pISSN: 2454-7107, eISSN: 2455-4189

Indian Journal of Law and Human Behavior
Volume 10 Number 2 / July - December 2024
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21088/ijlhb.2454.7107.10224.6

*Review Article*

# A Comparative Analysis of the Idea and Working of Federalism in India with Reference to U.S.A., Canada, Australia, and Switzerland

**Rajeev Kumar Singh**

**How to cite this article:**

Rajeev Kumar Singh, A Comparative Analysis of the Idea and Working of Federalism in India with Reference to U.S.A., Canada, Australia, and Switzerland. Indian J Law Hum Behav 2024;10(2):106-115.

**Abstract**

Federalism is a system of government in which power is divided between a central authority and various constituent units, such as states, provinces, cantons, etc. Federalism allows for diversity and autonomy of the sub-national units, while also maintaining a common national identity and interest. Different countries have adopted different models of federalism, depending on their historical, political, and social contexts.

India is a federal republic with a parliamentary system of government. The Constitution of India, adopted in 1950, provides for a division of powers between the Union and the States, with a concurrent list of subjects on which both can legislate.

The United States of America is a federal republic with a presidential system of government. The Constitution of the United States, adopted in 1787, establishes a federal system of checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the federal government, and the states. The Constitution also grants certain powers and rights to the citizens, such as the Bill of Rights, which limit the authority of the federal government.

Canada is a federal parliamentary monarchy with a constitutional system of government. The Constitution Act, 1867, formerly known as the British North America Act, 1867, created a federation of four provinces: Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. The Constitution Act, 1982, patriated the constitution from the United Kingdom, and added the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which guarantees the rights and freedoms of the people. Canada has a bilingual and multicultural society, with two official languages (English and French) and a recognition of the rights of the Aboriginal peoples.

Australia is a federal parliamentary constitutional monarchy with a Westminster system of government. The Constitution of Australia, adopted in 1901, established a federation of six states and two territories. The Constitution also outlines the roles and responsibilities of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the federal government, and the states. Australia has a common law system, with the High Court of Australia as the final court of appeal.

Switzerland is a federal semi-direct democracy with a directorial system of government. The Constitution of Switzerland, adopted in 1848, and revised in 1999, defines Switzerland as

**Author's Affiliation:** Assistant Professor, Amity Law School, Amity University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India.

**Corresponding Author: Rajeev Kumar Singh,** Assistant Professor, Amity Law School, Amity University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India.

**E-mail:** singh.rajeev264@gmail.com

**Received on:** 27-12-2024 **Accepted on:** 13-07-2024

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0.

a confederation of 26 cantons, which have a high degree of autonomy and sovereignty. The Constitution also provides for a system of direct democracy, in which the people can initiate or reject laws through referendums and popular initiatives. Switzerland has a multilingual and multicultural society, with four official languages (German, French, Italian, and Romansh) and a recognition of the diversity of the cantons.Thispaperwillendeavor to discuss,analyze,andcomparethesystemoffederalismindifferentcountrieswith respect to India and this doctrinal research will focus on the system of governance in the mentionedcountries.

**Keywords:** Federalism, Division of Power, Quasi Federal, Unitary, Bilingual, multicultural society, Parliamentary constitutional monarchy, Westminster system of government, presidential system of government.

## INTRODUCTION

Federalism is a mixed or compound form of government that combines, within a single political system, a general administration with regional governments such as provincial, state, territorial, cantonal, or other sub-unit governments. The relationship of shared authority between the two levels of government formed is its defining characteristic, best shown by the United States of America's contemporary federalism under the Constitution of 1787.[1] Thus, it may be described as a system of governance where two tiers of government with equivalent status share the same set of powers.[2]

Federalism is not the same as devolution within a unitary state, where the regional level of government is subservient to the general level, or confederal, when the general level of government is subordinate to the regional level.[3]

The Russian Federation, the US, USSR, Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Germany, Switzerland, Australia, and India are prominent instances of federations or federal states. Some people now refer to the European Union—also known as the federal union of states—as the model for federalism in a multi-state context.[4]

## THE CONCEPT OF FEDERALISM

In basic terms, federalism refers to a division of jurisdiction and authority between at least two levels of government.[5] This separation often takes place between two or more levels of government that are recognized by the constitution; that is, levels of government that are distinct from one another and have their own independent or semi-autonomous constitutional authorities.

