

Journal of Indian Studies

Vol. 10, No. 2, July– December, 2024, pp. 223 – 236

Provincial Autonomy in Pakistan and India: A Comparative Analysis with Reference to the 18th Constitutional Amendment and Indian Federalism.

Muhammad Nauman

Advocate High Court, LL.M (Std), Superior College of Law, Lahore, Pakistan

Email: naumannoor757@gmail.com

Shahzad Khalid

Director Legal/ Assistant Professor, Superior College of Law, Lahore, Pakistan.

Email: rana.shahzad@superior.edu.pk

Shahzad Ahmad

Advocate High Court, Lahore, Pakistan.

Email: navy.noor@gmail.com

Received:
Oct 01, 2024

Published:
Dec 31, 2024

ABSTRACT

Researchers conduct an analytical evaluation of political powers between provinces in Pakistan and India focusing on Pakistan's 18th Amendment and the country's federal governing system. This analysis based on comparative legal research method studies how both nations regulate their center-province relation through constitutional provisions along with their amendments and judicial decisions as well as legal structures. This paper conducts an in-depth examination of how the 18th Amendment affected Pakistan's federal system by assessing the current situation of provincial self-governance along with emerging administrative burdens. The study traces the historical development and legal display of Indian federalism to analyze state autonomous powers within the national constitutional framework. This research explores the various constitutional structures which exist in both nations because they affect how states and their central government interact with each other. This study analyzes federal governance problems in the United States and Canada for extracting useful lessons that pertain to South Asian countries. The paper details various obstacles that impede federalism implementation in Pakistan and India and offers framework strengthening recommendations for both countries. The analysis investigates the political and legal and administrative aspects of federalism in these two countries before suggesting improvements for provincial-government relations through the use of discourse analysis. This research enhances comprehension of extensive federal governance through various systems and demonstrates potential synergistic learning for Pakistan and India in building improved federal structures.

Key Words: Provincial Autonomy, Federalism, 18th Constitutional Amendment, Center-State Relations, Constitutional Law

Introduction

A. Background of the Study

Federalism being a system of governance entails the decentralisation of power between a core center and sub-units for instance provincial or state. In the assessment of federalism, the extent of autonomy provided to such units enabling them to govern their affairs but at the same time form the national framework is seen as a paramount measure of federalism success. After getting independence from the British rule, two countries of South Asia, Pakistan and India choose the federal system. Although these countries have somewhat transformed federative systems over the years, this was in different ways due to the historical, political and socio-economic differences among the countries.

According to the context of Pakistan, the struggle for provincial autonomy has been a persistent matter in its political chronicle that has produced extensive constitutional modifications and which includes the most prominent the 18th Constitutional Amendment in 2010. This particular amendment was intended to accord with the calls of provinces for decentralization with a view of transferring certain powers from the federal government to provinces. While India's federal structure was adopted at the time of the state's 1950 Constitution, it has undergone changes following amendment and political progress. It has been observed that Indian model of federalism gives a wide autonomy to the states but it also upholds a strong centralization; which sometimes has created tension between the center and the states.

Analyzing federal systems illuminates a country 's capacity to exercise control over the power sharing between central Governments and regional Governments. Pakistan and India, for instance, have federal systems, to respect the diverse population and regions' political dispersion. Analyzing how such provincial and state roles in federal systems reveal the historical and political development of these nations not only deepens our knowledge of these above stated countries' political development but also contributes to contemporary discords of governance and decentralization.

B. Research Objectives

In this research article, the author intent to compare and contrast provincial autonomy of both the countries Pakistan and India. The primary objectives include:

1. An empirical investigation into effects of the 18th Constitutional Amendment on the provincial autonomy in Pakistan.
2. To analyse the nature and development of state autonomy in the context of the Indian federal structure.
3. Discourse analysis of the promotion and maintenance of federalism as a political system in Pakistan and India.

Provincial Autonomy in Pakistan and India: A Comparative Analysis with Reference to the 18th Constitutional Amendment and Indian Federalism.

4. Suggesting the lessons and possibilities for emulation of federal experience that each country might find relevant in the case of the other.

