

URBAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INDIA UNDERSTANDING PHASES OF EVOLUTION

Shahid M. Zakauallah, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Maharashtra College, Mumbai

Abstract

Urban local government began to take shape in India in modern context since the seventeenth century. The British played an important role in its evolution. Over a period of time the people acquired a close connection with the governing mechanism at the local level. The needs at the local level were better understood and resolved locally. However, the development of urban local bodies has passed through several phases. In the post independent period efforts were initiated to refurbish the civic bodies and empower them with greater autonomy. The states governments were legally restrained to stifle the independence. The 74th Amendment came to recognise the urban local bodies and give them constitutional status and much needed power to take decision and resist the administrative dominance of the state government.

Keywords: *Evolution of local government, Municipal Corporation, Urban reforms, Municipal institutions, Local taxes, municipal finance, democratization, East India Company*



Scholarly Research Journal's is licensed Based on a work at www.srjis.com

British rule in India came to be extended through the East India Company which had received a royal charter from Queen Elizabeth I, in 1600 AD authorising it to trade in the East. The Company succeeded in getting royal permit from the Court of the Mughal Emperor Jehangir in 1608 through Captain William Hawkins. The company which was, in its origin, a commercial concern engaged in trade, further expanded its base and flourished. However, the unsettled political conditions in the 18th century, and the rivalry between the trading companies representing different European powers led the British to intrigue with the local rulers to protect their trading interests. As a consequence, the East India Company found itself landed suddenly with the liability to rule over vast tracts of land. The Company, at the same time, got concerned also with the health and conveniences of its servants. The basic necessities of a healthy and safe living, i.e., sanitation, light and roads were almost absent. The British obviously thought it proper to transplant some sort of municipal institutions in areas where the servants of the company and other Europeans had settled. (Kumar, 2006, P. 69) Hence, the modern municipal

Copyright © 2018, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies

government in urban India is essentially a creation and legacy of British rule. It was certainly imported in India by British from their own land. The modern urban local self-governing institutions in the country owe their genesis to Lord Ripon's Resolution of May 18, 1882 when for the first time an organised system of urban local bodies was constituted. However, in order to have a clear understanding of urban local government in India it is imperative that an effort is made to trace its origin in India. It will be further desirable to examine its phases of genesis and development and how and in what socio-political conditions these self-governing institutions have evolved and gradually flourished and what shape it took in pre-independent era and how it has reformed itself in the post independent India in different stages over a period of time. (Maheshwari, 2002, pp. 25-36)

Understanding phases of evolution

The evolution of local government in India under the British period may be divided into six phases.

Phase I (1687 – 1881):

The Charter issued by the company on December 30, 1687 created a municipal corporation and a Mayor's court in Madras in 1687. It was modelled on 'boroughs' which were already in existence in Britain. On the lines of Roman 'Municipium', the English people had established 'Municipal Boroughs'. Along with functions performed by the 'boroughs', the authority to levy specified taxes was also given to Madras Municipal Corporation. The corporation consisted of a Mayor, 12 Aldermen (co-opted members who were regarded as next in status to the Mayor) and 60 to 120 Burgesses (inhabitants of a town or borough with full rights of citizenship). The Mayor and three Aldermen who formed the Mayor's Court as well, acted as Justices of Peace. It was done on the lines of the City Corporation of London where a Mayor's court was also functioning. It was rather customary in England in those days to confer judicial powers on Municipal Corporations. The Company encouraged people of all nations residing within the limits of the corporation to associate with the local government. However, it was recommended that the Alderman should be from amongst the heads and chiefs of all respective castes. The Burgesses were to be both from amongst Europeans and Indians. The Mayor-ship was however, confined to the Englishman. The corporation was empowered to impose taxes for constructing different edifices for the conveniences of the residents. It was required, for example, to build a town hall, a jail and a school for the children of the Europeans,

to improve roads, undertake lighting, conservancy and similar other services. Thus, a beginning was made in the direction of establishment of municipal governments in India. (Maheshwari, 1979, pp.32-36)