According to the "coming together" perspective of federalism, it is explained and said that the name "federalism" originates from the Latin word Oedus, which means "league," "treaty," or "compact."[6] Furthermore, every level of government often has its own domain, or areas of public policy over which it alone may decide how to act or wield authority.

For instance, the national government normally has the last say on matters pertaining to the country, such defense, foreign policy, and the drafting of treaties, to mention a few. Regional governments, on the other hand, will have more authority, but this will differ greatly across them.

Today's globe is full of instances of federalist administrations, such as the Federated States of Micronesia, the United States, Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Nigeria, and the United Arab Emirates, to name just a few.[7]

## HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The concepts and establishments associated with the federal, political structure of governance may often be traced back to ancient Greek, Indian, and Israelite civilizations. Examples of contemporary federal policies are mostly found in the American 1787, Swiss 1848, Canadian 1867, Australian 1901, and Indian 1950. Since then, both at the national and international levels, the federal system of governance has enjoyed extraordinary popularity around the world. Political federalism often has its roots in social, cultural, and regional contexts where the people want both autonomy and union. As a result, the constitution aims to provide shared control within the federation and self-rule within the regions.

The concepts and establishments associated with the federal, political structure of governance may often be traced back to ancient Greek, Indian, and Israelite civilizations. Examples of contemporary federal policies are mostly found in the American 1787, Swiss 1848, Canadian 1867, Australian 1901, and Indian 1950. Since then, both at the national and international levels, the federal system of

governance has enjoyed extraordinary popularity around the world. Political federalism often has its roots in social, cultural, and regional contexts where the people want both autonomy and union. As a result, the constitution aims to provide shared control within the federation and self-rule within the regions.

According to "infrastructural power" theories, federalism is most likely to occur when the constituent states of a prospective federation already have highly developed infrastructures (e.g., they are already modernized states with modern constitutions and legislatures).[8]

### *Potential Benefits and Detriments of Federalism*

Being an extra check on government authority is one of federalism's most often mentioned advantages. Within a single level of government, unitary regimes often have highly centralized governmental authority. In contrast, authority can be distributed across several tiers of government in federal states. As a result, it is far more challenging for a single group of political elites to dictate the scope and course of governance. Rather, the many levels can serve as a check on one another when it comes to the use of political power.

The ability of federalism to partially safeguard local or regional interests is another frequently mentioned advantage. Numerous contemporary nation-states are enormous and have incredibly varied populations. Regional groupings might occasionally hold significantly distinct political demands and opinions from those in other parts of the country. A certain religious, ethnic, or linguistic group like the French Quebecois in Quebec-may dominate an area while being a minority within the country. By providing geographically based minorities with their own level of government and independent political jurisdictions and powers, federalism can shield them from being completely subjugated by the more powerful national majority.

The capacity of federal states to oversee and govern vast geographic regions is another potential advantage over unitary states. This was especially true in the past when managing big countries presented significant communication and transportation challenges for the central authority.

Federalism as a system of governance may also have several drawbacks. Federalism may be a check on government authority, but it can also cause gridlock and make it impossible for the government to address pressing national concerns. For instance, the Canadian federal government lacked the constitutional ability to implement nationwide programmes to combat widespread unemployment and poverty during the Great Depression.

Furthermore, because federalism frequently defends regional interests, it can deepen national differences and fuel continuing political unrest among various factions. It is reasonable to question whether Quebec nationalism would still be as strong today if Canada had been a unitary state rather than a federalist one. However, as Canadian federalism has allowed for the preservation of Quebec's interests inside the country, it is also possible to make the case that it has played a significant role in keeping the nation together.

