was released in 1908.

Since Ripon's resolution, there has been a significant advancement with the Royal Commission on Decentralization's Report. The Royal Commission's goal is to investigate the financial and administrative relationships between the Indian government and the province governments and authorities that answer to them (Kulkarni, V.B. 1974: 4). Although it did not agree with local government critics who claimed that excessive meddling stunted the development of local institutions in India, it nonetheless advocated for giving local governments more authority and gradually democratising them (Hussain Mohammad Ahmad, 1983: 23).

The Royal Commission on Decentralisation (1907) recommended the following: 1. Classifying municipalities based on population and giving more authority to larger municipalities.

2. Subject to maintaining specified minimum balances, the municipalities should have full authority over taxation within the bounds of the law and full control over their budgets.

3. Municipalities should typically elect their own chairman and there should be a sizable elected majority.

4. The government should absolve them of all responsibility for police, veterinary, and administrative hospitals, schools, and famine relief.

The new plan placed a lot of attention on how to ensure that people are represented. Both elected and nominated members served on the municipal boards, which were established for terms of three years. The town's municipal wards were divided into a rotational system, and the tenure of the municipal chairman and vice-chairman were set at three years and one year, respectively (Mohit Bhattacharya, 1969: 11).

The importance of municipal council participation rose as a result of the 1909 Minto-Marley Reform. A portion of the provincial legislature's members had to be chosen by local organisations under the reforms. As a result, elections were fiercely contested, and political party annexations either improved or occurred. Election-related interest and party involvement increased people's political consciousness, and in some provinces, ratepayers were required to participate, which made people realise they shouldn't just sit back and observe the aspects of municipal life that most affected them. Finally, the central and provincial governments' significant interest in having an effective administration led to better organisation of their administrative apparatus. The central and provincial governments also fostered town improvement and planning efforts.

It was decided that the first step of a political reform should be made in the area of local self governance as a result of the war of 1914 and the enthusiastic support and collaboration of Indians in it (Mukherjee, P. 1918: 696). The leaders of the educated middle class in India frequently emphasised the chances provided by local organisations to gain experience needed for future self-government. Up until 1916, the major figures in Congress were primarily gentlemen who had established themselves in local politics, such as S.N. Banerjee of

Calcutta, Sir Ferozshah Mehta of Bombay, and G.K. Gokhale, president of the Poona Municipality. Sardar Patel joined the Ahmedabad Municipality in 1917 and battled tirelessly for the expansion of its autonomy. Sir Sayyad Ahmad, a seasoned Muslim leader, urged his community to take an active role in municipal bodies. In 1923, Jawaharlal Nehru was elected chairman of the Allahabad Municipality. In 1927, Dr. Rajendra Prasad was chosen to lead the Patna Municipal Committee (Kulkarni, V.B. 1974: 4). As a result, before the diarchy, local organisations provided politicians with the chance to implement their plans.

In the latter months of World War I, Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy of India at the time, and Montagu, the country's Secretary of State for India at the time, reexamined India's constitutional quandary. In their statement, they noted that the realisation of responsible self-government also brought up the issue of reforming the status, authority, and structure of municipal and other local authorities in India. The Lord Chelmsford Resolution of 1918 outlined a few fundamental principles designed to create complete popular sovereignty over all local authorities, including municipalities and municipal corporations, whenever this is possible. The Montague-Chelmsford Report served as the foundation for the 1919 Government of India Act. The Act called for elected chairman of municipalities as well as the transfer of local governance to the popular and accountable minister under the diarchy system. The Act of 1919 gave the provincial government the exclusive authority to replace, suspend, or eliminate Municipal Councils. Additionally, it could alter the local budget and interfere with the Council's management by stopping or causing action in situations that threaten human life, health, safety, or public peace (Asok Mukhopadhyay, 1983:1). Assam, Bombay, Bihar, and Orissa all enacted the Municipal Act. The Government of India Act of 1919 will take effect in the provinces of Madras Central and Berar.

