

# HISTORY OF URBAN LOCAL BODIES

Urbanization is perceived as a determinant, as well as a consequence of economic development. Over the past two decades, many countries in Asia have experienced rapid economic growth. This has led to a rapid rise in their urban population. However, in spite of a significant increase in national wealth and personal incomes, the quality of life of an average urban resident is not satisfactory. Urban centers are characterized by squalor slums, traffic congestion, and shortages of water and power. While the national governments pursue the goals of economic development, it is generally left to the local governments to manage rapidly growing urban areas, and provides for basic services to his residents<sup>1</sup>.

Urban management and governance has assumed an increasing importance, as the capacity of a nation to pursue its economic goals is contingent upon its ability to govern the cities. This is largely due to the significant contribution of the urban centers to the national income. The economic liberalization and decentralization of government have been the most common features of developmental policies of most countries in the past decade. Nations have evolved policies, aimed at achieving high economic growth rates, integrating the national economy with the global one and increasing economic efficiency through greater competition. At the same time, decentralization policies, aimed at delegation, devolution and democratization have also been pursued<sup>2</sup>.

The emergence of these trends has a profound implication on urban management. In the general discussion of macroeconomic policies, the role of urban economies is not well recognized. The macro policies often have an anti-urban bias and the national governments have pursued programmes which restrict the growth of large cities, reduce migration to cities, and achieve a “balanced urban pattern”. It is only now that the role of city economies in national development has been understood. It is seen that in a global economy, there is an increasing competition among cities to attract cross-border investments<sup>3</sup>. The ability of a city to attract global investments largely determines the extent of investments in a nation. While the national governments are involved in macro policy formulations, it is left to the local government to provide for the necessary infrastructure and services to attract such an investment.

## Growth of Urban Population In India

Urban population in India quadrupled in four decades from 62 million in 1951 to 217 million in 1991 and 285 million in 2001. It touched a height of million at the turn of the century. The annual increment to urban population over the last five decades has been, on an average, 3.8 million. Urban population in the country is, at present, almost twice the combined urban population of France, Germany and United Kingdom. No other country in the world, except China, has urban system larger than in India. The fast pace of urbanization has imposed increasing pressures on the level of services in urban centers. Consequently, positive role of urbanization has been overshadowed by deterioration in the physical environment and quality of life in urban areas.

The level of urbanization has increased from 17.3 percent in 1951 to 25.7 percent in 1991 and further to 27.8 percent in 2001 (Table 1). The simple average increase in the level of urbanization in the fifty-year period has been about 2 percent per decade. The increase in urbanization level was more than double in the last 25(7 percent) compared to that in the first 25 years of this period (3 per cent). The level of urbanization in India is comparable to the rates in South Asian countries but is substantially lower than that in the developed countries (66-85 percent). Africa (45 percent) and South-East Asia (30 percent). India, along with other Asian countries, is among the least urbanized countries and is just embarking on urban transition – 50 percent is generally taken as a threshold level.

Although urban population has shown tremendous increase, the annual rate of growth of urban population has declined from 3.8 percent (1981) to 3.1 percent (1991) and two percent in 2001. The level of urbanization increased by 2.4 percentage points during 1981-91 as compared to 3.4 percentage points during 1971-81. The decadal growth rate of population increased substantially from 38.2 percent during 1961-71 to 46.1 percent during 1971-81 but came down to 36.2 percent during 1981-91 and further to 31.20 percent in 1991-2001. This indicates that tempo

of urbanization in India slowed down during the 1980s. The decline in urbanization rate can be explained by analyzing the contribution of various components of population growth such as natural increase, net migration from rural to urban and urban to urban areas and change in the status of areas as a result of re-classification and declassification, horizontal extension or the change in territorial jurisdiction of towns.

### **State-wise Patterns of Urbanization**

An analysis of state-wise patterns of urbanization (Table 2) shows that there is a large variation in the urbanization levels in the different parts of the country. While the urbanization level was 38.7 percent in the most urbanized State, it was only 11.1 percent in the least urbanized state. Out of the 15 largest states in the country, the level of urbanization in eight states was even higher than the national level<sup>4</sup>.

If might have been expected that the more developed states would exhibit the normal phenomenon of accelerating urban growth with industrialization and development. On the contrary, West Bengal and Tamil Nadu, two of the most industrialized states, have exhibited urban growth lower than the national average. Among the least urbanized states, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh have experienced urbanization somewhat faster. All the advanced states (Gujarat, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal) exhibit low levels of agricultural productivity, and industrialization in these states has little to do with the hinterlands. Industrial development in these states has not contributed significantly to overall development in the rural areas. Hence, acceleration in urbanization which normally accompanies industrialization is muted. Haryana and Punjab, whose development has been more agriculture led exhibit a more balanced development pattern. They may be expected to undergo an accelerated urbanization in the years to come, as they also intensify their industrialization. In summary, the normal phenomenon of accelerating urban growth with industrialization seems to have been muted in the advanced industrial states in India, because of the absence of corresponding improvements in agricultural productivity.

### **Urbanization in Uttar Pradesh**

Uttar Pradesh is the most populous state of the country. According to 2001 census, the state has a population of 1660.53 lakhs, showing an increase of 25.8 percent over the 1991 census. The state constitutes 16.17 percent of the total population of the country. Although the state recorded the second highest increase of 60.62 percent during 1971-81, it reached to sixth position with the decadal growth of 38.98 percent during 1981-91, and showed growth of 25.0 percent during 1991-2001. In absolute terms, the state has an urban population of 345.13 lakhs, constituting 12.09 percent of population living in urban areas in the country.

Uttar Pradesh stands first among all the states in number of towns as well. It accounted for 16.07percent, in absolute number 704towns of the country's total towns of 4368 in 2001. After creation of Uttarakhand numbers of towns have come down to 627.

### **Evolution of Local Government**

'Local Government' has a variety of meanings. Many attempts have been made to define the term by the different theoreticians and practitioners of public administration. It might be thought that local government could be easily defined, but this is not the case. Renowned jurists have admitted the difficulties in proposing a sound definition. For example, Sir Ivory Jennings states:

"The explanation of these difficulties of definition lies in the fact that local government is not a logical division of government... As soon as the jurist sets to work to provide his logical categories, he finds that local government is not one of them. The result is that draftsmen of Acts of Parliament avoid such juristic distinctions"<sup>6</sup>.

Sir John Maud and S.E. Finer observed: "Before starting to discuss local government, it is necessary to consider what is meant by local government; and this question is so difficult to answer clearly in a few words, that it seems best to introduce the subject by inventing a myth"<sup>7</sup>. About the local government institutions, which now exist in England, William Robson said that they were a curious compromise between

ancient forms and modern need<sup>8</sup>. Contrary to it, Smellie writes: “Modern English local government was established to deal with the problems which arose in the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century when the use of machinery began to shape the modern world”<sup>9</sup>.