It is crucial to remember, nevertheless, that the way a federal state distributes power across its tiers of government has a significant impact on whether it displays these potential advantages and disadvantages. For example, a highly centralized federal state may not be able to safeguard regional interests or serve as a check on government authority since most of its powers are granted to the central government.[9]

### *Federalism in India: A Comparitive Study*

Federalism has been discussed in public for many years in India, both before and after the country's 1947 independence, but since the 1990s, when the coalition period entered the national polity of the nation, it has been increasingly significant. The Cabinet Mission Plan, which was created before the Constituent Assembly was established, placed a strong emphasis on a central government with relatively limited authority that would be restricted to defense, communication, and foreign policy. On the other hand, this was rejected by the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League. Despite this, the Constituent Assembly's initial report predicted a weak Centre based on support for Cripps and Cabinet Mission Plans. All is well that ends well, and finally a healthy compromised was reached which resulted in a balance of power between the Centre and the State, and India was thus described as Unity of States 'and this unity being indestructible.

The Indian Independence Act of 1947 and the subsequent division of India were the driving forces behind the Constituent Assembly's adoption of a more unified form of federalism.

Mahatma Gandhi also supported a federation based on panchayats or villages and a decentralised structure. However, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar and the

then-prime minister Jawaharlal Nehru supported a unitary form of government, and home minister Sardar Vallabhai Patel supported federalism. The structure prescribed for Union as well as State governments with a single citizenship policy rather than dual citizenship.[10]

### *Indian Federalism:*

The Union Government and the State Governments are the two existing governments in India. Instead of being subservient to one another, the two governments collaborate while operating separately. Despite having certain characteristics of a federal constitution, the Indian constitution is not one in the literal sense.[11] The Indian Constitution is particularly unique in that it has elements that are essential for a federation to survive, but it also contains clauses that grant the Union Government more authority than State governments.

The *Government of India Act 1935* established the quasi-federal framework of the Indian Constitution going forward. The fundamentals of India's federal system of government were established by this Act. It outlined how the Union, and the provinces would split up the legislative authority. Prior to independence, there was a sense that the provinces ought to work together. The 1935 Act's guiding ideas have been enshrined in the Indian Constitution in a comprehensive manner.

Given its many advantages, a well-thought-out federal governance system is essential to fostering national stability and prosperity, as evidenced by the developed nations of the United States, Canada, Australia, and Switzerland, which have reached the highest levels of development. However, as many of the federal forms that emerged in the previous century—including Soviet Russia, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rhodesia, and Nyasal and—have shown, poorly designed federal systems are not resilient.[12]

### *What makes the Indian federation quasi-federal?*

India undoubtedly has a federally oriented political and constitutional system. Although the federal government and the state's share some authority, the constitution gives the federal government ultimate authority and places all administrative and financial authority in its hands.[13] It appears that a flaw led the architects of the constitution to include provisions that went against the federal idea. A few of the Central Government's rights are reiterated here: it can reorganize the states through parliament; it may overrule state law for grounds of national interest; and it can pick governors who will refuse to sign state legislation.

Governors play a part in the establishment of state governments, and under Article 356, the Centre has the right to dissolve state governments. The Centre also has residuary powers, and it is the Central authority that has the primary taxing authority. Thankfully, the federal system preserves the judiciary's ability to oversee the relationship between the Centre and the State. In summary, the Indian political system has federal elements that are bounded by an intrinsic unitary core.[14]

Former Chief Justice Beg, in *State of Rajasthanv UOI*, 1977 called the Constitution of India as amphibian. 'He said that if then our Constitution creates a Central Government which is amphibian', in the sense that it can move either on the federal or on the unitary plane, according to the needs of the situation and circumstances of a case.[15]

Similarly in S.R. Bommai v Union of India, pragmatic federalism was used. Quoting Justice Ahmadi, it would thus seem that the Indian Constitution has, in it, not only features of a pragmatic federalism which, while distributing legislative powers and indicating the spheres of governmental powers of State and Central Governments,is over laid by strong unitary features.[16]

The phrasesemi-federal '[17]was used for India in State of *Haryanav. State of Punjab*, where as in *Shamsher Singhv. State of Punjab*, the constitution was called more unitary than federal.'[18]

Another case on this issue is that of *State of West Bengal V. Union of India.* This case dealt with the issue of exercise of sovereign powers by the Indian states. The Supreme Court in this case held that the Indian Constitution does not promote a principle of absolute federalism. The court further outlined four characteristics highlighting the fact that the Indian Constitution is not a-traditional federal Constitution.[19]

First of all, as in a federal state, each State does not have its own independent Constitution. India's Constitution is the ultimate charter that unites all the states.