The next step was the establishment of a Mayor's Court in all the presidency towns of India. The charter issued on 24th September, 1726, with an intention to introduce uniformity of approach to all the three towns, established Mayor's Court in the presidency towns of Calcutta and Bombay in addition to the city of Madras. The Mayor's Court was however, more judicial than an administrative body. The charter also provided for the constitution of a corporation in each presidency town, appointment of a Mayor and nine Aldermen. Thus, the charter of 1687 created a corporation and a Mayor's Court in Madras, while the charter of 1726 created similar organizations in all the three presidency towns. However, under the new charter their functions were largely judicial. In 1793, a new attempt was made to establish municipal organisations in the presidency towns. The local government in India acquired a statutory basis. Municipal corporations were established in three presidency towns of Madras, Calcutta and Bombay by the Charter act of 1793. It empowered the Governor General-in-Council to appoint Justices of Peace from among the servants of the East India Company and other British inhabitants for the mayor's Court. The Justices, beside judicial duties, were required to provide for scavenging, police and repair of streets, etc. In 1801, town duties were imposed in the towns of Bengal for the purpose of improving public resources. This however, was not welcomed in general. These authorities were authorised to levy taxes on houses and lands. They performed functions like scavenging, police, maintenance of roads and culverts. (Mattoo, (2010, pp.44-46)

In 1842, municipal administration was extended to the district towns in Bengal. As it was voluntary, no town came forward to constitute a municipality. The year 1870 was an important year in the evolution of local government in India. The famous 'Resolution' of the then Viceroy Lord Mayo (1869-1872) came into existence. It advocated decentralisation from the Centre to the provinces. The resolution regarded municipal government as the most essential and promising. The operation of this resolution further developed local self-government in India. Financial decentralisation also became an important aspect of Lord Mayo's resolution. However, despite all these progressive steps, local government institutions were dominated by the British and Indians were generally not allowed to participate in their functioning. Hence, for Indians, it was neither 'local' nor 'self-government'. However, as a result of these

developments, political consciousness gradually spread among Indians. This certainly gave rise to the new urges and aspirations.

Lord Ripon who succeeded Lord Mayo in 1880, was India's Viceroy from 1880 to 1884. He was known for his liberal views and did not generally ignore the sentiments of Indians. He however, felt it was not yet time to give them a share in the central and provincial governments, but opportunities should be thrown open to them for training in political and popular education. He was of the opinion that this training could be purposeful only when local bodies became elective and enjoyed real powers. This meant reduction in control exercised by the central and provincial government over the local government institutions. With these progressive views, he took several measures to strengthen the evolution of local governments in India. He was also responsible for many reforms in the internal administration of India. He, as the then Governor-General of India, took remarkable decisions and further evolved the local government and made it really self-government. Hence, Lord Ripon is rightly regarded as the father of local self-government in India. (Arora, 2010, P. 97)

Phase II (1882-1919):

In this phase, the study attempts to focus on Lord Ripon who made an earnest endeavour to remove the defects that prevailed in the municipal administration of his times. He is rightly considered as the founding father of urban local self-government in India. It was he who implanted the concept of municipal authorities as an essential component of Government. Lord Ripon's famous Resolution of 18th May, 1882 on local self-government, which is also called as Magna Carta of Local Self-Government, extensively dealt with the urban local bodies, their functions, finances and powers. As part of the objective of Ripon's policy, the resolution provided that 'adequate resources' which are local in nature and suited for local control, should be provided to local bodies. Secondly, the resolution aimed at evolving real self-government. He also expected the local government to suggest as what measures, legislative or otherwise, are necessary to ensure better local self-government. According to Lord Ripon, 'Local self-government was an instrument of political and popular education'. He is rightly credited with the enunciation of a new philosophy of local government. (Pinto, 1998, PP. 121-124) Further, he is rightly commended for creating suitable conditions in the country which set the groundwork of local self-governance in independent India. Although, Ripon nominated government as the eventual decision-making authority having managerial powers and