The term “Local government” has two words, ‘Local’ and ‘Government’. The term ‘Local’ relates to specific portions of the country defined by Locality, implying a definite area and the population living therein. The ‘Local’ institutions are concerned with the needs and problems of the area thus defined. The second word ‘government’ refers first to its representative character as it has to form part of the constitutional structure of the country, and in the second place to the ‘autonomy’ it possesses. The local authorities are the same flesh and blood as the sovereign, but to a limited extent. Each council is elected (directly or indirectly) by the people of an area, and it is answerable to that local electorate, just as the sovereign is ultimately responsible to the national electorate. Thus, local government becomes an integral part of democracy.

It can, thus, be said that local government is the regulation in particular localities, of matters of primarily of local importance by locally elected bodies raising the money necessary for their activities, by the imposition of local taxes and generally subordinate to the Central/State Government<sup>10</sup>. Although the local authorities are elected bodies, they have to operate within the framework of the Constitution of the country and the law under which they are created.

Local Government is established to make life possible; it could be used to make life good. With the passage of time, people desired to have an increasingly wide choice in everything that affected them. They wanted to look after their own affairs. As this matter of choice differed from country to country, the emphasis on the local affairs, requiring the establishment of local government also varied. Thus, local government in England in primary stages was administering the ‘poor laws’, whereas in British India for the Britishers, the law and order problem was paramount and the local government was required to raise the taxes for meeting the cost of ‘watch and wards’. These functions could have been met by the central or state authority, but it was thought, that since the need was local in nature, the locality should pay for it. The service was arranged either by the local community or by the state, on behalf of the citizens of the area. As the local needs continued to grow with the increased awareness and consciousness, the desire for better life has been at the root of improvements in the standard of services and of introduction of new services. Thus, the essence of local government lies in the fact that local inhabitants, through their democratically elected representatives, determine what should happen locally, should it happen and how should it happen. This process involves, not only those who are elected but also who elects them.

The local authorities can be called local states. The citizens of a country are on the one hand, organized as a national state and on the other as local states. In India they are organized at a middle level, also known as province/state. The local organizations, thus, have three outstanding features”

1. They are allowed to exist for purposes specified by the national state;
2. each local state resembles the national state within the given jurisdiction, both having a representative institution, executive machinery and the power of issuing commands, which the inhabitants of the area have to obey; and
3. they are used for certain purpose as agents of national state.

Whatever may be the degree of resemblance, the local state is a creation of the national state or of the provincial state. It has been the practice throughout, both in England and India. Not only that, irrespective of the independence given, the local authorities, i.e., the locally elected bodies, have to operate all the time within the framework established by the Government. The services to be provided and the functions to be performed are pre-determined or approved by the Parliament/state legislature. Then, they are subjected to many ministerial regulations and approval.

The minimum and maximum of each service to be provided by the local authority can be prescribed through the Legislative Acts and statutes. There lies a wide area of discretion between the two extremes. And it is this area of discretion, which provides the base for local autonomy. The citizen is concerned with the provision of services, and more with their effective provision in terms of efficiency and

convenience. His satisfaction is vital and for securing it, local government units become sovereigns in a larger democratic structure. The citizen very much want to exercise control on these units through democratic process. Because, the governments are, otherwise, secretive by nature and the bureaucracy is inaccessible and non-responsive. He expects the elected representatives to be accessible, responsive and also removable, if possible. Thus, the local authorities function also as an instrument of public opinion.

From political point of view, local government is called 'democracy on the doorstep'. It contributes to the social and political education of the citizen. It is educative for the electors, who are called upon to do their voting in relation to issues that are readily comprehensible to them; and for the councilors, who can gain experience in the act of responsible leadership. Thus, it has both political and educational value. The democratic value of liberty, equality and fraternity become real in the self-governing community.

Modern local government has, in addition, to play a vital role in the economic development of the country, whether it is the town planning, housing activity, and trade or poverty alleviation. It should be used as a positive instrument in this direction. The economic value of local authorities is being increasingly recognized.

Now, it could be argued, that when local government was meant only for provision and management of certain services, those services could very well be provided by the national/state government through appointed officials or through appointed boards. The answer, obviously, would be in the affirmative. But in such a situation the ability of the local inhabitants to influence the policy and administration of those services would have been reduced. The people want to have the benefit of certain services at the local level and pay taxes for them at the same level. And also problems faced by the people vary from region to region and from city to city, hence the need for local government. The government institutions should, therefore, have, apart from the legal independence, a degree of political, financial and administrative independence required for determining policies on local matters, levying taxes, implementing the policies and administering the services. It promotes popular control, participation and communication. Decentralization becomes a necessary corollary and should be made real.

## **Growth of Municipal Government In India**

The modern municipal government in urban units is essentially a creation and legacy of British rule. It was imported in India by Britishers from their own land. However, it is said that the origin of local self-government had very deep roots in ancient India. On the basis of historical records, excavations and archaeological investigations, it is believed that some form of local self-government did exist in the remote past. In the Vedas and in the writings of Manu, Kautilya and others, and also in the records of some travelers like Magasthene, the origin of local self-government can be traced back to the Buddhist period<sup>12</sup>.

The Ramayana and the Mahabharata also point to the existence of several forms of local self-government such as Paura (guild), Nigama, Puga and Gana, performing various administrative and legislative functions and raising levies from different sources.

Local government continued during the succeeding period of Hindu rule in the form of town committees, which were known as 'Goshthis' and 'Mahajan Samitees'. The representative character of these samitees was respected by the rulers. These Mahajans sometimes delegated their functions to their representatives or to Panchakulas (committees of five) who used to collect revenue on behalf of the state. In addition to Panchkulas, 'Talara', an officer of the state, supervised local administration and policing with the help of the elected representatives<sup>13</sup>.

In the Mauryan period followed by the Gupta era and subsequently in the medieval period, the system of local self-government continued to be more or less the same.

However, the system of local self-government was quite different in the Mughal period. The Mughals were fond of building new cities and maintaining them. Those cities were, by and large, centers of trade and industry. Surat, Patna and Ahmedabad, for example, happened to be provincial capitals and offered a rich market. Whatever urban administration was there, it was autocratic in form. The City Kotwal, appointed by the Emperor, was the key-centre of municipal administration. He was responsible for maintenance of inventory of houses, roads, levy and

collection of local taxes, tolls, transit duties etc. The markets were controlled by him. He kept a check on weights and measures and a vigil on the local prices. These are basically municipal functions, which were performed by him in addition to his foremost duty of maintaining law and order. Thus, in 'kotwal' of the Muslim period, offices of the modern Municipal Commissioner and the City Magistrate were combined<sup>14</sup>.