C. Research Questions

To achieve the above objectives, the following research questions will guide the study:

1. A comparison of provincial autonomy in Pakistan, after the 18th Amendment to the Constitution of Pakistan, with state autonomy in the context of India.
2. Had there been different provisions of constitution of Pakistan and India to determine the ratio between the center and the provinces/states?
3. What new problems did appear both in the USA and in Canada concerning the concept of Provincial/State Autonomy?
4. This paper asks the following question: what potential reforms can help improve the functioning of federalism in Pakistan and India??

D. Methodology

The present study employs a comparative legal research approach with emphasis on Pakistan and India, the source data include the constitution, constitutional amendments, case laws, and other relevant legal provisions. A review of academic articles, reports and case studies will also be conducted in order to ensure that there is good understanding of the development and current status of provincial autonomy in both countries.

II. Theoretical Framework

A. Concept of Federalism

Federalism can be described as decentralized system of governance effectively enacted where the central government and the constituent units' powers are enumerated in the constitution, (Riker, 1964). National matters are handled by the central government as they are universal while the sub-national units handle those matters that are specific to a certain region thus the ability to bring unity in diversity in a certain country. They think that federalism contributes to the formation of the large political union and at the same time maintains cultural and administrative differentiation.

Thus, it could be argued that the effectiveness of a federal system of government relies with the extent to which decentralisation is granted to sub national division. The devolution this afford provinces or states legislative, administrative and judicial autonomy to undertake activities in the provincial or state realm without much interferences from the center. However, the nature of distribution of power between the center and the provinces or states may not be the

same in every federation and this may be due to historical, political as well as cultural factors (Watts, 2008 as cited).

On this premise, federalism as a concept of governance offers a pedestal through which the nature of the centralized government power in relation to other regional power can be understood. Whereas classical federalism assumes of balance of the central and regional government, the current and more adapted theories of federalism are polymorphic, that is, they are in a constant state of change.

Federalism in the classical definition of the Federal relation is therefore a creation of a common will of independent personalities who agree to form a common state but retain their individuality. This can be illustrated by examples of historical evolution of federal systems such as in the case of USA and Switzerland; the states or cantons have quite a lot of power besides the center. (Riker, 1964) However in the modern federation there are inter linkages of powers; the central government is more or less involved in the various integration processes in the country, in matters relating to cooperation and economic policy making.

There are also certain historical cum political factors and socio-economic factors that had made federalism in Pakistan and India possible. For instance, both countries have got similar characteristics in as much as administrative legacy from British colonial masters was concerned, but the two countries evolved politically in a different way and faced different population and economic challenges. These contexts are important so as to understand how the federalism has evolved in these countries and the effects it has on the provincial or state authority.

B. Theoretical Perspectives on Autonomy

The theory and nature of self-governance in federalism can be looked in a number of ways. Centralization/decentralization power/authority distribution is the leadership struggle is one of the main focuses. This is the transformation by which several powers are centralized at the national level due to reasons of standardization, or need to centralize some powers in regard to issues of security in the nation or economic stability in the country. On the other hand, decentralized system wants the powers to be given to the regional governments, stresses on regional, local, cultural and can enhance participation and portrayal (Elazar, 1987).

On this basis, it is possible to understand that federal systems can be located between these two poles, and there are those that are more oriented on centralization, and those that are more oriented on decentralization. This is not to insinuate that the extent to which decentralisation is carried out is determined by the wants of the central administration only but rather by the political, economic and cultural factor of the country in question. For instance, in multicultural societies where ethnic, linguistic or religious diversity is characteristic, decentralisation can be justified for non-conflict and pluriethnicity assurance (Stepan, 1999). However, whenever there is hostility or civil strife externally or

Provincial Autonomy in Pakistan and India: A Comparative Analysis with Reference to the 18th Constitutional Amendment and Indian Federalism.

internally, decentralization may not be considered proper for it erodes on unity and stability of the country.

While Pakistan and India were formed the question of centralization-decentralization was important to define the share of powers between the center and provinces or states. As it has been mentioned in the theoretical backgrounds on autonomy, the level of decentralization of power could be the indications of the capability of the efficient governing, the chance for the definite groups' representation and the stability of the federal framework.