superintendence over the local self-governance system, yet his suggestion to assign the actual municipal administration to the elected representatives of the people was epoch making. The resolution provided for a non-official Chairman and the municipal tasks included education, sanitation, provision of light, roads and supply of drinking water and such other objects of public conveniences. Following the resolution, a number of legislations were enacted in several provinces providing for compulsory election of larger proportions of the municipality. Initially, these bodies had more nominated and official members. Later, educated Indians and business interests were given representations in them. Ripon's progressive thoughts however, could not be realised in its entirety mainly due to discouraging mind-set of his successors, fund constraints and too much bureaucratic interference, etc. (Maheshwari, 1970, P.142-144)

A review of the working of various legislations passed by the provincial government after Ripon's resolution was made by the Government of India in 1896. Two resolutions were adopted by Lord Elgin's government, one in 1896 in respect of municipal bodies and the other for local boards in 1897. They showed an improvement in the working of local bodies so far as their finances and especially the expenditure was concerned. The general conclusion was that much useful work was done by them and that they had made substantial progress in the work of administration. However, Lord Curzon, who succeeded Lord Elgin in 1899 as Viceroy, was a believer in high standards of efficiency. He was not prepared to sacrifice efficiency in local administration for the sake of self-government. He believed that Indians did not possess the necessary ability to be entrusted with any considerable measure of self-government. His viceroyalty is known for excessive centralisation.

Viscount Morley, who was the Secretary of State for India during 1905-1910, got worried at this trend of over-centralisation. At his instance, a Royal Commission on Decentralisation was appointed on September 12, 1907 to enquire into the relations then existing for financial and administrative purposes between the Government of India and the various provincial governments and between provincial governments and the local bodies. The Commission was expected to suggest if through decentralisation those relations could be simplified and improved and if the executive power could be brought closer to local conditions. The Commission published its report in 1908. It made certain noteworthy recommendations in regard to the urban local government. It suggested an elected president for the municipalities but confirmed that District Collectors should continue to remain the president of the local

boards. It recommended that the municipalities be given more authority in deciding about taxes and their budgets. It also suggested devolution of government funds for public works, drainage, water supply, etc to the municipalities. It further recommended that the Government control on municipalities in matters of raising local fund should continue. It also suggested that the responsibility of primary education be entrusted to the municipalities. Thus, the Commission was in favour of having a tripartite system for larger cities on the pattern of Bombay model, i.e., an elected chairman, a nominated executive responsible for administration and a Standing Committee. Despite good intentions behind these recommendations, however, municipal bodies could not make substantial progress till the end of the First World War (1914-18). (Mohanty, 1999, pp. 42-46)

The joint report on Indian Constitution Reforms known as Montague-Chelmsford Report submitted in 1918 acknowledged the importance of extension of franchise at the local level. They felt this would help in arousing citizen's interest in elections and in the functioning of local bodies. They were of the opinion that the largest measure of responsibility should be introduced at the local level because this will provide an outlet for the energies of the Indian politicians. The Government of India adopted a resolution on 16th May, 1918 as a corollary to the Montague-Chelmsford Report. At this stage, roughly one third of the Chairmen of municipalities in India were nominated officials, another one third were elected officials and the remaining one third formed elected non-officials. (Mookherjee, 2010, pp. 22-27)

