



COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FEDERALISM BETWEEN CANADA AND CHANGING VALUES OF FEDERALISM IN INDIA

MOHD. SALEEM HUSSAIN

Amrit Law College

Dhanauri, Roorkee

ABSTRACT

This article examines "federalism" as an abstract political concept similar to liberalism and socialism, and "federation" as a descriptive term denoting a form of government. The phrase "federative systems" refers to the genus of which federations are a species. The notion of "federalism" has significant consequences for comparison examinations of federations such as Canada and India. Both Canada and India began as quasi-federations and have since transformed into federations. They are not founded on the concept of federalism. The Constitution was not only the blueprint for a federation, but it was also inspired by a political theory we call "federalism," which consists of interlocking principles of governance who are very distinct from the parliamentary tradition that Canada and India adhere to. If these two nations wish to move beyond viewing federation as a means of power distribution, they will need to reevaluate their parliamentary tradition and, eventually, develop their own concept of federalism.

India's federal system seeks to explain their effectiveness in terms of their symbiosis with the projects of nation-building and state-formation in India. This is done through a presentation of the basic structure of federalism in India and its political constraints. Federalism, along with parliamentarism, is axial principle of Government in India. Indian federalism is not a static entity.

It has been evolving over the years from a predominant - namely parliamentary system. The flexibility of the federal process has made it possible for India to accommodate ethno-national movements in the form of new regions, thus gradually increasing both the number of states and the governability of the union. In this article we examine federal Process in India, structure, asymmetric federalism, and the interaction between globalization and India's federal system, in the context of the country's past decade of economic reform. Federalism in the modern age is a principle of reconciliation between two divergent tendencies, the widening range of common interests and the need for local autonomy.

Keywords: Federalism, Asymmetric federalism, Indian federal system.

INTRODUCTION

The division or absence of division of powers between the national and provincial administrations determines whether a state is federal or unitary. In a federal system, the formal separation of powers is established by the constitution.

In a unitary system, there is no distinction between the national government and the states or provinces. It is possible for power to be devolved from the central/national government, but this is rare granting local governments specific authority. Federalism is a crucial concept for comparative politics. Some scholars have also utilized federalism to examine regionalization and regionalism in international politics and area studies. The usefulness of federalism has been the subject of debate. In the first half of the twentieth century, Harold J. Laski declared that the federalist era had ended.

In contrast, eminent federalism scholar William H. Riker asserted to the second half of the 20th century that the age of federalism had arrived. Recent research has determined that, despite contending claims, twenty-five states are federal states. Australia, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Germany, Russia, Switzerland, the United States, India, Brazil, Mexico, Canada, Nigeria, Pakistan, Malaysia, and the United Arab Emirates are among these countries. Nevertheless, approximately forty percent of the world's population lives in federal republics.

Federalism requires the sharing of constitutional and political power, i.e., the ability to administer at two levels; however, a state may also contain local governments. Every federal system necessitates a separation of powers between the federal and state governments, each of which is autonomous and not subordinate to the other. To avoid disorder and conflict between the two competing jurisdictions, the power has been divided between the center and the States, and the division of power is one of the most crucial aspects of federal constitutions. The Seventh Schedule of the Indian Constitution includes three lists of legislation: the Union List, the Concurrent List, and the State List.

1. The three legislative lists listed the respective powers vested in Parliament, the state legislature, and both of them concurrently. Nevertheless, if a subject was not covered by any of the three Lists, it would be considered a residual power of the Parliament.
2. As the ultimate interpreter of the Constitution in a federal structure, the independent judiciary plays an important role in upholding constitutional values.

CONCEPT OF FEDERALISM

In its simplest form, federalism refers to "a division of jurisdiction and authority between at least two levels of government" This division typically occurs between two or more constitutionally recognized levels of government, i.e., levels of government with their own autonomous or semi-autonomous constitutional powers.