British rule in India came to be extended through the East India Company, which was, in its origin, a commercial concern engaged in trade. The unsettled political conditions in India in the eighteenth century, and the rivalry between the trading companies representing different European powers led the Britishers to intrigue with the local rulers to protect their trading interests. As a consequence the East India Company found itself landed suddenly with 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 Britishers thought it proper to transplant some sort of municipal institutions in areas where the servants of the company and other Europeans had settled.

Madras was the first city to have a local government established under a charter, dated December 30, 1687, issued by the Company<sup>15</sup>. The Municipal Corporation, which came into existence on September 29, 1688, was to consist of a Mayor, 12 Alderman and 60 to 120 Burgesses. The company declared in the charter that it wanted to encourage people of all nations and all sects of religion residing within the limits of the corporation and that the Alderman should be form among the heads and chiefs of all respective castes. The Burgesses were also to be both from Europeans and Indians. The Mayor ship was confined to the Englishmen. The corporation was also to have a town Clerk and a Recorder, who could not be other than Englishman. The Mayor and three Aldermen formed a court of Record, known as the Mayor's Court. They acted as Justices of Peace. It was done on the lines of the City Corporation of London, where also a Mayor's court was functioning. It was rather customary in England in those days to confer judicial powers on Municipal Corporations.

The Madras Corporation was given powers to raise money by taxing the inhabitants. From the funds so raised it was required 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 government in India. It was a period when local government in England had not been fashioned properly.

The next step, not of the same significance was the establishment of Mayor's Court in all the presidency towns, i.e. Madras, Calcutta and Bombay, by King George-I through a charter issued to the Company on 24<sup>th</sup> September 1726. The charter introduced uniformity of approach to all the three towns. The charter also provided for the constitution of a corporation in each presidency town, appointment of a Mayor and nine Aldermen. The charter of 1687 created a corporation and a Mayor's court in Madras, while the charter of 1726 created similar organization in all the three presidency towns. However, under the new charter their functions were largely judicial.

With the renewal of Charter of the East India Company by the British Parliament in 1793, a new attempt was made to establish municipal organizations in the presidency towns. It empowered the Governor General-in-Council to appoint Justices of Peace from among the servants of East India Company and other British inhabitants for the Mayor's Courts. The Justices, beside judicial duties, were required to provide for scavenging, police, and repair of street, etc. They were also authorized to assess households for payment of rates. In 1801 town duties were imposed in the towns of Bengal for the purpose of improving public resources. This amounted to use of local resources for filling the imperial coffers. The indirect tax in the shape of town duties was condemned by Charles Trevelyan in his 'Report on Town Duties' in 1833. Between 1813 and 1816 different regulations were made to set-up committee in large cities to collect taxes on houses and lands for the provision of a town choukidar. Act XVI of 1837 authorized to committee to use the savings from House Tax for cleansing and repairing of towns.

The Act of 1842 was the first formal measure for organizing municipal institutions, but initially it was confined to Bengal Presidency. Under the Act any town could constitute a committee, if two-thirds of the householders put up a written demand for the purpose. The Town Committee was authorized to levy tax on the householders and undertake sanitary service. Because of the provision for direct taxation the Act

could not become popular. Only one town in Bengal made use of the Act, but the inhabitants there too, when called upon to pay tax, brought legal proceedings against the tax collector for trespass and won damages. Thus, the attempt to impose a direct tax met the same fate.

In U.P. (then called as North West Provinces), the Act was introduced in two towns at the request of European residents, first in Mussorie in 1842, followed by Nanital in 1845. Some how it did not succeed in either place.

The elective element was introduced in a restricted sense in Bombay under the Act XI of 1845 and in Calcutta under Act No. XVI of 1847. In Bombay a board of conservancy was established which was to have five members elected by the justices of Peace. Calcutta was provided with a Board of Seven Commissioners for the improvement of the city. Four of them were to be elected according to formula agreed upon by the rate-payers and the government. However, the said elective principle suffered a set-back in 1856. Act No. XIV and XXV prescribed for the three presidency towns a uniform system of administration and defined functions of civic administration. A body corporate consisting of three nominated salaried commissioners was set up in each of the three towns. All the municipal functions were concentrated in their hands.

After the mutiny and its suppression and re-occupation of Oudh in 1858, the management of Nazul and Municipal affairs was entrusted to Local Agency Committee set-up for the purpose. In Lucknow, the committee had the Deputy commissioner as its President and City Magistrate as Secretary. However, a new committee was set up in 1862 with thirteen members, of whom four were non-officials. The Judicial Commissioner was its President, the commissioner, Lucknow Division, was the vice-president, while the deputy commissioner acted as its secretary's.

A Royal Army Sanitation Commission was appointed by the Government in 1863 to report on the condition of the health of the Army in India. Most of the towns were dirty and insanitary. The Commission recommended measures for better sanitary arrangements to be implemented immediately. Within a few year of publication of its report and in the wake of Lord Lawrence's resolutions of 1864, Acts were passed for extension of municipal administration in different provinces. For example, Punjab Municipalities Act, 1867, Madras Town Improvement Act was passed in 1865, the N.W.P. Municipalities Legislation was enacted in 1868 and Bengal had two Acts, No. III in 1864 and No. VI in 1868. The N.W.P. Act contained a provision for the election of the President if so directed by the provincial government.

Then in 1870 came the Lord Mayo's resolution, which included: "But beyond all this, there is a greater and wider object in view. Local interest, supervision and care are necessary to success in the management of funds devoted to Education, Sanitation, Medical Charity, and Local Public Works. The operation of this resolution, in its meaning and integrity, will afford opportunities for the development of self-government, for strengthening Municipal Institutions, and for the association of native and Europeans, to a greater extent than heretofore, in the administration of affairs".

In this way, an emphasis was laid in the direction of "Self-Government". As a consequence either new acts were passed or the old acts were amended in several provinces to incorporate the elective principle in local bodies. The Madras Town Improvement Act of 1865 was amended in 1877; Bengal made provision for election in larger towns in 1873; in Bombay the Act of 1850 was superseded by Act VI of 1873 providing for some elected and some nominated members. The elective system in the North-West provinces including Oudh was introduced in 1872 and in 1874 through the orders of the provincial government. A combined Act for the municipalities in NorthWest Provinces and in Oudh was also enforced in 1873. Punjab introduced the elective system under Act IV of 1873. In Central Provinces election by wards commenced in 1876. But, in all the provinces it was a half-hearted attempt, the elective element was not introduced in full measure. By and large the Presidents/chairman still continued to be from amongst the officials.

Lord Ripon, who took over in 1880 as the new Viceroy, was a liberal and could not ignore the sentiments of Indians. He felt that 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.