In Pakistan, centralization has had traditionally been defended on the grounds that there is need to save the nation, in a state that is ethnolinguistically highly fractionalized. Centralization and direct interferences in the provincial affairs have ensured some of them cause tensions Balochistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa among its subjects who have called for more decentralisation (Waseem, 2010).

Similarly, the scope of autonomy has a different flavor in the Indian context where the multiplicity of societies combined with commitment to the democratic polity has mitigated in its formulation. Even though the powers of the central government are quite extensive according to the Indian Constitution, state self-governance is also provided for where it is most relevant, for instance in relation to language, culture, and the use of land by the inhabitants of the state. This equilibrium has enabled India better deal with the issue of diversity as far as resource and representation of states are concerned, though the spoils system has not been fully implemented in relation to the states of India to the satisfaction of (Chhibber 2004).

This is because federally system that are inclined towards decentralization are generally in a better place to solve the problems of the heterogenous population since problems as such lend themselves to local solution. But decentralization also must be accompanied by sufficient institutional capabilities at the provincial or the state level for operationalizing it. This was true in Pakistan where the 18th Amendment enhanced provincial autonomy and devolution of powers; the efficiency of which is contingent upon the provinces' capacity to mobilize and cope with the new responsibilities (Cheema, 2015).

Public choice theory, in contrast, is interested in decentralization as a method of political control and competition. In this way, by decentralizing the authorities the citizens can more easily control their leaders, while regions with access to resources and investments compete for them and, thus, improve the quality of governance (Riker, 1964). From this point of view decentralisation is seen as a remedy to corruption and a drive of enhancing the quality and accessibility of public services and at the same time this approach reveals the difficulty of achieving the compliance of development in different regions.

Historical institutionalism, a branch of institutionalism does not only stress the influence of history and institutions on federalism and autonomy. In Pakistan and India, the present federal status is molded by the experience of colonial rule and the subsequent decision made while framing the constitutions of the two countries.

For instance, India's shift to a more formal and complex federal structure has brought more stability than centralization attempts in Pakistan that seem to contradict the diversity of provinces' needs in most cases according to Khan (2011).

III. Provincial Autonomy in Pakistan

A. Historical Context

Significant historical factors which have contributed to the nature of political structure of Pakistan includes unstable democracy and authoritarian rule, political parties' conflicts and ethnic diversity. After its independence in the year 1947, Pakistan aimed at decentralizing the federal structure with a view to accommodating all its provinces. However, with the hegemonic control exerted by military and civil bureaucracy there were issues of centralization which created conflicts with provinces especial East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), Balochistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Waseem (2010).

The call for provincial autonomy has always been in the political debate in the Pakistan ever since its inception. Some of the demands that were not met include, governance structure, the excess power that was accorded to the central government the 1973 Constitution that was ushered in by the then Prime Minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto aimed at meeting this demands through having more balanced federal system. However, this was again not to be the case because several military regimes and subsequent central governments further centralized power and eroded federalism principles.

Such problems were addressed in the same year when a new constitution – the Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh – was promulgated with an aim to ensure a more balanced federal structure today. It had provision for provincial self-government but actually provinces had almost limited power and the central authority had leverage over in many important sectors such as defense foreign policy and finance. Military coups of 1977 and 1999 replicated the ongoing process of centralization of power even further the provincial governments are frequently left out of the decision-making process at all (Khan 2011).

B. The 18th Constitutional Amendment

The Pakistan 18th Constitutional Amendment Bill passed in 2010 is one of the most major steps towards the decentralization. Its purpose was to enhance the provincial powers in the country by decentralizing the power from federal government to provincial. Some provisions of the amendment contain the end of Concurrent Legislative List, shifting of some ministries to provincial governments, and wholly command over natural resources (Khan, 2011).

This act is known as landmark in the federal system of the country because it sought to bring redressal of the provincial complaints for years demanding

Provincial Autonomy in Pakistan and India: A Comparative Analysis with Reference to the 18th Constitutional Amendment and Indian Federalism.

autonomy and also to correct the asymmetrical power structure of the center and provinces. However, its implementation has not been without some challenges; the central bureaucracy has been reluctant in implementing the policy, lack of funds to support the policy and the regional disparities.