According to the "gathering together" theory of federalism, the word "federalism" is derived from the Latin word Oedus, which means "league," "treaty," or "compact." Moreover, each level of government typically has its own distinct jurisdiction, i.e., areas of public policy over which it alone can exercise authority or has the ultimate say. Typically, the national government has the ultimate say on "national" issues such as national defense, foreign policy, and treaty-making, to name a few. In contrast, regional administrations will have authority over more "regional" issues, although this can vary significantly between federations. The term 'federation' is derived from the Latin phrase foedus, which means an agreement, contract, or compact. Consequently, a federal state is viewed as a compact or association of states/provinces as a result of a deal or treaty. It is a configuration whereby a number of comparatively separate elements join together to form a whole. It refers to a governing body that is divided both functionally and structurally into national administrations and their constituent sections, called provinces or states. The political institutions, compositions, and operations of federal states must reflect this associational relationship. Robert Garon describes federalism as a "form of government in which sovereignty or political power is divided between the Central and Provincial Governments so that each is independent of the other within its sphere." Most frequently, federalism emerges through either the centripetal or centrifugal processes. The constituent elements initiate the construction of the federation in the centripetal process. The reasons for forming a federation can vary from case to case. However, the main draw and push factors in the centripetal origin of federalism are the security concerns of constituent units and the desire for economic prosperity.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

Generally, ancient Indian, Greek, and Israelite antiquities are the source of the concepts and institutions underlying the federal political organization. Examples of modern federal policies are to be found primarily in the United States in 1787, Switzerland in 1848, Canada in 1867, Australia in 1901, and India in 1950. Since then, the Federal form of government has enjoyed unprecedented popularity on both the national and supranational levels across the globe.

FEDERALISM: COMPARITIVE STUDY

"Federalism has been a part of India's public discourse for many decades, both before and after the country's independence in 1947, but it has gained greater significance since the 1990s, when the coalition era began in the country's national polity." Prior to the founding of the Constituent Assembly, the Cabinet Mission Plan emphasized a Central Government with extremely limited powers that would be restricted to foreign affairs, defense, and communication. In contrast, neither the Muslim League nor the Indian National Congress supported this position. Despite this, the first report of the Constituent Assembly, with the encouragement of Cripps and Cabinet Mission Plans, envisioned a feeble central government. The passage of the Indian Independence Act of 1947 and the ensuing partition of India prompted the Constituent Assembly to adopt a version of federalism that was more unitary.

Additionally, Mahatma Gandhi favored a decentralized structure and a panchayat/village-based federation. On the other hand, former Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and Dr. BR Ambedkar supported a unitary

form of government, while Home Minister Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel supported federalism. All's well that ends well, and eventually a healthy compromise was reached that resulted in a balance of power between the Center and the State, resulting in India being described as 'Unity of States' with this unity being unbreakable. The structure mandated for Union and State governments with a single citizenship policy, as opposed to dual citizenship.

INDIAN FEDERATION IS 'QUASI-FEDERAL'

India has a political and constitutional structure with clear federal characteristics. There is a power-sharing arrangement between the Center and the States, but the Constitution grants the Central Government supreme authority and places all administrative and financial authority in its hands.¹ It appears that a deficiency prompted the framers of the Constitution to include provisions that ran counter to the federal principle. Governors appointed by the Center can withhold assent to legislation¹

passed by the state; Parliament can override the legislation passed by the states for reasons of national interest; Governors have a role in the formation of state governments and the Center is vested with the power to dismiss the state governments under Article 356; the remaining powers are vested in the states. Fortunately, the same judicial review authority exists in the Center-State relationship as in federal structures. In summary, the Indian political system has federal characteristics that are circumscribed by a unitary nucleus.²²

In *State of Rajasthan v UOI*, 1977, former Chief Justice Beg referred to the Constitution of India as "amphibious." He stated, "... If then our Constitution establishes a Central Government that is 'amphibious,' in the sense that it can move either on the federal or unitary plane, depending on the situation and circumstances..."³

In *S.R. Bommai v. Union of India*, "pragmatic federalism" was also employed. According to Justice Ahmadi, "...it would appear that the Indian Constitution contains not only characteristics of a pragmatic federalism which, while distributing legislative powers and indicating the spheres of governmental powers of State and Central Governments, is overlaid by strong unitary characteristics."⁴

⁵In *State of Haryana v. State of Punjab*, the term 'semi-federal' ⁶was used to describe India, whereas in *Shamsher Singh v. State of Punjab*, the constitution was described as 'more unitary than federal.'