The famous resolution, which is also called as Magna Carta of Local Self Government, was issued by Lord Ripon's Government on 18<sup>th</sup> May, 1882. The objective of Ripon's policy was two-fold. On the first hand the resolution provided that "adequate resources which are local in nature and are suited for local control, should be provided to local bodies". In the second place the resolution aimed at real self-government. He also wanted the local governments to suggest as to what measures, legislative or otherwise, are necessary to ensure more local self government. According to Lord Ripon, Local Self-Government was "an instrument of political and popular education"<sup>18</sup>.

Another important reform sought to be made by Ripon was in the composition of local boards, whether rural or urban. He felt that they must have a large preponderance of nonofficial members, and in no case the official members should exceed one third of the whole. He commended that the nonofficial members must be led to feel that real responsibilities to discharge. Having this end in view he suggested that, wherever practicable, a non-official should be made chairman of the Board. He went to the extent that where the District Magistrate continues to be chairman; he must not have, in that capacity, the right to vote in the proceedings. Thus Lord Ripon turned the tables in favor of the elective principle and he is acclaimed as 'Father of Local Self Government in India'.

The first outcome of the new resolution was making of legislations to enable local governments to give effect to the general scheme.

In Madras, a committee was appointed by the government in 1882, to report on the then existing local self-government and to suggest the needed reforms. Incorporating many of the recommendations made by the committee the District Municipalities Act IV of 1884 was passed. One of the important provision was related to the election of 3/4<sup>th</sup> of the number of municipal commissioners by rate-payers.

In Bombay, the Act of 1884 prescribed the election of at least one-half of the commissioners as a general rule both in 'city' and 'town' municipalities. It also fixed a limit on the number of government officers being nominated as members. It could not exceed one-quarter of the total. Similarly, Bengal Act No. III of 1884 also provided for election of two-third municipal commissioners by the rate-payers. The Chairman was to be elected by the commissioners in a majority of municipalities and the Vice-Chairman in all of them. The number of official members was also reduced to one-quarter.

In North-West Provinces and Oudh a new law was enacted in 1883 (Act XV), which enabled election of three-fourth of the members by the rate-payers and of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman by the municipal committee. However, the provincial government reserved the right to appoint the chairman in any municipality.

Punjab, through Act XIII of 1884, gave powers to municipal committees to elect their own presidents and vice-presidents, subject to government's approval. The elective elements in a municipality could be introduced at the pleasure of the provincial government. However, it did assure that after the introduction of the elective principle into a municipality, the step could not be retraced unless and until a majority of the electors moved an application for it or until it was considered against public interest.

Assam and Central Provinces adopted no new legislation. They continued to follow the provisions of Bengal Act V of 1872 and Act of 1873 respectively.

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 October, 1896 in respect of municipal bodies and the other for local boards in August, 1897. They showed an improvement in the working of local bodies so far as their finances and especially the expenditure were 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"<sup>19</sup>.

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 centralization.

In North-West Provinces and Oudh a new act was passed in 1900 to make a comprehensive provision for the organization and administration of municipalities. However, it was considered as a retrograde step in the sense that the local (provincial) government was given powers to restrain municipalities from giving effect to the election proviso. Thus, the elective principle was again given a blow.

Viscount Morley, who was the Secretary of State for India during 1905-10 got worried at this trend of over centralization. At his instance a Royal Commission on Decentralization 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 decentralization those relations could be simplified and improved and if the executive power could be brought closer to local conditions.

The Commission, among other things, recommended that the municipal chairman should usually be an elected non-official<sup>20</sup>. About the elective element it said that a municipal council should ordinarily contain a substantial elective majority, nominees being only a sufficient proportion to provide for due representation of minorities and official experience<sup>21</sup>. 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. For large cities, say with a population of 1,00,000 or upwards, the Commission felt that the form of municipal government should be somewhat different so, as to provide for full time executive officers. Some of the other recommendations made by the Royal Commission were:

- i. Municipalities should be relieved of any charges they may now have to incur in respect of police, veterinary work etc.
- ii. They should also be relieved from contributions for services of a provincial character, or for statistical and other establishments maintained in government offices.
- iii. Municipalities should have full liberty to impose or alter taxation within the limits laid down by the municipal laws.
- iv. Where an Act does not prescribe a maximum rate, the sanction of an outside authority should be required to make any increase in taxation.
- v. Similar sanction should be required where a municipality desires specially to exempt any person or class of persons from municipal taxation.
- vi. Municipalities should have a free hand in regard to their budgets. The only check required should be with regard to maintenance of a minimum standing balance to be prescribed by the Local Government. The freedom should include the power of re-appropriation.
- vii. Municipalities should not be subject to any orders requiring the allotment of a percentage of their revenues to any particular services ,and
- viii. Municipal councils should be able to delegate any of their administrative functions to Committees, which may include persons not on the council.

The recommendations of the Decentralization Commission were circulated to the provincial governments. Some progress was made on the lines of these proposals. The number of non-official chairmen gradually increased. In consonance with the recommendation of the Commission, the post of Health Officer in larger towns and Sanitary Inspector in smaller towns was made obligatory at the instance of Government of India. Municipal Commissioners were appointed in Ahmedabad and Surat in 1915.

In the wake of Swaraj and Swadeshi movement came Morley-Minto Reforms in 1909. The local bodies were made electoral colleges for certain seats in the provincial legislatures. The political parties organized themselves at local levels and started participating in keenly contest in local elections. However, the resources of local bodies were poor. The provincial governments also depended on the Centre, because it was the latter which controlled the resources and deserves of taxation. Under such conditions the desired development of local government institutions could not take place.

The United Provinces Municipalities Act of 1916 (which replaced the Act of 1900) is a landmark in the development of city governments in U.P. It incorporated recommendations of the Royal Commission on Decentralization and the Resolution of Government of India, 1915. From the political point of view the importance lies in the removal of guidance and control exercised by the official chairman. The Act provided for delegation of powers and functions to committees and officers of the Board. It also introduced the post of Executive Officers as the head of the permanent staff. However, the Chairman was the executive head, empowered for appointing and dismissing municipal staff and laying down the terms of their service. Except for the appointing and dismissing powers for the Centralized Service Personnel, he still continues to be both, the political and administrative executive.

The joint report on Indian Constitution Reforms (popularly known as Montague- Chelmsford Report), submitted in 1918, realized the importance of extension of franchise at the local level. They felt that this would help in arousing citizen's interest in elections and in the functioning of local bodies. They were of the opinion that 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 chairman of Municipalities in India were nominated officials, another one-third were elected officials and the remaining one-third formed elected non-officials.