The Concurrent Legislative List which enabled both the federal and the provincial governments to make laws on the same subject was also done away with by the 18th Amendment. By completely presuming these subjects to the provinces it vastly increased their legislative and administrative authority by way of the amendment. This was done in sectors like education, health, agricultural sector and local governments which are in through bearing to the development of the region (Cheema, 2015).

The amendment also reformed the Council of Common Interests which is the forum for resolving disputes between federal and provincial government. It was hailed as positive development that the CCI has emerged as a more potent player in policy formulation and resource mobilization for the provinces with regard to the national government's policies and projects.

However, the 18th Amendment has not been without any obstacles as will be discussed below. Due to a simple fact that provinces still have a limited administrative capacity and fiscal resources, and due to continuing security threats in provinces such as Balochistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, resulting in the fact that provinces have not been able to perform efficiently those new tasks and responsibilities which had been assigned to them. Furthermore, the centralization of power where the federal government has not let go of some key areas, especially over the exploration of natural resources and collection of revenues, the effectiveness of the amendment has been blunted (Waseem, 2010).

C. Impact and Critique

In the following paragraphs we will examine how and in what extent, the provincial autonomy in Pakistan has been affected by the merger of 18th Amendment. In one way or the other, it has centralized provinces by enabling the provinces control resource, policies and administration. It has also helped in enhancing governance and development in some sectors for instance in the health and education sectors in some part of the world (Cheema, 2015).

On the other hand, the amendment has also revealed flaws in the provincial governments' ability to deal with the powers recently devolved to them. Challenges such as inadequate administrative experience, highest levels of embezzlement and corrupt practices in political arena have played major roles in delaying the amendment. Second, the concentrating resource in provinces has aggravated regional and provincial disparities making provinces restless and demanding more decentralisation (Baxter, 2013).

D. Case Studies and Regional Impact

Nevertheless, in order to have a vivid insight of the impacts of the 18th Amendment on the provincial autonomy, it is relevant to take a look at the different case scenarios concerning more successes and failures provinces incurred. For instance, in the devolved structure for Sindh province, it is possible to discern positive changes in the sphere of health and education since devolution of powers to the provincial center enables him, who is in a better position to comprehend the character of the province and therefore, he responds to the achievable local situations. However, in Balochistan the lack of appreciable numbers of administrative and security apparatus have let the province to reap the benefit of decentralizing measures and improved autonomy to the optimum level (Khan, 2011).

Similarly, the largest province in terms of population – Punjab – has both ends of the consummation/achievement of the 18th Amendment and the reckoned losses. On the positive side of the province has had some measure of control over its resources and polices; however, this picture is not without vices such as the problem of co-ordination between provinces and the Fed and the problem of federal resource distribution. These case studies unmask the degrees of impact of 18th Amendment at the provincial level of Pakistan and to show that as Baxter stated in 2013, decentralization requires constant support and development for enhancing its performance.

E. Future Prospects

The future of provincial autonomy in the constitution of Pakistan has become a question mark at the moment, but rests on the federal and provincial government's willingness to adhere to the federalism principles as have been envisioned in the 18th Amendment. This in a way is acknowledging the existence of provincial autonomy but further goes a notch higher to endorse that the provinces should be assisted as far as capital requirements and strengths to enable efficient delivery of their services. In addition, other mentioned points of power which can contribute to the way of maintaining the unity of the country and avoiding conflicts of resources and authorities between provinces are addressing inequalities between the provinces, and increasing the interprovincial cooperation.

IV. State Autonomy in India

A. Historical Development

India's style of federalism is derived from the constitution of 1950 which was fashioned to achieve unity in diversity. Here the Constitution provides the central government with a considerable reinforcement but at the same time organizes a substantial decentralisation to the state level as well. However, some of the

Provincial Autonomy in Pakistan and India: A Comparative Analysis with Reference to the 18th Constitutional Amendment and Indian Federalism.

primary concern of political contestation between the center and states pertain to the still contentious principle of state sovereignty.