The government of India act of 1919 instituted a dyarchy at the province level, but it did not function as smoothly as its creators had anticipated. It caused numerous conflicts and impasses. The failure of provincial governments to offer the necessary advice, direction, and assistance that was intended by the idea of external control, or, to use the exact phrase - "control from without" - spelt out by Government of India Resolution of May 16, 1918, was one significant result of this state of affairs. Previously, the provincial governments took little action to assist or caution the municipal councils when wrongdoing called for less severe sanctions. Simon Commission made the following observation as a result: the government was handed a pole-axe where a spur and rein were required (Venkatarangaiya M. and M. Pattabhiram, 1969: 16).

Most of the time between 1920 and 1930, the local government was run by an elected chairman who had both executive and deliberative powers. It was claimed that the majority of Municipal Chairmen lacked the skills necessary to carry out the legal obligations placed upon them. The municipal chairmen, who were always affiliated with one or the other political party, let party concerns influence how they carried out their executive responsibilities. They owed their election to the party men, and they could still be removed from government by a vote of no confidence after being elected, so they could not afford to offend them. Aside from this, elected chairmen have little administrative experience and little free time for their executive duties. This led to administrative inefficiency, work falling behind schedule, late tax collection, and, last but not least, loss of authority over the office employees (Venkatarangaiya M. and M. Pattabhiram, 1969: 16).

In order to separate the executive role from the deliberative function and to entrust the executive function to officials chosen by the government, Acts were passed in the various provinces after 1930. As a result, the municipal chairman's duties were strictly deliberative in nature. After 1937, when provincial autonomy was implemented in the provinces, the separation of the executive from the deliberative function for administrative efficiency was followed by the establishment of the controlling apparatus of municipal administration at the state level. For the purpose of enhancing the municipal administrative structure, high power committees were established in the provinces of Bombay, the United, and the Central. However, due to the resignation of popular ministers and the subsequent dissolution of provincial legislatures shortly after the start of the Second World War, municipal administration was unable to advance.

Post-independence Period

Momentous changes in India's local self-government emerged after the country won its independence in 1947. Through suitable legislative enactments, several state governments of the Union began their efforts to restructure the institutions of urban local government in their respective states. The new laws generally provided for judicial, legislative, administrative, and financial forms of control. The state governments' administrative authority included the ability to periodically give instructions for the effective management of local affairs and management of municipal finances according to sound principles. In addition, provisions were made in each of the new Acts for the state government to intervene under specific conditions, such as complete mismanagement of municipal affairs, administrative indiscipline brought on by excessive partisan politics, grave financial impropriety, or indulgence of egregious Act, rule, or regulation violations (Government of India, 1989).

The Indian Constitution, which went into effect on January 26th, 1950, stipulates in Article 40 that the states must organise panchayats, but it does not impose a matching obligation on the state to establish urban organisations. Two entries contain the lone mention of urban self-government. The first entry is labelled "Local Government," which refers to the charter of the Municipal Corporation, improvement trusts, district boards, and mining settlement. This is found in List-II of the seventh schedule. Planning for the economy and society is listed as item 20 on the concurrent list. Both entry 5 of the state list and entry 20 of the concurrent list would apply to urban planning (Government of India, 1989). Periodically, the five-year plans also emphasised the issues with municipal bodies and their incapacity to handle the escalating needs of urbanisation. By forming a number of commissions and committees, the Central Government occasionally demonstrated its concern for the need to reform urban bodies.

Important committees and commissions, as well as their contributions, include:

1. The Local Finance Enquiry Committee, which was in place from 1948 to 1951, recommended expanding the taxing authority of urban organisations.
2. The Taxation Enquiry Commission (1953-54) recommended reserving a portion of certain taxes for local governments to use exclusively. The Committee on the Training of Municipal Employees (1963) emphasised the importance of establishing training facilities for municipal employees at both the federal and state levels.