State of West Bengal v. Union of India is another case involving this subject. This case involved the exercise of sovereign authority by Indian states. In this case, the Supreme Court determined that the Indian

¹ Prakash Karat "Federalism and the political system in India"

² Prakash Karat "Federalism and the political system in India"

³ *State of Rajasthan v Union of India* (1977) 3 SCC 592

⁴ *S R Bommai v Union of India* AIR 1994 SC 191

⁵ *State of Haryana v. State of Punjab*

Constitution does not promote an absolute federalism principle. Four additional characteristics were enumerated by the court to demonstrate that the Indian Constitution is not a "traditional federal Constitution."

First, there is no provision for distinct state constitutions, as is necessary in a federal state. The Indian Constitution is the paramount document that regulates all states.

Second, the Constitution can only be amended by the Union Parliament; the States have no authority to do so.

Thirdly, contrary to a federal Constitution, the Indian Constitution vests the highest authority to invalidate any action that violates the Constitution in the Courts.

In contrast, Justice Subba Rao was of the opinion that, according to the structure of the Indian Constitution, sovereign powers are distributed between the Union and the States based on their respective spheres. The legislative scope of the union legislature is significantly broader than the one of the state legislatures; therefore, in the event of a conflict, the laws enacted by Parliament should prevail over those of the states. In a few instances of legislation involving interstate disputes, the President's approval is required for the laws' validity. In addition, each state has its own judiciary, capped by the State Supreme Court. According to the erudite jurist, this specific circumstance has no bearing on the federal principle. During his argument, he drew a parallel to Australia. In Australia, the Privy Council hears appeals against certain decisions of the High Courts of the Commonwealth of Australia. Consequently, the Indian federation cannot be refuted on this basis. Compared to the states, the Union has more financial resources available. The extraordinary powers vested in the union in the event of national emergencies, internal disturbance or external aggression, financial crisis, and failure of the Constitutional machinery of the State are designed to safeguard the future of the nation. The authority conferred to the Union to alter the state boundaries is also an extraordinary ability to address future contingencies. States are preeminent in their respective executive and legislative spheres. In a summary, Justice Subba Rao argued that the Union has a greater function than the states, and thus the Union's powers must trump the States'. India, like Canada, is an asymmetrical federation because some states have constitutionally guaranteed prerogatives that distinguish them from the other states.

FEDERALISM IN INDIA

The constitution of India was proclaimed on January 26, 1950. Although the Indian Constitution provides that "India, that is Bharat, shall be a union of nations" (Article 1) and nothing mentions the word "federation" or "federalism," Dr. B. R. Ambedkar stated in 1948 that the "Draft Constitution could be both unitary and federal depending on the needs of time and circumstances." In normal circumstances, it is designed to function as a federal system. However, it is designed to function as a unified system during periods of conflict (Tillin, 2019). In the Indian constitution, the following aspects of decentralization can be identified.

- ❖ **Written and Rigid Constitution:** The Indian constitution adopted in 1950 had twenty-two chapters, 395 Articles and eight provisions. It is the source of states and central government powers and authorities. The Indian constitution is a blend of rigidity and flexibility. Indian constitution is flexible. However, on issues related to center-state relations, the constitution is stringent. Any constitutional amendment affecting center-state relations such as the division of powers and state 's representation in the Parliament requires a majority of the total membership of the house and a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members of the house present and voting. The amendment also requires to be ratified by fifty per cent of state legislatures.
- ❖ **Division of Powers:** The scheme of division of powers in the Indian federation is presented in the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution of India. The constitution has three lists, Union, State, and Concurrent, for dividing the powers between the center and the states. There are 100 subjects on the Union list over which the central government has exclusive authority. The State list contains 61 topics. Initially, the Concurrent list included 47 subjects over which both the federal and state governments can enact laws. The Concurrent list has been enlarged to 52 subjects, with the 42nd Amendment of 1976 transferring five subjects from the State List to the Concurrent List. As in most constitutions, when there is a conflict between the laws of the central and state governments, the laws of the central government take precedence. The residual powers are exercised by the Center.
- ❖ **Dispute Settlement Mechanism:** In the Indian federation, the judiciary and intergovernmental entities are two mechanisms for managing and resolving disputes between the center and state or between the two states amicably. The Supreme Court is the ultimate arbiter in center versus state and state versus state disputes. The matters related to
 - ❖ (i) the center and one or more states
 - ❖ (ii) center and state or states vs a state or states
 - (iii) one or more state vs one or more states fall under the primary jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. These issues can be promptly brought to the Supreme Court. Additionally, the Supreme Court has the authority to interpret the Constitution. Its power of judicial review serves as a safeguard against the possibility of central government encroachment on state powers and authorities. The intergovernmental bodies prevent the escalation of conflicts and attempt to manage them prior to their exploration or escalation into disputes. Inter-State Council (Article 263) and National Development Council introduce central and state administrations to a single platform to discuss their problems and issues.
- ❖ **Bicameral Legislature:** The Indian government, which is called Parliament, has two chambers. The Rajya Sabha is the top house, and the Legislative Assembly, or Lok Sabha, is the lower house. In a two-chamber government, the Lok Sabha (also called the "People's Council") speaks for all the people in the country. On the other hand, the Rajya Sabha (Council of States) is the part of the national government that serves the states. Members of the Rajya Sabha are chosen by the state governments, while members of the Lok Sabha are chosen directly by the people. The