With the installation of responsible governments under diarchial 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 enlarged electorate. This generated enhanced activity in the local institutions. Municipal elections were keenly contested. And in wake of the recommended reforms came the spate of municipal legislations in different provinces by repealing or amending the old Acts.

A new Act of Municipalities had already come into force in U.P. in 1916. The Punjab Act of 1911 was amended in 1921 to increase the powers and independence of municipal councils, and also to lower the franchise. The municipalities were encouraged to elect non-official presidents and vice-presidents. The municipal law in Bihar and Orrisa (combined) was enacted in 1922. Earlier the Bengal Municipal Act of 1884 was in force in those two provinces. The new Act incorporated the spirit of various reforms discussed in the preceding paragraphs. Central Provinces and Assam also followed the suit.

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 rare-payers, including women, were given right to vote and to seek election. However, the elective strength was raised to three fourths in 1929.

In Bombay city franchise was extended under the Act of 1922. It also removed the sex qualification for election as councilor, and gave greater power to the Municipal Corporation. Another Act passed in 1925 made the city municipalities, with a population exceeding one lakh wholly elective. In other municipalities the strength of elected members was raised to 4/5th of the total membership. Women were given right to vote and stand for election. A special provision for the representation of depressed classes was also made.

The Indian Statutory Commission (popularly know as Simon Commission) was appointed by the British Crown in 1927 to examine the working of responsible government introduced under the Act of 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 and others have been equally conspicuous failures, the bulk lies between these extremes”<sup>22</sup>.

The Commission favored 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. As 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 the reserved and transferred subjects was withdrawn. Popular governments were installed in different provinces. Indians, having now been given powers, concerned themselves with the re-organization of local self-government. Many provincial governments appointed committees to re-organise the local-government. The Government of United Provinces appointed a committee under the president ship of Mr.A.G. Kher in 1938 to examine the structure and working of the existing law and machinery relating to local self-government and to recommend suitable organizational set-ups armed with adequate powers and resources. One of the major recommendations of the committee was that those municipalities which, had a population of 1½ lakhs or above and their annual income exceeded Rs. 15 Lakh per annum, should be declared as Corporations. Their powers and privileges were to be defined by the state government<sup>23</sup>.

The popular governments resigned in 1939 as a protest against the British Government's dragging India into war without her consent. Therefore, the recommendations made by these committees could not see the light of the day until after independence.

Independence brought a new kind of activity in every sphere of public life. It opened a new chapter in the history of local government in India. The present Constitution came into force in 1950 and the local self-government entered a new phase. The Constitution of India has allotted the local self-government to the state list of functions. Since Independence much important legislations for reshaping of local self-government have been passed in many states of India. The constitutions of local bodies were democratized by the introduction of adult suffrage and the abolition of communal representation. In July 1953<sup>24</sup>, the U.P. Government took a decision to set-up Municipal Corporations in five big cities of Kanpur, Agra, Varanasi, Allahabad and Lucknow, popularly known as KAVAL Towns. As a result, the state of U.P. adopted a new Act for Municipal Corporations in 1959.

After Independence the National Government appointed a committee in 1948 known as the Local Finance Inquiry Committee, to report on ways and means for improving the financial resources of local bodies. The report came in 1951. The taxation Enquiry Commission, set up in 1953, was also baffled with this problem. The Central Government though, under the Constitution not charged with the responsibility of local government, has been the principal source of reforms in the municipal field. It is the Central Government, which has been responsible for setting up committees and commissions and other organs devoted to study the problems of local government.

The other significant committees and commissions appointed were:

1. The committee on the training of Municipal Employees, 1963;
2. The Rural Urban Relationship Committee, 1963-1966;
3. National Commission on Urbanization, 1985-1988.

The Centre Council of Local Self-Government constituted by the Central Government, has also played a significant role in labouring on reforms needed in the various aspects of municipal government and administration. The Rural-Urban Relationship Committee devoted itself to both functional and financial aspects and was largely microscopic in its approach. One more report came from another committee of the council on the service conditions of municipal employees (1965-68). Then in 1985, the Central Government appointed the National Commission on Urbanization, which gave its report in 1988. This was the first commission to study and give suggestions on all aspects of urban management.

Apart from the contributions made by the Central Government, committees were appointed in different states in order to improve the municipal organizations and administration there under. Municipal legislations have been suitably adapted from time to time keeping this end in view. Major structural changes had not taken place except in the larger and important cities, where municipal corporations had been established, and in U.P. in 1966, where Centralization of Municipal Services took place, until 1992, when the Constitution 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment Act was passed.

The Constitution (74<sup>th</sup> Amendment) Act, 1992 is a landmark initiative of the Government of India to strengthen local self-government in cities and towns. It is built upon the premise that all ‘power’ in a democracy rightfully belongs to ‘the, people’. It prescribes that the elected municipal representatives must have a decisive role in the planning, provision and delivery of civic infrastructure and services. Accordingly, the Act stipulates that if the state government dissolves a Municipality, election to the same must be held within a period of six months. Moreover, the conduct of municipal elections is entrusted to statutory State Election Commission, rather than being left to executive authorities. The mandate of the Municipalities is to undertake the tasks of planning for ‘economic development and social justice’ and implement city/town development plans. This role is much larger than what is traditionally perceived of them as the providers of ‘services’.

The 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment Act aims transformation in the ‘structure’ of urban service delivery. The starting point for the same is municipal governance. The Act envisages three types of Municipalities : Municipal Corporations for large cities, Municipal Councils for smaller cities and towns, and Nagar Panchayats for areas in transition from ‘rural’ to ‘urban’. Accordingly, the state governments have re-categorized different areas by notifying the criteria for classification of municipal bodies.

To ensure that the Municipalities are sensitive enough to the problems of weaker sections and women, the 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment provides for reservations for scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs) and women in municipal councils. The seats reserved for SCs and STs are to be in proportion to their share in population of the respective cities/towns. A minimum of 33 1/3 per cent of per seats are reserved for women. Reservation is intended to provide a voice to those who were neglected in the past.

The approaches adopted in the Constitution (74<sup>th</sup> Amendment) Act to appropriately address the above issues are as follows:

- (i) The constitution of Wards Committees for a group of wards is mandatorily prescribed for cities with more than 3 lakhs population, with no bar for the constitution of such Committees in cities/towns with lesser population, with a view to taking municipal governance closer to the people.
- (ii) An illustrative list legitimate municipal function is provided in the 12<sup>th</sup> Schedule for guiding the state government in the assigning of responsibilities to the Urban Local Bodies (ULBs).
- (iii) The constitution of District and Metropolitan Planning Committees (DPCs and MPCs) for the preparation of the District and Metropolitan Development Plans is mandatory. At least four-fifth of the members of a District Planning Committee should be the elected representatives of the concerned Municipalities and Panchayats. Similarly, at least two-third of the members of a Metropolitan Planning Committee must be the elected municipal councilors and chairpersons of Panchayats. The representatives from urban and rural local bodies in these Committees are to be in proportion of urban to rural population in the respective jurisdictions.
- (iv) The state governments are required to specify the sources of municipal finance “by law”. It is mandatory for them to constitute State Finance Commission once in every five years which would recommend the devolution of taxes, charges, fees tolls, duties, shared revenues and intergovernmental transfers to the Municipalities. Under the amended Article 280 of the Constitution, it is mandatory on the part of the Central Finance Commission to recommend devolution of Central resources to supplement the State Consolidated funds with a view to implementing the recommendations of the State Finance Commissions.