The Rural-Urban Relationship Committee (1963–1966) looked into all facets of local government, including staffing, planning, and taxation, and focused on the interdependence between the town and its neighbouring villages.

The Committee of Ministers on Augmentation of Financial Resources of Urban Local Bodies (1963) made note of the fact that urban bodies weren't even collecting taxes on the territory set out for them and advised local bodies to establish statutory urban development boards to carry out town development.

The creation of a statewide cadre of municipal employees was advised by the Committee on Service Conditions of Municipal Employees (1965–1968).

Wide-ranging recommendations for reviving local government were made by the National Commission on Urbanisation in 1988 (Government of India, 1989). The M.N. Venkatachalliah-led National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution (2005–2006) has also pushed for state governments to delegate more authority to ULBs.

Veerappa Moily, the chair of the second administrative reforms commission (2007–2008), recommended that there be three levels of administration for municipal governments, that ward committees be established in each ward, and other changes (Kataria S.K., 2007:4).

74 Constitution Amendment Act

The effectiveness of representative legislative bodies at all levels of government is essential to the survival of democracy. The availability of structural arrangements, i.e., constitutional provisions, affects how effective these entities are. In metropolitan regions, local government has no constitutional mandate. Due to the lack of proper constitutional protection for urban local governance, municipal democracy has been exceedingly shaky. Even though the municipal acts call for periodical elections for these committees, it is well known that they are routinely suspended under various pretexts. Numerous regional Nagarpalika Sammelanas and a seminar for municipal officers from throughout the nation were also organised in 1989 by the Union Government in addition to extensive consultations among elected representatives of municipal authorities. Chief Secretaries of all the States and Union Territories were also the subject of discussions. The Chief Ministers' and State Ministers for Local Self-Government convention was conducted. How to build urban self-governments and ensure proper operation was the central concern of all these conversations. These debates served as the foundation for the Constitution (65th Amendment) Bill, which was presented in August 1989 and approved by the Lok Sabha (Kataria S.K., 2007:4).

The Constitutional Amendment Bill was subsequently examined following the change of administration, and it was tabled in the Lok Sabha in September 1990. But sadly, the dissolution of the last Lok Sabha caused this Bill to expire. Later, on September 16, 1991, the Lok Sabha received the Constitution (73rd Amendment) Bill, 1991, which dealt with municipalities and was largely based on the Constitution (65 Amendment) Bill, 1989. A Joint Parliamentary Committee received the referral, held many hearings, and received written and oral testimony from numerous organisations and individuals. The Joint Parliamentary Committee had in-depth conversations with a number of municipalities' officers, elected officials, and state governments. The Constitution (74th Amendment) Bill was discussed in the Lok Sabha and passed on December 22, 1992, and in the Rajya Sabha on December 23, 1992, based on the Joint Parliamentary Committee's report. More than half of the State

Legislatures passed a resolution endorsing the measure, and on April 20, 1993, the President gave his approval (Kataria S.K., 2007:4).

A significant step towards the devolution of authority to the general populace is the 74th amendment to the Constitution. The Constitution (74th Amendment) Act gives the State Governments the chance to make the appropriate amendments to their current legislation that conflict with its provisions. Part-IX-A, which deals with matters relating to urban local bodies such as municipal corporations, municipalities, and nagar panchayats, as well as issues relating to them like their structure and composition, reservations for seats, elections for municipalities, their powers and functions, finances, planning at the district and metropolitan levels, and other provisions, has been added to the Constitution as a result of the Amendment Act. The Act provides for the creation of municipalities, municipal corporations, and nagar panchayats.

An area designated for a Nagar Panchayat is primarily rural in nature but with time develops urban functions. For smaller urban areas, municipal councils should be established, and for bigger urban areas, municipal corporations. The Act leaves it up to the State Government to choose which type of urban local government would be established for each urban region because the demographics and other factors that determine which type of urban local body should be determined differ from State to State. This gives the Act some wiggle room so that a State can create various kinds of urban local bodies while taking into account the regional circumstances in the state (Kataria S.K., 2007:4).