Second, the States lack the authority to change the Constitution; only the Union Parliament may do so.

Thirdly, the Indian Constitution gives the courts the authority to declare any action that breaches the document unconstitutional, which is in direct opposition to a federal constitution.

On the other hand, Justice Subba Rao believed that the Indian Constitution's structure divided the Union's and the States' sovereign rights according to their respective domains. Since the legislative domain of the Union legislature is far broader than that of the State legislative assemblies, in the event of a disagreement, the laws approved by the Parliament should take precedence over those made by the States. A few pieces of legislation involving conflicts between states require the President's approval to be enacted. Additionally, each State has a judicial system, with the State High Court serving as its head. According to the erudite court, this has no bearing on the federal concept. He used Australia as a comparison while he was arguing. In Australia, the Privy Council hears appeals against specific rulings made by the Commonwealth of Australia's High Courts. On this basis, the Indian federation cannot be refuted. In comparison to the states, the Union is endowed with more financial resources. The union has exceptional powers that serve as safety valves to safeguard the future of the nation in the event of a national emergency, domestic unrest or external aggression, financial catastrophe, or breakdown of the State's constitutional apparatus. The exceptional authority to satisfy future needs is also vested in the Union with the right to redraw the borders of the States. Within their specific fields, both executive and legislative, the States are supreme. In summary, Justice Subba Rao contended that as the Union is more important than the states, the Union's functions should take precedence over those of the States.

Like Canada, India is an asymmetrical federation in which certain states enjoy prerogatives protected by the constitution that distinguish them from the other states. But unlike Canada, India has never had an easy time granting a community or geographical entity special status.[20]

### *Division/Distribution of Powers*

The federation's most fundamental and important feature is its power distribution. The many branches of state government are made up of the federal government as well as the municipal, state, and federal unit governments. The India Constitution's Seventh Schedule has 67 items that are part of the State list, meaning that State governments can enact laws based on them. In contrast, the Union list, which has 97 items, can only be used by the Union Government. This demonstrates that although there is a system designed to accommodate the federal essence, the division of powers results in a state that is essentially quasi-federal.

Putting the US Constitution in perspective, which separates the federal and state governments' respective functions. Within their designated domains, these governments are autonomous and well-coordinated rather than subservient to one another.[21] The States are the end result of the Constitution and, eventually, of Parliament; the Indian Constitution is not a covenant or treaty between the States per se. Renowned federalism expert Professor Ronald L. Watts argues in favour of the Indian approach, noting that in some circumstances—such as the early cases of Canada, India, and Spain—where territorial social diversity and fragmentation are strong, it has been deemed desirable to grant the federal government sufficiently strong, even overwhelming, powers to thwart potential tendencies towards balkanization.

Federalism has always remained a work-in progress or as *Iqbal Narain* puts it constantly in the making'.[22] To deal with the evolving environment and new difficulties, the federal structure must be continuously adjusted and repaired.

### *Federalism in USA*

The changing dynamic between the federal government of the United States and the state governments is known as federalism. Dual federalism gave way to associative federalism in the American political system. The federal government and the states "are in reality distinct trustees and agents of the people, constituted with different powers".[23]

Because the states were already well-established political entities, the U.S. Constitution did not need to define or explain federalism in any particular clause. However, it does often discuss the rights and obligations of state governments and state officials regarding the federal government. The Constitution lists the stated authorities that the federal government is granted, including the authority to impose taxes, declare war, and control both domestic and international trade. The McCulloch v. Maryland (1819) ruling of the Supreme Court, the post-Civil War amendments to the Constitution, and the general contention of the war that the states were legally bound by the federal government's final decisions all greatly increased the authority granted to the federal government.