With the installation of responsible government under diarchy system in various provinces under the Act of 1919, the local self-government was transferred to ministers responsible to new provincial legislatures. The ministers and the legislative councils displayed keen enthusiasm on clothing local bodies with greater powers, freeing them from official control and making them responsible to a substantially large electorate. This generated enhanced activity in the local institutions. Municipal elections began to be keenly contested. Further, to give effect to the principles enunciated in the 1919 Resolution, fresh legislations were passed in three Presidencies. In Madras, the Municipal Act of 1919 and District Municipalities Act of 1920 gave powers to the Councils to elect their own chairmen and frame their own budgets. The external control was reduced to minimum. All the tax-payers, including the women, were given right to vote and to seek election. (Singh, 1991, P. 136)

Phase III (1920 – 1937):

During this phase, the national movement for independence started gaining momentum, causing anxiety to both governments in Britain and India. Hence, the conclusion of World War First, was a curtain raiser for the fight for freedom for India. There were pervasive demands for Indian Constitutional reforms. Morley-Minto Reforms did not convince the people of India and their dissatisfaction continued. Considering this, Mr. Edwin Montague, the Secretary of State for India made a pronouncement in the House of Commons that the British policy believes in increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India. (Singh, 2000, P. 111). Hence, they wanted to trim down the public functions of the Government in favour of the local administration. It was with this aim in view the Montague-Chelmsford Report was published and Lord Chelmsford on 16th May, 1918 declared the policy of gradual removal of unnecessary government control and of differentiating the spheres of action appropriate for government and for local bodies respectively. It was indeed a fresh initiative in the history of local government in India as the government itself came out with such pronouncement. The Montague-Chelmsford Reform was personified in the Government of India Act, 1919 which was enforced in 1920. (Mudgul, 1998, pp. 33-37)

Under this Act, municipal local bodies were endowed with greater powers and functions in the realm of education, health, sanitation, public works, agriculture, etc. The scope of government meddling in municipal local bodies was reduced and they became responsible to an enlarged body of voters. As a result of these changes at the grassroots level, enormous fervour prevailed among the people of India and many towering leaders like Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Purushottam Das Tandon got elected to the municipal councils. The working of the municipalities however, did not pick up much speed as desired. The municipalities continued to be financially dependent on the Government. (Nadkarni, 2018, pp. 21-23)

In view of increasing dissatisfaction, the Indian Statutory Commission popularly known as Simon Commission was constituted by the British Crown in 1927 to review and examine the working of responsible government under the Act of Government of India Act, 1919 and to suggest steps which should be taken to advance the system. It surveyed the

developments made in the field of local government from 1920 onwards. The Commission observed, 'in every province, while a few local bodies have discharged their responsibilities with undoubted success yet others have been equally conspicuous by their failures, the bulk lies between these extremes.' (Pinto, 1996, P. 214). Further, the Commission favoured appointment of professional administrators, to be left free in the details of administration, powers of punishment and correction, more by advice and encouragement, to the provincial governments, as was the case in Great Britain. It felt the appointments to various positions in the municipalities were based on considerations other than merit. The chairman had too much power over the staff. Communal and caste considerations came into play both in municipal politics and municipal administration. All these factors were responsible for impairing the efficiency of local bodies. New reforms were introduced under the Government of India Act, 1935. A restricted form of provincial autonomy was granted. The distinction between reserved and transferred subjects was withdrawn. Popular governments were installed in different provinces. Indians, having now been given powers, concerned themselves with the re-organisation of the local self-government. Many provincial governments appointed committees to re-organize the local government. (Mullen, 2014, pp. 14-18)

Despite these developments, since the time of the enactment of Government of India Act, 1935 though the period chronicled, no significant development in respect of the urban local government was observed.