To make municipalities more responsive to the needs of the people, the composition of each municipality calls for direct elections to fill every seat. Each seat shall represent a ward in the municipality. The geographical constituencies in the municipal areas have been divided into wards for election purposes. The State Legislature has the discretion to specify how Chairpersons of Municipalities will be chosen, either through direct elections or from among the elected officials of the relevant municipalities. The Act provides provisions for the formation of ward committees in order to promote the accessibility of elected representatives to the public and decrease the distance between the voters and the elected. State legislatures have sole authority over the makeup, representation of geographical areas on the ward committees, and how the seats will be filled. It is anticipated that it will be a useful tool for assisting in the implementation of projects and fostering increased participation of the general public and their representatives at the local level. A member of the ward committee who represents a ward within the ward committee's territorial jurisdiction is required to be a part of the group. This member of the municipality would serve as the group's chairperson and as an ex-officio member of the ward committee.

According to the Act, the percentage of reservation for SCs and STs in municipal areas must match the proportion of their population there. It is a requirement that at least one-third of the available seats be set aside for women. In a municipality, seats must be reserved for women, SCs, and STs. These seats must be distributed by rotation among several constituencies.

This constitutional amendment's expanded role for elected local authorities in the planning process is a key component. Numerous organisations are currently functioning outside the framework of democratically elected municipal organisations that have been given the important duty of urban planning. Along with other organisations accountable to the State rather than the people, some of these authorities include city development trusts and authority

for city improvement. For the first time, the Act calls for the creation of a District Planning Committee at the district level in each State, which will be responsible for combining the plans created by municipalities and panchyats to create a district-wide draught development plan. After the Act is passed, municipalities will be expected to take a more active part in urban development, which will involve looking at different ways to enhance local organisations from both a managerial and functional perspective. The Constitution now has a new schedule called the 12th Schedule that lists town planning, acceptance of land use and building construction, and planning for economic and social growth as the functional issues of priority for municipal organisations (Kataria S.K., 2007:4).

The Act also requires that elections be held within six months of any municipality's term ending, that a Finance Commission be established annually to ensure that municipal finances are sound, that the Controller and Auditor-General of India examine municipal accounts, and that State governments conduct municipal elections while working under the direction of the Election Commission.

The Constitution Seventy-fourth Amendment Act is a positive step towards reviving urban government units and improving amenities and services for the residents of these places. A first sincere attempt to impose sufficient constitutional obligations in order to stabilise democracy in local administration was made with the Amendment Act on Municipalities in 1992. It is a sign of the State's intention to provide the people the freedom to make their own plans and participate in the political process. Though for various reasons, many constitutional experts view the Act as a significant turning point in the evolution of India's local government system.

Implementation of the Amendment Act

In 1994, the municipalities and corporations Acts were revised in every state to implement the 74th Constitution Amendment Act. The state governments then periodically revised the Acts to improve their provisions and address newly emerging political, legal, and administrative issues. Instead of implementing changes into the then-current Kerala Municipality Act, 1960, the Kerala government saw the need to adopt a comprehensive piece of legislation applying just to Town Panchayats, Municipal Councils, and Municipal Corporations.

As a result, the Kerala Municipality Act, 1994 was passed, integrating a number of the 74 Amendment Act's provisions. The Government of Tamil Nadu chose to rewrite the outdated, disparate laws for each form of urban local body after carefully examining all of the existing laws governing how they function. This was done to increase efficiency. As a result, the comprehensive Tamil Nadu Urban Local Bodies Act, which governs several local bodies, was passed into law in 1997.

Certain Scheduled Areas and the Tribal Areas of India have not been covered by the 74th Amendment Act's provisions. As a result, portions of Meghalaya, Mizoram, and Nagaland have been excluded from the scope of the aforementioned Act. However, it should be noted that classic municipal institutions like the municipal board, notified area committee, etc. are still in use in these states to manage urban areas.