The Indian central government has always been very powerful and this was especially so when the Congress Party was in power both at the center and in the states right from the early years of freedom struggle. Some years later, regional parties began coming up for the stronger forces and led to the decentralisation of the political system. The raise of state demands has drawn for more demands of state autonomy especially from the culturally and linguistically defined areas (Chhibber, 2004).

B. Key Constitutional Provisions

The Indian Constitution outlines the division of powers between the center and the states through three lists: The division of powers is in words the Union List, the State List and the Concurrent List. The Union List consists of such matters as fall under the exclusive power of the center as defense, foreign affairs, and currency. The State List includes those that are under the purview of states because they have plenary powers over them and have exclusive legislative power over them; in this case, they include police and public health, agriculture. Concurrent list refers to the issue or subject matter on which both the center and the state can legislate; however, the center has always supremacy in case of the conflict of legislature (Swarup, 2007).

Besides, the Constitution has prescribed practices like the Governor's rule and the President's rule under which the Centre can encroach upon the state domain. Such provisions have been a source of concern since most citizens regard them as symptoms of centralizing and controlling state (Kapur, 2001).

C. Challenges to State Autonomy

The states' sovereignty has hence been undermined in India by aspects like direct interference by the central government, provincial charity and uneven growth and development in the regions. Much criticized have been the central government prerogative of President's rule under which the central government can suspend state governments and rule directly, an action which appears to have had some negative correlation with the federal character of the system, and the autonomy of states.

Another quite challenging task is the status of financial independence also a challenge having in mind that today's fortunes rely much on center grants and other revenue share facilities. Revenue reserves such as the income tax and the customs duties are still retained at the center and this restricts the states to obtain fiscal independence as well as implement their preferred developmental agenda and policies (Singh, 2014).

D. The Role of Regional Parties

One of the developments which has accented the question of state autonomy in India is the increasing importance of the regional parties. Such parties that are usually base on linguistic, cultural or regional platforms, have been very instrumental in demanding more state powers and decentralisation. The effect of regional parties has been well recorded when it comes to formation of coalition governments at the central levels in which the regional parties have been able to bargain for better policies in their respective regions (Chhibber, 2004).

For instance, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) party in Tamil Nadu has been vocal on the question of state self-governance, where it has sought to champion the cause of the state in such areas as language in education. Thanks to the activity of the party, the position of the Tamil language and culture within the Indian federation has improved. Likewise, the Shiv Sena is a political party in Maharashtra, which has also strived hard to get policies adopted according to the Marathi speaking people, this can be on employment issues or even cultural identifications (Swarup, 2007).

Therefore, the role of regional based parties brings out the party system imperative of accommodation of regional autonomist impulse. In this way, for example, these parties speak for regional opinions that can affect national policies and foster the formation of a more decentralized federation. But by the same token the regional political parties have given rise to certain problems of integration the worst of which arise when regional interests are not in tune with national requirements (Bhattacharya, 2012).

E. Impact of Economic Liberalization

Many of the changes spoke about in relation to state autonomy were also witnessed due to the economic liberalization of India in the 1990s. As the central government evolved towards a post Maoist market inclined economy, more state discretion in economic initiatives such as industrialists, infrastructural and investment was recognized. Such a change has provided the states the opportunity to pitch for investors and capital and with results in different economic development models across the nation (Singh, 2014).

The states that stand firstly in implementing the structural reforms – be it Gujarat, Maharashtra or Tamil Nadu – have gone a long way in the process of gaining economic growth and development. On the contrary, the less developed infrastructure or poor governance of state like Bihar & U.P has been an indicator of the slow progress. It has brought out the issue of ‘state autonomy’ in the economic management process but it has also led to debate on widening disparity within regional states of India (Kapur, 2001).

V. Comparative Analysis

A. Structural Differences

The structures of federalism of Pakistan and India are somewhat alike as both the countries are striving to prevent concentration of power at the center while at the same ensuring that the regional power is also accounted for. However, there are key differences in the constitutional setting and the politics of the two countries. The federal structure of the government of Pakistan has always been more centralized than that of many other nations, with more substantial power vested in the central government than in the provinces. The 18th Amendment means a clear decentralization measure in this case, but there are several problems with its application.