President chooses twelve people for Rajya Sabha based on their achievements to the arts, literature, sciences, and society states of the Indian Union (Uttar Pradesh) has thirty-one seats in Rajya Sabha, while the seven small states only have one seat each. In the US, all areas get the same number of Senate seats, no matter how big or small they are. In India, however, states get Senate seats based on how many people live in them. This is why Uttar Pradesh, which has the most people in the Indian Union, has 31 seats in the Rajya Sabha while each of the seven tiny states only has one.

❖ **Dual Government:** There is both a central government and state governments, and each has its own governmental structures and ways of doing things. They have their own lawmakers, government, and court system. The President is the leader of India as a whole, and the Governor is the legal leader of each state. If India's top court is the Supreme Court, then a state's greatest court is its High Court.

Indian Federation has two levels of government. This is because the national government and state governments each have their own set of political organizations. But unlike the US and Switzerland, India only has one citizenship, and that is Indian citizenship.

FEDERALISM IN CANADA

❑ **Written and Rigid Constitution:** The British North America Act of 1867, which was passed by the British Parliament, made Canada into a self-governing part of the British Empire called the Dominion of Canada.

It brought federalism to Canada by putting together the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick into one federal government. Later, some more provinces joined the Dominion. Canada is made up of four different areas: Ontario, the Western Provinces, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces. Canadian federalism also includes the North- West Territories and Yukon, in addition to the areas. The Canada Act of 1982 has made Canada's government system even stronger. The Canadian Constitution has the following features of a federal government.

❖ **Bicameral Legislature:**

The Constitution Act of 1867, also known as the British North America Act of 1867, was enacted by the British Parliament and established a federal parliamentary system in Canada. The procedure for amending the Canadian constitution has evolved over time. The 1867 Act lacked a mechanism for amending the constitution. Formerly, the Canadian Parliament would ask the British Parliament to determine whether or not an amendment should be made. The Canadian Parliament was granted the authority to modify the constitution in 1949. The Canadian constitution can be amended in five ways according to the Canada Act of 1982 (Pelletier 2017: 258-259). First, the federal Parliament has the authority to amend provisions affecting the federal government. Second, provinces have the sole authority to amend their constitutions. Thirdly, few amendments necessitate the approval of two-thirds of provinces, which contain the majority of the nation's population. Additionally known as the 7/50 procedure. Fourth, other amendments necessitate the sanction of the federal government and all states

(Section 41). Fifth, the only state whose approval is required for a Parliamentary amendment affecting only one or more states, but not all states, is the affected state.

Regarding federal structure, the Canadian constitution's amendment procedure can be characterized as rigorous.

□ **Division of Powers:** In Canada, there is a clear way that power is shared. The main way that the Canadian union divides up its powers is through the Constitution Act of 1867. Under sections 91 and 92(10) of the Constitution, the federal government has the power to make laws about things of "national" interest, such as national defines, foreign affairs, employment insurance, banking, federal taxes, the post office, fisheries, shipping, railways, telephones, and pipelines, Indigenous lands and rights, and criminal law. Also, sections 92, 92(A), and 93 say that the provincial governments can make laws about "local" things like etc taxes, hospitals, prisons, education, marriage, land, and human rights. In the Concurrent list of the Canadian constitution, things like farmland, old-age benefits, and immigrants are listed. In the case of a conflict, section 95 says that the federal law applies to farmland and immigration, while section 94A says that provincial rules apply to the old-age pension. The federal Parliament has the remaining rights. It means that the federal Parliament will get the rights that aren't on the list of provinces.