The Constitution (74<sup>th</sup> Amendment) Act envisages a ‘systemic change’ in municipal governance in the country; it prescribes an institutional framework for the efficient delivery of urban services. This framework consists of a number of statutory institutions, which include

1. Municipalities to function as “institutions of self-government” – prepare “plans for economic development and social justice”, perform functions and implement schemes as may be entrusted to them by the state governments, including those related to the Twelfth Schedule [Article 243W(a)];
2. Wards Committees and other Committees to carry out the responsibilities conferred upon them, including those in relation to the Twelfth Schedule [Article 243W(b)];

3. State Election Commission to superintend, direct and control the preparation of electoral rolls and conduct all elections to the rural and urban local bodies [Article 243K(1)];
4. State Finance Commission to review the financial position of the rural and urban local bodies and make recommendations to the Governor regarding (i) the “principles” which should govern the distribution of resources between the state and local bodies, the determination of the revenue resources to be assigned to or appropriated by local bodies, the grants-in-aid from the State Consolidated funds to such authorities; (ii) the “measure” needed to improve their financial position; and, (iii) any other matter as the Governor may refer to in the interests of sound finances of the local bodies [Article 243(1)];
5. District Planning Committees (DPCs) to” consolidate” the plans prepared by the Panchayats and the Municipalities in the district as a whole [Article 243ZD(1)];
6. Metropolitan Planning Committees (MPCs) to prepare draft development plan for the Metropolitan area as a whole [Article 243 ZE(1)].

The Constitution (74th Amendment) Act addresses the first two aspects, leaving considerable tasks to be attended to at the state and municipal levels. In a multi-tier federation, path-breaking breaking institutional changes as those envisaged in the 74th Amendment are bound to involve conflicts of interest. Institutional transformations are likely to be faster when they receive strong support from the beneficiaries, take all the stakeholders into confidence and incite strong public opinion against the vested interests. The support of the Central and state governments in absolutely critical as there can be no decentralization without the higher authorities shedding some of the powers they have enjoyed for years.

The 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment Act aims at ushering in strong grassroots level democracy through the establishment of the above key institutions. However, the Constitution leaves the issues of their empowerment and operationalisation to the wisdom of the state governments. Most states have only conformed to the letter of the Amendment and not to its spirit. Amendment to the Municipal legislation in various states has only been with regard to the electoral reforms. While elections have taken place in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, little effort has been made to enlarge the functional and financial domain of the Municipalities. The State Finance Commissions have submitted their report to the state governments but there is a great deal of reluctance by the state governments to accept its recommendations. On the contrary, many states have further reduced the financial powers of Municipalities after the State Finance Commission reports were submitted. The states have made provisions in their legislation for the Ward Committees, District Planning Committees and Metropolitan Planning Committees, but these committees are still to be made functional in many states.

### **Urban Local Govt. in Uttar Pradesh**

The state has a long history of urban local government. Uttar Pradesh (the erstwhile United Provinces) has been a pioneer in enacting the legislations as well as governs the functioning of the urban local institutions. A municipal Act exclusively for Lucknow was enacted in 1856, followed by North-West Provinces and Avadh Municipal Act, 1873 which was substituted in 1883 in pursuance of Ripon Act of 1882. In accordance, sufficient reforms were introduced in 1870 and 1882 in municipal administration. The notified area committees were constituted under an Act of 1900 and the Zilla Parishads Act came into existence in ‘1906’. The U.P. Town Area Act was enacted in 1914 and the U.P. Municipalities Act came into effect in 1916, in 1919 U.P. Town Improvement Act was legislated and Improvement Trusts were created in five big towns. In 1945 Kanpur Urban Area Development Act was passed and a Development Board substituted the Improvement Board there. The buildings (Regulation Act was legislated in 1958 followed by the U.P. Municipal Corporation Act, 1959. In 1973 U.P. Planning and development Act was enacted and the Development Authorities were set up. The legislation of U.P. Water Supply and Sewer System Act 1975 created a number of Jal Sansthans. These Acts have been after amended to cope with the changing scenario<sup>26</sup>.

## Post-74<sup>th</sup> Scenario

In consonance with the 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Constitution, the Uttar Pradesh Local Self Government Laws (Amendment) Act, 1994 was passed by the legislature of Uttar Pradesh, which came into force w.e.f. 31.05.1994. Some of the salient changes made through the Amendment Act, 1994 are as under :

1. U.P. (Nagar Mahapalika) Act, 1959 and U.P. Nagar Palika (Municipalities) Act, 1916 have been renamed as U.P. Nagar Nigam Act, 1959 and U.P. Nagar Palika Act, 1916 respectively, while the U.P. Town Area Act, 1914 has been repealed.
2. Before 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment there were 5 categories of the urban local bodies i.e.:
  - (i) Nagar Maha Palika
  - (ii) City Board
  - (iii) Nagar Palika
  - (iv) Notified Area Committee
  - (v) Town Area Committee

But after the 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment there are only three categories of Urban Local Bodies in Uttar Pradesh:

- (1) Nagar Nigam (Municipal Corporation)
- (2) Nagar Palika Parishad (Municipal Board)
- (3) Nagar Panchayat (Town Panchayat)

Before 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment, under section-30 of the Act, the State Govt. was empowered to dissolve any Municipality any time if it is satisfied that the board has made a willful default in the performance of any duty or has exceeded or abused its powers.

But after 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment this power has been curtailed and now it is provided under section-30 of the Act, (1916) that, if the govt. is satisfied that a Municipality persistently makes willful default in the performance of duties imposed upon it or exceeds or abuses more than once its powers it may dissolve it after having given the municipality a reasonable opportunity to show cause.