### *The Federal Government*

The legislative arm of the federal government is represented by the US Congress. The Senate and the House of Representatives make up its bicameral

government. There are 435 voting members of the House at the moment, and each one represents a congressional district. The population of each state as reported in the most recent US Census determines the number of members each state has in the House. On the other hand, regardless of population, there are two senators from each state in the Senate. Currently, there are 100 senators, one from each of the 50 states, and their mandates are for six years. Every two years, around one-third of the Senate is up for election.

The Constitution grants numerous powers to Congress. These are listed in Article I, Section 8 and include the authority to tax, collect, and regulate money, to establish post offices and roads, to issue patents, to establish federal courts subordinate to the Supreme Court, to combat felony and piracy, to declare war, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to establish, arm, and discipline the militia, to exercise exclusive legislative authority in the District of Columbia, and to create laws necessary to carry out the function. There have been several disagreements on the boundaries of the federal government's authority during the two centuries since the United States was founded. The US Supreme Court has frequently rendered decisions in litigation pertaining to these disagreements.

Although authority is frequently assigned to Cabinet members and other authorities, the President of the United States retains executive authority inside the federal government. The President and those to whom the President has granted authority make up the executive branch. In addition to being the head of state and administration, the president also serves as top military commander and ambassador.

### *The Local Government*

Most Americans' everyday lives are often most influenced by their state governments. Since the Tenth Amendment forbids the federal government from assuming any authority not specifically granted to it by the States in the Constitution, states manage most matters that are most important to the people who live in their respective jurisdictions. State governments often need to generate money through bonds or taxes because they are not allowed to create money. Because of this, if the economy is struggling, state governments either hike taxes or implement drastic budget cuts.[24]

Every state has a codified constitution, a written system of governance, and laws. The Constitution merely requires "a Republican Government" in each state. As a result, there are frequently significant variations in state law and practice pertaining to a variety of topics, including property, crime, health, and education. The governor is each state's top elected authority. In addition, every state has an elected state legislature, whose members speak for the state's citizens. Every state keeps its own state court system in place. Justices of the highest and lesser courts are appointed, as they are in the federal system, in certain states, while they are elected by the people in others.

Local government in most states is run by town, city, or county boards, water management districts, fire departments, library districts, and other similar governmental bodies that pass laws affecting their area. These rules cover things like driving, selling alcohol, and owning pets. The mayor is often the most senior elected figure in a town or city.[25]

### *Federalism in Australia*

On January 1, 1901, the six independent Australian colonies of New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, and Western Australia united to form the Commonwealth of Australia, formally embracing federalism as a fundamental constitutional principle. According to the Commonwealth Constitution, it is still a federation of the six "original States". After the United States (1789), Mexico (1824), Switzerland (1848), Canada (1867), the German Empire (1871), and Brazil (1891), Australia is the seventh-oldest federation in the world.

### *Federation*

The American federal system was considered while designing Australia's federal structure. A "supremacy" clause, strong bicameralism (the States are equally represented in the Senate despite large population disparities), the division of senators into different cohorts on alternating electoral cycles, the creation of the High Court of Australia, a supreme court with the authority to declare actions of either level of government unconstitutional, and a complicated two-step amending procedure were all included. The specified powers belonged to the Commonwealth government, not the States.

Australia's participation in the First World War contributed to the growth of the Commonwealth powers. But the true turning point occurred when the High Court rejected its early principles that had upheld the coordinate model and the States' position within the federation in the 1920

Engineers Case, Amalgamated Society of Engineers v. Adelaide Steamship Co Ltd.[26]

The challenge Australia faced at the start of World War II and the Commonwealth government's financial resource mobilization marked a second turning point. The Commonwealth and the States were able to impose taxes thanks to the constitutional structure. Nonetheless, the Commonwealth filed legislation to provide it exclusive authority over income taxes in 1942. Even in situations when it could be believed that such regulation is in the best interests of the country, the federal Parliament lacks the authority to regulate in many sectors, notwithstanding the concentration of financial and legislative authority. This has caused the federal and state governments to work together to establish regulatory frameworks in areas like competition law and the marketing of agricultural goods.