❖ **Dispute Settlement Mechanism:** Before 1949, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had the authority to interpret the constitution. Since then, the Supreme Court of Canada has been granted interpretive authority. Contrary to the centralist intentions of many constitution-makers, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council favoured provincial autonomy in its constitutional interpretation between the 1880s and 1930. After 1949, when the Supreme Court of Canada became the highest court in Canada, the situation altered. It appears that the Supreme Court favours a powerful federal government.

❖ **Two Tiers of Government:** Canada has two levels of government, called federal and local, just like other federal states. The Lieutenant-Governor is the person who speaks for the Crown. If the Prime Minister is in charge of the central government, the Premiers are in charge of the state governments. There is also a government and officials in each province. Each state has its own legislative, executive branch, and court system, just like the federal government.

At first, each of the four provinces had two houses of parliament. At the moment, they only have one chamber, and the people vote for them. The size of the provincial legislatures varies. For example, Prince Edward Island's legislature only has 27 members, while Quebec's legislature has 125 members.

FUNCTIONING OF FEDERALISM IN CANADA AND INDIA

In more than 150 years of Canadian federalism's operation, three dominant patterns have emerged: colonial, classical, and interdependence federalism. During the period of colonial federalism, the federal authority ruled the provinces. The map of Canada's government was redrawn, and additional provinces were added. In addition, there is a preference for shared rule over self-rule, unity over diversity, and autonomy. The federal government received the right to regulate commerce, impose taxes, and nullify provincial laws that were likely to conflict with federal law. Linguistic tension between English and French, the economic crisis caused by declining imports from colonies, the judicial role of the Crown Court, and the prospect of an attack from the south gave rise to a tendency towards centralization. John Macdonald, Canada's first prime minister (1867-1873 and 1878-1891), utilized the reservation and disallowance powers to enhance the federal government. The federal government abandoned policies such as disallowance, thereby strengthening the federal government, and provinces stepped into new areas such as income tax, minimum wage, transportation construction, and education.

The phase of interdependence federalism was characterized by increased coherence and interdependence between the federal and provincial administrations. Federalism's interdependence has been managed by increasing federal expenditures and fostering intergovernmental relations. The federal government provided provinces with conditional grants to expand social programs such as hospital insurance, mothers allowance, and financial assistance for disadvantaged groups.

As interventionists, provinces such as Quebec contested the conditional grant initiative. The legalization of cannabis and international trade are two interdependent spheres. Although international trade decisions fall under federal jurisdiction, federal and provincial negotiators made trade agreements with the European Union side-by-side. Provinces were also consulted during the United States-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement negotiations.

In more than seven decades of its journey, Indian federalism has also been marked by cooperation and competition between Union and States. Various factors such as the role of the Supreme Courts, functioning of political parties,

regional and national leadership, emergence of new issues, and emergencies like wars and pandemics have significantly affected the functioning of federalism. Indian federalism has passed through many phases, which is presented in models like cooperative federalism, bargaining federalism, and competitive federalism. The initial phase of Indian federalism is called *cooperative federalism* by Granville Austin. In this phase, given the single-party dominance at the center and states called Congress System by Rajni Kothari and charismatic leaders like Nehru and Shastri, center and states worked cooperatively. However, with the end of one-party dominance, there began a new phase in Indian federalism called *bargaining federalism* by Morris Jones. In this phase, although Congress maintained dominance at the center, it lost power in many states. With different parties coming to power at the center and states, states started bargaining with the central government for financial aid, grants and special status. The *competitive federalism* phase primarily started in the 1990s. In states like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal, Tamil Nādu, Kerala, and Tripura, regional political parties and