The Act of 1935 had nothing new to say in the context of local self-government or for that matter the urban local government. The Act did away with the diarchy and in the Governor's provinces, provincial autonomy was instituted. The Act concluded a division of power between the Centre and the provinces. Certain subjects were solely handed to the Federal Legislature, others to the provincial legislatures. Issues relating to local government and municipalities were kept in the provincial list. Hence, all matters relating to the municipality came under the purview of the provincial legislature. The Act came into force in the provinces in 1937 and since then till the achievement of independence nothing new had been added to the history of municipal administration in India. (Maheshwari, 1979, pp. 44-48)

Phase IV (1938 – 1949):

During this phase, the local government in India ceased to be mere experimental form of self-government. It, indeed became the constituent part of self-government for the country as a

whole. In this period deficiencies and drawback became more conspicuous. The different provincial governments launched investigations into local governing bodies to make them correct institutions for conducting local affairs. Several enquiry committees were set up in United Province and Bombay Provinces in 1938 and 1939 respectively. However, the recommendations of the Municipal Committees were not uniformly carried out in various provinces. Nevertheless, there was definite trend towards progressive strengthening of local government. Efforts were made to bring about democratization of local government by further lowering of the franchise and abolition of the system of nominations. Organised initiatives were also taken to bring about a separation of deliberative functions from the executives' ones. The Indian independence in 1947 brought a new era of local self-government in India. The local self-government started functioning in an atmosphere of independence from foreign rule. In 1948 the ministers of local self-government in the provinces met and stressed upon the need for vital role of local self-government in free India for urban administration. Jawaharlal Nehru who was present on this occasion, remarked, 'Local self-government is and must be the basis of any true system of democracy. We have got rather into the habit of thinking of democracy at the top and not so much below. Democracy at the top may not be a success unless you build on this foundation from below.' (Maheshwari, 1984, P. 23)

A description can also be made here of a scheme of local government which was formulated in 1937 and implemented in a revised form in 1948 in the Central Provinces. The scheme which was the brain-child of D. P. Mishra who was the Minister of local self-government at that time, was regarded as bold one, even revolutionary in terms of reconstruction of local government in the province. It managed to do away with the duality of the administrative system. It almost merged the district administration and the local government with its independent entities, rural; and urban. It extended the sphere of the activity of the district board to the whole of the district administration. It made the district collector the chief executive officer of the district board and the district staff as its own. This scheme of local government apparently had several advantages. It managed to secure for the district board an efficient executive and administrative staff made up of the collector and his subordinates without incurring any additional expenditure. Secondly, it sought to mitigate the bureaucratic character of the district administration. Thirdly, it was expected to enhance the importance of local self-government among the people and provide them with enough opportunity to take

interest in it. However, the scheme being radical in nature faced severe criticism and hence temporarily stalled. In a revised form, the scheme with a new name called the 'Janapada scheme of local government' was adopted in 1948 by the Central Provinces where it was welcomed and earned much appreciation. It became a source for further development in the field of urban local government in India.

The janapada scheme of local government as implemented in the Central Provinces was regarded as an innovation of high order. In a way it anticipated the recommendations of Balwantray in respect to rural local government and was considered even better in many respects. The scheme took the government closer to the people by adopting 'Tahsil' as the unit of administration. Hence, the emphasis was shifted from the district to a smaller area called Tahsil. The making of Tahsil as the unit of administration, further decentralized the administration. The tahsil was officially named as Janapada which stood for a group of villages constituting a single unit for purpose of administration. The Janapada scheme was implemented in 1848. Despite its shortcomings, it had a historical role to play in the evolution local government in the Central Provinces. Similarly, the Bombay Provincial Corporation Act, 1949 was brought out to constitute the municipalities throughout the Maharashtra region. (Myneni, 2016, pp. 45-47)

Phase V (1950 – 1992):