Conclusion

Most state governments haven't given power to urban local governments, so they haven't been able to do their jobs well. Instead of using their roles to make the changes people want to see in their cities, mayors and council members use them to move up in the political world. Local governments are not in charge of organisations, such as those that help with urban growth or that are owned by the state.

The first and most important problem in urban areas is a lack of money. In many small towns, it is hard for the municipal committees to pay their workers on time. These local governments don't have enough administrative tools at their hands. Employees who aren't paid enough often act dishonestly, which costs the company money. Even though municipal organisations get money, they are not able to work well. Most of the money given to local government in cities is limited money.

Reforms are being made to urban services and local governments with the goal of getting the state to give more money to urban local governments. With these changes, urban local bodies would be able to offer their people better services for public health and cleanliness. Goa is now one of the five states that have finished the ULB reform process. The other four are Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, and Rajasthan.

References:

- Appa Rao, T, (2000). *Municipal Government in Visakhapatnam (1858-1998)*, Visakhapatnam: Srivani Printer.
- Asok Mukhopadhyay, (1983). "Status of Municipal Government", *Nagartok*, VoLXV.No.3, July-September.
- Benzamin Backer (1956). *Urban Government in India* New Delhi: East-West Press Pvt. Ltd..
- Government of India (1989). *Urban Local Bodies, A Summary of Recommendation of Selected Commission, Committees and Conferences*, New Delhi: Ministry of Urban Development.
- Hugh Tinker (1954). *The Foundation of Local Self Government in India*, London: London Press.
- Hussain Mohammad Ahmad, (1983). *Municipal Government in India*, New Delhi: Meerat Case Studies, IIPA.
- Hussain, M.A. (1992). "Urban Government on India, With Special Reference to Andhra Pradesh", *Civic Affairs*, January, issues 15, pp.5-13.
- Kataria S.K., (2007). "Future of Municipal Governments in India", *Nagarlok*, VoLXXXIX, No.4, October-December.
- Kulkarni, V.B. (1974). *What Ails our Municipalities*, New Delhi: Sunday Standard.
- Maheswari, S.R., (2004). *Local Government in India*, Agra: Lakshmi Naraian Agarwal.
- Mohanthy L.N.P., (1999). *Urban Government and Politics in India*, New Delhi: South Asian Publishers.
- Mohit Bhattacharya, (1969). *Municipal Administration in India*, New Delhi: IIPA.
- Mukherjee, P. (1918). *Constitutional Documents*, Vol,1, Calcutta: Tahcker Spink Co.
- Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru (1966). *The Discovery of India*, Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

- Pillay, K.K., 1953). *History of Local Government in the Madras Presidency 1850-1919*, Madras: Allied Publishers.
- Pradeep Sachdeva (1991). *Dynamics of Municipal Government and Politics in India*, Allahabad: Kitab Mahal Publishers.
- Rajdhyaakasha, N.D. (2008). *Staffing Pattern: A Study of 'A' Class Municipal Councils in Maharashtra*, Bombay: All India Institute of Local Self Government.
- Ramayan Prasad, 1963). *Local Self Government in Vindhya Pradesh*, Bombay: All India Institute of Local Self Government.
- Sharma S.K. and U.N.Chaula (1957). *Municipal Administration in India: Some Reflections*, Jalandhar: I.B.C. Publication.
- Sharma S.K.& Dashrath.P (1966). *Early Chauhan Dynasties from 800 B.C. to 1300 AD*, London: Macmillan.
- Sharma, M.P. (1946). *Local Self Government and Finance*, Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.
- Shourie, H.D. (1963). *A Plan for Municipal Reform in India*, Delhi: India Book Co.
- Singh U.B. (1977). *Urban Local Self Government in India*, Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
- Singh, U.B. (2001). *Urban Local Self-government in India*, Jaipur: Rawat Publications.
- Venkatarangaiya M. and M. Pattabhiram (1969). *Local Government in India: Selected Readings*, Madras: Allied Publishers.