3. At present urban local body cannot be kept dissolved for more than six months period. According to section-8 of U.P. Municipal Corporation Act, 1959 and section-10-A of U.P. Municipalities Act, 1916, elections have been made compulsory before the expiry of a period of six months from the date of its dissolution.
4. **Reservation of seats:** Under section 7 of the U.P. Municipal Corporation Act, 1959 and section-10-A of the U.P. Municipalities Act, 1916, following provisions of reservation have been made<sup>27</sup>.
  - (i) In every urban local body seats shall be reserved for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the number of seats so reserved bear as nearly as may be, the same proportion to the total number of seats to be filled by direct election in that local body as the population of the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes in the municipal area bears to the total population of such area and such seats may be allotted by rotation to different wards in an urban local body in such order as may be prescribed by rules.
  - (ii) In every urban local body twenty seven percent of seats, to be filled by direct election, shall be reserved for the backward classes and such seats may be allotted by rotation to different wards in such order as may be prescribed by rules.
  - (iii) Not less than one-third of the total number of seats reserved under aforesaid (i) and (ii) shall be reserved for the women belonging to the Scheduled Castes, and Scheduled Tribes or the backward classes, as the case may be.
  - (iv) Not less than one-third of the total number of seats including the number of seats reserved under aforesaid (iii) shall be reserved for woman and such seats may be allotted by rotation to different wards in such order as may be prescribed by rules.

(v) The officer of the Mayors and Presidents shall be reserved for the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes, the backward classes and the women in such manner as may be prescribed by the rules.

5. **Constitution And Composition Etc. of wards Committees** :Provision for the constitution and composition etc. of wards, committees have been made under section-6(A) of the Act, 1959 and under section 3(B) of the Act, 1916.

In every Municipal Corporation there will be Wards Committees but in Municipalities it will be constituted only in those municipalities, which have a population of three lakhs or more.

6. **Financial Powers:** Financial Powers of Mayor and Mukhya Nagar Adhikari in case of Municipal Corporation and President in case of Municipality and Nagar Panchayat have been increased to a great extent.
7. **District Planning Committee** : Provisions have been made to constitute a District Planning Committee which will prepare the draft development plan of the district. The committee shall in preparing the draft development plan have regard to matters of common interest between the Panchayats and the Municipal Corporations, Municipal Councils and Nagar Panchayats including spatial planning, sharing of water and other physical and natural resources, the integrated development of infrastructure and environmental conservation. Besides this the Committee will take into account the extent and type of a available resources whether financial or otherwise and consult such institutions and organisatins as the governor may be order specify.
8. Powers regarding the framing and making the byelaws have been delegated to the local bodies. Now it shall be subject to the only condition of the bye laws being made after previous publication and of their not taking effect until they have been confirmed by the state govt. and published in the official gazette.
9. **Expansion In the Duties:** Function which have been added as a consequences of the 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment in the duties of the urban local bodies are as follows <sup>28</sup>:
- (i) Providing water supply for domestic, industrial and commercial purposes;
  - (ii) Establishing, maintaining and assisting maternity centers and child welfare and birth control clinics and promoting population control, family welfare and small family norms;
  - (iii) Regulating tanneries;
  - (iv) Construction and maintenance of parking lots, bus stops and public conveniences;
  - (v) Promoting urban forestry and ecological aspects and protection of environment;
  - (vi) Safeguarding the interests of weaker sections of society including the handicapped and mentally retarded;
  - (vii) Promoting cultural, educational and aesthetic aspects;
  - (viii) Constructing and maintaining cattle pounds
10. **Constitution of state Finance Commission (S.F.C.)** Consequent upto 73<sup>rd</sup> and 74<sup>th</sup> Amendments to the Constitution of India, and in exercise of the powers conferred by Article 243(1) & (X), the Governor vide Finance Departments Notification no. RG-1933/x-53-94 dated October 22, 1994 constituted the State Finance Commission (Panchayat Raj & Local Bodies). The S.F.C. was required to study and recommend among other things the distribution between state, gram/kshetra/zila panchayats and urban local bodies, of the net proceeds of taxes, duties, tolls and fees livable by the state which may be divided amongst them under part IX & IX-A of the constitution and the allocation between Panchayats at all levels an urban local bodies of their respective shares

of such proceeds. Subsequently the state government through Notification No. RG-743/X-94-68/94 dated April 24, 1995 extended the term of the commission till 31<sup>st</sup> December 1995, which was again extended upto 31<sup>st</sup> December, 1996 later on.

First State Finance Commission (SFC) submitted its Interim Recommendations to the state government on 31<sup>st</sup> December, 1995 and Final Recommendations on 31<sup>st</sup> December 1996, which were accepted by the government in January 1998. The recommendations of the S.F.C. were made effective since 1<sup>st</sup> April, 1997. There are in all 61 recommendations of the S.F.C. which deal with the Urban Local Bodies, foremost amongst them are as follows <sup>29</sup>:

- (i) Devolution of the 7 percent of the proceeds of the total tax revenue of the state government to the urban local bodies.
- (ii) The inter-se distribution of the 7 percent of net proceeds is, 3.12 percent each of municipal Corporations and Municipalities and the remaining 0.76 percent to Nagar Panchayats.
- (iii) S.F.C. has recommended the criteria of 80 percent population and 20 percent area for devolution of net proceeds of state's tax revenue to the three categories of urban local bodies and determine their inter-se percentage share accordingly in 3.12% of net proceeds earmarked each for Municipal Corporation and Municipalities and 0.76 per cent of net proceeds earmarked for Nagar Panchayats. The amount of 7 percent devolution was Rs. 445.78 crore in 1997-98 while in 1998-99 it swelled up to the tune of Rs. 525.00 crore.
- (iv) Unpaid electric bills (upto 31<sup>st</sup> March) of the local bodies which is about Rs. 550 crore has been waived off. State Government is paying the same amount to the U.P. State Electricity Board on behalf of at urban local bodies.
- (v) Loans sanctioned to the urban local bodies which was over due on 31<sup>st</sup> March 1997 under-water supply schemes, Integrated City Development Scheme, special component plan for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, schemes for the beautification of the cities have been converted into grants by the state government.
- (vi) Rates of Non-Tax Revenue have been revised and as mentioned earlier the power to further revise these rates in future by framing or amending the bye laws has been delegated to urban local bodies.
- (vii) To increase the own sources of tax revenue of urban local bodies the target has been fixed to fix the demand as per the estimated population of 1997, minimum per capita of Rs. 120 for municipal Corporation and Rs. 40 to 90 per capita in Nagar Palika Parishad (depending upon the population) and Rs. 20 per capita in Nagar Panchayats vide g.o. No. 3488/IX-9-97-55/97 dated October 22, 1997.
- (viii) Imposition of all types of taxes enumerated in the Act, has been made compulsory vide g.o. No. 2371(1)/IX-91998 dated September 23, 1998. The second state finance commission submitted its report to the state government lay back and it is under consideration.