leaders emerged as key players. The regional leaders entered into bargaining with the central government on issues ranging from government formation to policy-related issues. This is undoubtedly because of the rise of coalition politics, as no single party could form a majority government at the center. Since the end of coalition politics and the rise of the Bharatiya Janata Party at the center as the single largest party has led to the return of quasi federalism, though in a competitive federal setting. India has been described as -federal because although there is a federal constitutional structure and constitutional scheme, it is a centralised federal system. It is competitive because states are accusing the central government of not disbursing their share of funds and using federal agencies like the Central Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement Directorate against the leaders of ruling regional political parties. It is competitive also because, in the age of para diplomacy, states are competing among themselves to acquire foreign direct investment and offering facilities to multinational corporations to start a business. The recent COVID-19 pandemic has introduced discord in Indian federalism. As one observer of Indian federalism noted, in responding to the two waves of Covid-19 pandemic, the first in 2020 and the second in 2021,—India has moved from unilateral centralized decision-making in the first wave to something that approximates unilateral decentralized decision-making—by default—in the second wave (Louise Tillin, 2021). Even though health is a state list item during the first wave, the central government has made rules (under the provisions of Disaster Management Act 2005) to tackle it through initiatives like imposing lockdown and procuring vaccines. The central leadership was missing as there was the decentralization of key areas of pandemic response, such as vaccine procurement and distribution. In both the stages of the pandemic, effective Center-State coordination was missing.

CONCLUSION

Federalism has proven to be an effective mechanism for power distribution and conflict resolution in diverse, plural, and expansive societies. Depending on the circumstances, the origin, nature, and operation of federalism have taken on various forms and paths in various states. Not every federation examined in this unit possesses all defining characteristics. Nonetheless, every state has a written and rigorous constitution, a separation of authority, bicameral legislature, dispute resolution mechanism, and two distinct tiers of government. Even though these characteristics are present in every state, the degree of constitution rigidity, the distribution of powers between national and provincial governments, the principles of state representation in the federal legislature, and the operation of the dispute resolution mechanism vary from state to state in the discussed cases.

The operation of federalism has evolved over time. The operation of federal is influenced by factors such as the ruling parties and ideology. As a result of changes in the positions of ruling parties, court decisions, and ideologies, and the functioning of national and provincial governments, federalism has taken on distinct forms and patterns, including quasi federalism, cooperative federalism, bargaining federalism, and competitive federalism. The elements of centralization and decentralization have competed for federal states as a whole.

The evolution of Canadian federalism from a conflictual to an interdependence phase via cooperation and constructive engagement. The evolution of Indian federalism from cooperative to competitive through bargaining federalism.

On the basis of the preceding discussion, it can be concluded that the Indian constitution possesses all the characteristics of a federal constitution; both the center and the states have the autonomy to make laws in their respective constitutionally allotted domains. In certain circumstances, however, the center has preeminence, as stated in the Constitution. The supreme court is the protector and guarantor of the Constitution, so an independent judiciary is crucial if either government attempts to overstep its bounds. Since the beginning of the Constitution, the concept of federalism in India has continued to evolve. With the shift in the political system, from the dominance of a single party to the era of coalition government. In the wake of the rise of regional parties and fragile coalition administrations, the federation must become more adaptable and conciliatory, especially in its financial aspects. The Goods and Services Tax (GST) is an example of states having equal authority to impose taxes in order to enjoy autonomy, which is a significant tax reform in India's fiscal history. Instead of engaging in conflict, the federal government and state governments are expected to work in cooperation and coordination.

In a recent ruling in the NCT of (Delhi) case, the Supreme Court emphasized the concept of collaborative federalism, according to which both the Center and the state governments must express their willingness to achieve a common goal and move in the direction of harmonious coexistence and interdependence, despite their differences. People will suffer the most if both governments engage in a conflict of any kind. Both administrations operate simultaneously on the same people and in the same territory; therefore, in the modern era, they must perform their duties with mutual understanding and cooperation. The Center and state administrations occasionally engage in conflict, however, due to their divergent political ideologies. It is not possible that all 28 states will be ruled by the same party, and it is likely that the ideology of the party ruling in a state will differ from that of the party ruling at the center; therefore, both governments must consult with one another before making any decisions. Without the cooperation of both governments in achieving the constitutional objective, no policy or program can be effectively implemented. We must adhere to the principle of cooperative/collaborative federalism in India because it is a necessity of the times.

The people elected governments at three levels, and governments at each level are accountable to their respective electorates; it is the constitutional obligation of each government to work for the well-being of the people. In light of these changes, namely globalization, technological advancement, and a paradigm shift in economic policy, it is necessary for the Union and state governments to cooperate and collaborate with each other and local entities in order to meet the common requirements of the people.