With the enforcement of Constitution of India on 26th January, 1950, the local government in the country entered a new phase. The Constitution of India was structured on federal guidelines. The Constitution split government functions in three lists; a. Central; b. State; c. concurrent. The Constitution allotted local government to the State List of functions and were governed by State statutes. The Constitution of India made meticulous provisions for ensuring democratic operation of the Parliament and the State Legislatures. However, apart from a vague reference to the Municipalities, in item-5 of the State List of subjects for the enactment of laws on urban administration, there was no mention in the Constitution of India about urban local bodies. Thus, initially, the Constitution did not make urban local governance an exact constitutional obligation. While the Directive Principles of State Policy refer to Village Panchayats (rural local bodies), there was no explicit reference to the urban local bodies. As a consequence, owing to insufficient and unclear Constitutional provisions for urban local bodies, democracy at the grassroots level had not been resolute and purposeful for quite

long period. Though the respective Municipal Acts of States provide for recurring elections to the municipal bodies at specified intervals, they were generally superseded for unspecified period. For that reason, it was not possible even to talk about democracy at this level. It had been therefore a long felt need to ensure the conduct of elections to the urban local bodies under the auspices of a self- regulating and unbiased body to ensure transparent representation of different segments of the society. However, in the absence of a statutory body, the matter rested with the state government which showed no sign of playing a positive role and bring about desired changes. Defining the role of the State in relation to the Urban Local Bodies, the Taxation Enquiry Commission (1953-54) had observed, 'It is the responsibility of the State to see that local bodies are efficiently organised, that they perform their functions properly and that they take adequate part in the development of the country. Government control and help should however, be not be so meticulous or minute as to destroy the autonomy or self-reliance of local bodies. (Report, 1954: 374) After independence, while the local self-government in the rural areas progressed, it was not so in the case of urban local bodies. The condition of the urban local government therefor, remained unchanged for a long time. There was no structural transformation whatsoever. However, urban clusters were growing rapidly. Hence, as compared to the significant and positive changes in rural local government, the development of urban local government has been slow to the extent of being unimpressive. It is only of late that the urban local government has attracted the attention of the government. The Third Five Year Plan (1961-66) took note of the importance of urban local government. (Maheshwari, 1979, 55-57)

Despite slow progress in the areas of urban local government several state governments came forward to set up committees to enquire into the functioning of local government institutions and to suggest remedial measures in the rural areas. The Panchayati Raj was recommended by a committee set up by the Central Government. In addition to the Balwant Rai Mehta Committee (1957), the central government also set up Ashoka Mehta Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions (1978) and the GVK Rao Committee to review the existing administrative arrangements for rural development and poverty alleviation programmes (1985).

In the urban areas, there has been a spurt in the number of municipal corporations in the country. While there were only three municipal corporations in 1947, the number has been

increasing with the passage of time. (Pinto, 2005, PP.177) Another significant development of this phase has been the separation of the rural local government from the urban local government. The departments of local self-governments in the states are concerned only with the urban governments.

Also, in relation to rural local government, there was encouraging Constitutional support. The Directive Principles of State Policy (DPSP) of the Constitution declared: 'State shall take steps to organise village panchayats to endow them to function as units of self-government'. However, despite sluggish development in this regard, several important legislations for reshaping the local self-governments were passed in different states of India. Further, the constitution of local bodies was democratized by the introduction of adult suffrage and the abolition of communal suffrage. The National Government appointed a committee known as the Local Finance Enquiry Committee with an objective to explore ways and means for improving the financial resources of local bodies. The Committee submitted its report in 1951. Similarly, the taxation Enquiry Committee set up in 1953 was also baffled with this problem. Though the Constitution did not give the direct responsibility of the local bodies to the central government, yet it has proved to be the principal source of reforms in the municipal field. Later, the UP government decided to set up municipal corporations in several big cities of the state. As a result, the state of UP adopted a new legislation for municipal corporations in 1959. The other significant committees and commissions which were appointed by the central government to report on various aspects of urban local government during this phase are as follows:

- i. Local Finance Enquiry Committee, 1951
- ii. Committee on the Training of Municipal Employees, 1963
- iii. Committee of Ministers on Augmentation of Financial Resources of Urban Local Bodies, 1963
- iv. The Rural Urban Relationship Committee, 1966
- v. Committee on the Service Conditions of Municipal Employees, 1968
- vi. Committee on Budgetary Reform in Municipal Administration, 1974
- vii. Study Group on Constitution, Powers and Laws of Urban Local Bodies and Municipal Corporations, 1982
- viii. National Commission on Urbanization, 1988