Now in the following pages the handbook deals exclusively with the data relating to Urban Local Bodies of Uttar Pradesh and contains the following data tables:

### ***List of Tables***

- ❖ Trend of Urbanization in India
- ❖ State-wise level of Urbanization
- ❖ Urban Local Bodies of Uttar Pradesh at A Glance
- ❖ List of Class wise Urban Local Bodies of Uttar Pradesh
- ❖ Basic Information of Municipal Corporations of Uttar Pradesh
- ❖ Basic Information's of Urban Local Bodies - Uttar Pradesh
- ❖ Trends of Urbanization in Uttar Pradesh
- ❖ Class wise Population of ULBs in Uttar Pradesh
- ❖ Slum Population of Districts & Urban Local Bodies – Uttar Pradesh
- ❖ Classification of Urban Workers in Uttar Pradesh
- ❖ Population Growth of ULBs in Uttar Pradesh (1901 - 2001)
- ❖ List of Elected Mayors and Chairpersons of ULB's
- ❖ Women Representation in Urban Local Bodies of Uttar Pradesh
- ❖ List of Elected Women Mayors and Women Chairpersons of ULB's

## REFERENCES

1. Vekateshwaralu, U., Urbanization in India, New Age International Pub., Delhi, P. 235.
2. Ibid. P. 235.
3. Ibid.P. 235.
4. Tewari, V.K., Urbanization in India : Patterns and Perspective, Paper presented at the National Seminar on Future Cities – Urban Vision-2021, Oct. 6-7, 1997.
5. Singh, U.B., Urban Local Government in Uttar Pradesh Post- 1992 Scenario, Quarterly Journal of The All India Institute of Local Self Government, Vol. LXVIII No. 3-4, July-Dec., 1997, P.1.
6. Jenneifer, S.I., Principles of Local Government Law, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. P. 3
7. Maud, S.J. and Finer, S.E., Local Government in England and Wales, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. P.1
8. Robson, W.A., Development of Local Government, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., P. 91.
9. Smellie, K.B., A History of Local Government, P.10.
10. Barratt, C., Your Local Authority, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. P.2.
11. Maud, S.J. and Finer, S.E., Opcit, PP-7-8
12. Mukherjee, R.K., Local Government in Ancient India, Forward and Preface.
13. Sharma, Dashrath, Early Chauhan dynasties From 800 B.C. to 1300 A.D. McMillan Corp., London, PP-2003-2004.
14. Saran, P., Provincial Government of Mughals, PP-232-234.
15. Tinkar, H., The Foundation of Local Self Government in India, Pakistan and Burma, 1954, PP-25-26.
16. Report of the Lucknow Municipal Board Inquiry Committee, U.P. Government, 1942, P-7.
17. Resolution of Government of India, No. 171747-759, dated 18<sup>th</sup> May, 1882.
18. Mahaeshwari, S.R. Local Government in India, Orient Longmans, Delhi, 1971, P-17.
19. Memoranda submitted to the Indian Statutory Commission by the Govt. of India (Vol.V), 1930, P. 1064
20. Report of the Royal Commission on Decentralization in India, 1909, Vol. I, P-282.
21. Ibid, P. 281.
22. Report of the Indian Statutory Commission, Vol. I, Chapter 4, para 349.
23. Report of the Local Self-Government, vide Notification No. 11/6/XI-457, Municipal Department, dated March 24, 1938), Part II, Para II, Para XI, P-3.
24. **Sharma, V.N.** “Our Nagar Mahapalikas : Major steps towards better civic rule”. Northern India Patrika (Supplement), February 1, 1960.
25. 74<sup>th</sup> Amendment Act, Government of India, 1992.
26. **Singh, U.B.**, Opcit, P. 169.
27. 1.1th Finance Commission, Urban Local Bodies of U.P., Local Bodies Directorate, U.P., Lucknow, 1999.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.

## Trend of Urbanization in India

Census Years	Total Population (million)	Urban Population (Million)	No. of Towns/ UAs	Percentage of Urban Population to Total Population	Decadal Urban Growth Rate (%)	Tempo of Urbanization (Percentage Per Year)		
						Annual Exponential Growth Rate	Annual Gain in percentage of Urban population	Annual Rate of Gain in Percentage of Urban population
1901	238.40	25.85	1827	10.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1911	252.09	25.94	1815	10.29	0.35	0.03	-0.06	-0.51
1921	251.32	28.09	1949	11.18	8.27	0.79	0.09	0.86
1931	278.98	33.46	2072	11.99	19.12	1.75	0.08	0.72
1941	318.66	44.15	2250	13.86	31.97	2.77	0.19	1.56
1951	361.09	62.44	2843	17.29	41.42	3.47	0.34	2.47
1961	439.23	78.94	2365	17.97	26.41	2.34	0.07	0.41
1971	548.16	109.11	2590	19.91	38.23	3.21	0.19	1.08
1981	683.33	159.46	3378	23.34	46.14	3.83	0.34	1.72
1991	846.30	217.61	3768	25.71	36.47	3.09	0.24	1.02
2001	1027.01	285.35	5161	27.78	31.12	2.73	0.31	2.07

**Note :**

- 1- Population data includes projected population of Assam in 1981.
  - 2- Population data includes projected population of Jammu & Kashmir in 1991.
- Source : Census of India (1991a), Census of India (1991b).

## State-wise Level of Urbanization

States	1981		1991		2001	
	Urban Population	% of Urban to Total	Urban Population	% of Urban to Total	Annual %age 1981-91	Urban Population (Million)
Maharashtra	21.99	35.03	30.54	38.69	3.34	41.19
Gujrat	10.60	31.12	14.25	34.50	3.00	18.89
Tamil Nadu	15.95	32.95	19.08	34.16	1.81	27.24
Karnataka	10.73	28.89	13.91	30.92	2.63	17.92
Punjab	4.65	27.70	5.99	29.54	2.56	8.24
West Bengal	14.45	26.47	18.71	27.48	2.62	22.49
Andhra Pradesh	12.49	23.32	17.89	26.90	3.66	20.50
Kerala	4.77	18.74	7.68	26.39	4.88	8.27
All India	159.46	23.34	217.61	25.71	3.16	285.35
Haryana	2.83	21.90	4.05	24.61	3.65	6.11
Madhya Pradesh	10.59	20.30	15.34	23.18	3.78	16.10
Rajasthan	7.21	21.04	10.07	22.88	3.40	13.21
Uttar Pradesh	19.90	17.95	27.61	19.85	3.33	34.51
Orissa	3.11	11.79	4.23	13.36	3.12	5.50
Bihar	8.72	12.47	11.35	13.14	2.67	8.68
Assam	1.78	9.87	2.49	11.11	3.41	3.38

Note : Chatisgarh, Jharkhand and Utteranchal were noted furcating Madhya Pardesh, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh respectively in 2000.

Source : Census of India (1991a), Census of India (1991b).