Unlike Russia's federal system that was originally centralized and still remains relatively so although there are signs of decentralization particularly with the coming of regional parties and formation of coalitions. Nonetheless, the relationship between the central government, its fiscal interventions, fiscal measures and the practice of President's rule has remained a source of state autonomy.

B. Constitutional Provisions

Pakistan as well as India has provisions of the constitution that lays down the division of powers between the central and the provinces/states. But still, the Constitution of India has a much clearer and well-defined division of the powers between the Union, the State and Concurrent list. The above issues of imbalance of powers could have destabilized the federal system, but for the fact that there is a lot of clarity in the usual demarcation of powers between the federal government and the individual states.

In Pakistan, the powers were re-allocated and re-distributed through Eighteen Amendment; however, administrative factor and Regionalism hurdle it in its way. It is thus up to the provinces whether they will effectively address their new duties whereby the success of the amendment is determined by the central government's readiness to facilitate the devolution exercise.

C. Challenges and Opportunities

Two issues emanating from the two countries include the question of provincial/state autonomy. The major constraints that have been identified as a major challenge in Pakistan include administrative capacity, financial constraint, and regions inequality. In India the challenge is more politically based with Centre State relations problems regarding President's rule, financial emergency and many states demand for more autonomy.

Nevertheless, both countries also have prospects for being Mbeki's "worthy adversary" and deriving lessons from each other's experiences. There is much that

Pakistan can learn from India regarding the issues of dealing with revenue sharing and inter- provincial relations and a federal structure which is as decentralized as that of the current Pakistani set up. India, in contrast, might benefit from studying Pakistan's 18th Amendment in regard to the constitutional changes that enhance provincial power.

D. Intergovernmental Relations

There is a peculiarity of federal systems where the relationship between the central government and the provinces or states is known as intergovernmental relations. Thus, in both the Pakistan and India these relations are determined by constitutional provisions, political process and resource allocation.

Pakistan being a federal country, it is worth noting that the intergovernmental relations have for most of the time been characterized by conflict over resources, policies, and administration. These relations were therefore sought to be enhanced by the provisions of the 18th Amendment which sought to clearly delineate the functions of the federal and provincial governments. Nevertheless, some issues exist, especially in regard to revenue identify and distribution, as well as inter provincial cooperation (Khan, 2011).

India, for its part, has a heavier machinery for the intergovernmental relations such as the Inter-State Council that exists to foster understanding of the relations between the center and the states as well as the Finance Commission that is tasked with the responsibility of determining the financial relations between the center and the states. These mechanisms have worked well to some extent in dealing with some of the emerging conflicts in a pluralistic cumulative federal setting, but they remain relevant and pronounced especially in matters concerning fiscal decentralisation and the deployment of central authority administrative powers (Swarup, 2007).

E. Lessons Learned

Comparative study of provincial autonomy in Pakistan and state autonomy in India provide several useful insights to both Pakistan and India. Thus, the case of intergovernmental relations in the context of fiscal federalism for Pakistan could hold useful lessons as to how the center could better liaise and co-operate with provinces on issues of central and provincial concern in India. Furthermore, the position of regional parties in Indian political context testifies that question of political participation is crucial for reaching efficiency of decentralizing measures. Thus, the Indian political leadership would do well to draw lessons from the spectacular experience of Pakistan's 18th amendment, which reformist zeal as well as observing that the centralization of power remains critical to demands for more autonomy. India remains one of the most successful federal countries and yet continuities of the demands for autonomy in different regions like Kashmir and the Northeast indicate that there might be need for the further reformation of federal

Provincial Autonomy in Pakistan and India: A Comparative Analysis with Reference to the 18th Constitutional Amendment and Indian Federalism.

system in order to meet regional demands in a way that preserves unity (Bhattacharya, 2012).

VI. Conclusion

A. Summary of Findings

Based on the comparative analysis of provincial autonomy in Pakistan and India the arguments pointed out at the different approaches and problems which faced the two states in their attempts to establish workable relationship between the center and provinces. 'The 18th Constitutional Amendment in Pakistan though can be considered as an attempt of decentralization if it has to be successful then it has to be implemented effectively and should receive backing from the federal as well as provincial governments. In India, although the process of decentralisation of the federal system is still going on, but the problems of autonomy for the states and regional disparities are still complex.