It is important to mention that the Central Council of Local Self-Government constituted by the Central Government also played an important role in suggesting and implementing reforms which were needed in various areas of municipal government and administration. The Rural Urban Relationship Committee devoted itself to both functional and financial aspects and assessed many areas in minute detail. The other committee of the Central Council undertook a meaningful study on the service conditions of municipal employees (1965-1968). In 1985, the Central government appointed the National Commission on Urbanization which submitted its report in 1988. This was the first commission to study and make recommendation on all aspects of urban management. In addition to the contributions made by the Central Government, a number of committees were instituted in different states in order to improve the municipal organisations and their administration. With a view to bring about suitable changes, municipal legislations have been amended from time to time in different states. However, major structural changes did not take place except those which fell in the domain of larger and important cities where municipal corporations were already established. The Uttar Pradesh Government took an important initiative in 1966 when it chose to centralise the municipal services. Thus, reforms of these scale and nature went on till advent of the Constitution 74th Amendment Act in 1992. (Bardhan, 2008, P. 44-48)

Phase VI (1993 onwards...):

The Indian Constitution was amended by P. V. Narasimha Rao Government to provide the constitutional base to the local government, both rural and urban, in 1992. Both the 73rd and 74th Constitution Amendment Acts were passed in December, 1992 and subsequently became important central legislations in April, 1993. Now, local government constitutes the third stratum of government existing in its own right. (Maheshwari, 1970, P.79)

Although the process of enactment was completed in April, 1993, the 74th Constitution Amendment Act came into force nationally on June 1st, 1993. Urban local self-government along with the rural is a state subject under the Indian Constitution. All states and union territories, therefore, were asked to ratify the 74th Constitution Amendment Act and bring all their relevant existing legislations in congruence with that of with that of 74th CAA by May 31st, 1994.

The exercise of confirming to the constitutional amendment was completed by all the states and union territories by 31st May, 1994. In case of Maharashtra, it was done through

Maharashtra Municipal Corporation and Municipal Council (Amendment) Act, 1994. Its provisions came into force on May 31st, 1994 within the jurisdiction of the State of Maharashtra. (Shahid, 1997, PP.68-71) Now the impact of the implementation 74th Amendment on the local governance needs to be assessed and analysed. There are areas where there is a need to further streamline different aspects of the administrative and financial issues connecting the civic governance. However, a critical analysis of the outcome of the Amendment seems to be the need of the hour.

References:

- Mookerji Radhakumud, (2010), Local Government in Ancient India, Nabu Press Publishing*
- Mudgal Rahul, (1998), Local Self-Government in India, Book Enclave Publisher*
- Mullen Rani D. (2014), Decentralization, Local Governance and Social Well-being in India, Routledge Publications*
- Myneni Dr. S. R., (2016), Local Self-Government, Published by Allahabad Law Agency.*
- Nadkarni M. V., N. Sivanna, L. Suresh, (2018), Decentralised Democracy in India; Gandhi's Vision and Reality. Published by Routledge India*
- Oyugi, Walter O. (2000), Decentralisation for Good Governance and Development: Concepts and Issues. Regional Development Dialogue 21. No 1:3-21*
- Parth J. Shah & Makarand Bakore, (Edt.) (2006), Ward Power: Decentralised Urban Governance, Published by Centre for Civil Society, Delhi.*
- Phadke, V. S., & Guha Banerjee Swapana, (2007), Urbanization, Development and Environment, Rawat Publications, Jaipur.*
- Pinto, Marina, (1998), Metropolitan City Governance in India, Government Press, Mumbai*
- Pinto, David Anthony and Pinto Marina Rita, (2005), Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai and Ward Administration, Konark Publications, New Delhi*