B. Recommendations for Future Research

Scholarly work can be conducted in future to research on specific provinces/ states of each country to look at how the autonomy has influenced governance, development and conflict management. Further, a comparative analysis with other countries with federal structures, including the US – Canada and US–Australia – could shed more light on how the central and the regional power can be effectively and sustainably implemented.

C. Implications for Policy and Practice

Evidences obtained in this study can prove beneficial for the policymakers in improving the working of the federal system in both Pakistan and India. There remains the further support to the strategy of the 18th Amendment in Pakistan, including the capacity development of the provincial governments and balancing the regional disparities. In India, there are suggestions that government should promote some measures for the devolution of powers and authority from the center and the expansion of state resources.

D. Policy Implications

This paper therefore has laid significant policy implications based on the findings of the comparative analysis done between Pakistan and India. In Pakistan, the key policy action should lie in the building up of the capacity of the provincial governments to efficiently discharge the functions devolved on them. This involves a process of offering consultation on the technical aspects of aids policy both at program and provinces, enhancing the administrative capacity as well as addressing the issue of fairness or equitable distribution of AIDS policy among the provinces. Furthermore, there is a need to carry on the earlier form of intergovernmental discussions and coordination because of the continued

complexities in the process of implementing the 18th Amendment to the Constitution (Cheema, 2015).

On this account, there is a clear role for policymakers in India to improve the institutional conditions for state autonomy—especially where disparities are all the more significant. This could require going back to the drawing board in relation to center-state relations, enhancing fiscal relations in the second decade of the federal Nigeria and guaranteeing recognition for the regional parties in the decision-making processes of the country. Further, attempts should be made to deal with the issues of cultures and language-based conflicts with a view of fostering national unity in culturally and linguistically diverse regions (Singh 2014).

E. Conclusion

Therefore, the comparative study of provincial autonomy in Pakistan and state autonomy in India will reveal the both the similarities and the differences between the two nations in terms of the problem faced by each country in working out the balance between the powers of the central government and the provinces/states. Despite the progress made in both countries decentralisation efforts, there is still problems as administrative mechanisms, regional deviances and inter government relations causes hold up. Either country can unearth generalizable phenomenon regarding provincial autonomy and its effect and then carry out certain changes that would make federal system in its country more stable and efficient.

References

- Baxter, C. (2013). *Pakistan on the Brink: Politics, Economics, and Society*. Routledge.
- Bhattacharya, H. (2012). *Federalism in India: Institutionalizing Multiculturalism*. In A. Benz & J. Broschek (Eds.), *Federal Dynamics: Continuity, Change, and the Varieties of Federalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Cheema, A. (2015). *The Political Economy of Decentralization in Pakistan: Lessons from the 18th Amendment*. *Development Policy Review*, 33(5), 531-551.
- Chhibber, P. (2004). *Federal Arrangements and the Provision of Public Goods in India*. *Asian Survey*, 44(3), 374-394.
- Elazar, D. J. (1987). *Exploring Federalism*. University of Alabama Press.
- Kapur, D. (2001). *The Indian Parliament as an Institution of Accountability*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD).
- Khan, H. (2011). *Constitutional and Political History of Pakistan* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Riker, W. H. (1964). *Federalism: Origin, Operation, Significance*. Little, Brown and Company.
- Singh, M. P. (2014). *India's Federalism: Political Economy of Reform and Public Policy*. *Journal of South Asian Development*, 9(2), 145-164.
- Stepan, A. (1999). *Federalism and Democracy: Beyond the U.S. Model*. *Journal of Democracy*, 10(4), 19-34.
- Swarup, S. (2007). *Federalism and the Indian Constitution*. *Indian Journal of Political Science*, 68(1), 1-18.
- Waseem, M. (2010). *Federalism in Pakistan*. In R. L. Watts & R. Chattopadhyay (Eds.), *Federalism and the Constitution of Pakistan*. Viva Books.