Australia is divided into various Territories in addition to the States. The Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory are two of those that have their own government. The Australian Government oversees the remainder. According to the Commonwealth constitution, all are governed by the parliament.[27]

### *Federation in Canada*[28]

The separation of powers between the national parliament and the province governments characterizes Canada's federalist system.

### *Levels of Government*

The federal and provincial levels of government are the two legally recognized tiers of Canadian federalism. The territorial and municipal governments that the nation also has are not recognized by the constitution. Each level of government in Canada's federal structure is introduced, along with its current standing, in the section that follows.

The federal or national government is the first level of government recognized by the constitution. This level oversees passing and carrying out national legislation. By doing this, the federal government receives its own constitutionally granted authority and jurisdiction, which it can use without consulting the provincial government.

The national Parliament, which is based in Ottawa, the nation's capital, is the most significant federal government entity in Canada. Along with the Monarchy and the Governor General, who acts as their federal representative, the House of Commons and the Senate are the two legislative chambers.

Although his role in Canada's current system of government is primarily ceremonial, the Monarchy is the head of state for the federal government. The House of Commons, the elected legislature, and the federal head of state and cabinet—officially known as the Prime Minister and Cabinet own the majority of the federal government's power. The House of Commons is an elected parliament with significantly more jurisdiction than the Senate, the second federal legislature, which is an appointed body. The federal judiciary is another important federal entity. This includes Canada's top court, the Supreme Court of Canada, which is chosen by the federal government. The Federal Court of Appeal, the Federal Court, the Tax Court of Canada, the Court Martial Appeal Court, and the tribunals Martial (the last two are military tribunals) are further significant federal courts. An further significant government establishment is the national public service. This covers every department and agency under the federal government that assists the federal government in creating and carrying out policies within its purview.

The province government is the second tier of Canadian government recognized by the constitution. British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island are the 10 provinces that make up Canada. Every province has a provincial government of its own. These provincial governments are free to enact and implement laws within their borders as allowed by the constitution, without from intervention from the federal government or from one another.

Every provincial government has a legislature housed in the capital city of that province. The provincial head of state is either the Monarchy or the Lieutenant-Governor, whoever is best represented in the province. But this job is mostly ceremonial, much like at the federal level. The executive councils and elected legislatures of each province, along with their heads of state, have actual provincial authority.

The provincial court system consists of provincial trial courts and provincial courts of appeal. The federal Supreme Court of Canada has jurisdiction over these courts, which deal with criminal, constitutional, civil, family, traffic, and by law cases. In addition, each province has its own provincial public service, which is made up of government

departments and agencies entrusted with assisting the administrations in charge of developing and implementing policies within their respective provinces. The Northwest Territories, Nunavut, and the Yukon are the other three territories that make up Canada. Each has its own territorial administration.

Similar to their provincial counterparts, these are regional administrations that are in charge of enacting and enforcing laws within their respective boundaries.. Territories, on the other hand, are not recognized by the constitution as independent entities with their own set of laws and authorities. Rather, the federal government, which created the territories and established their fundamental structure, has legislative authority over the territories.

The head of state is a territorial commissioner, who performs many of the duties of a province lieutenant-governor. However, the real power rests with the elected legislative assembly, the territorial head of government, and his or her executive council, much like with the federal and provincial governments. Every territory has a judicial system and public services.

Territories have a lower standing in Canadian federalism since they are not recognized by the constitution as independent governments. As a result, territories are not legally able to influence constitutional amendments that alter the distribution of powers between the federal and provincial levels of government. However, it is standard procedure to engage territory administrations in intergovernmental conferences and decision-making sessions.

The final level of government in Canada is local government, which includes municipal, county/ parish, and semi-regional councils, boards, and agencies. Like the territories, local governments have separate powers and jurisdictions but are not recognized by the constitution. Rather, the provinces and territories, who oversee establishing and defining local governments, are in charge of local governments.

### *Federation in Switzerland*[29]

The state of Switzerland is federal. This indicates that the Confederation, the cantons, and the communes each have a certain amount of governmental authority. Every entity is assigned tasks.

The introduction of federalism to Switzerland in 1848 allowed for the enjoyment of variety within a single state. With four official languages and incredibly varied topography, federalism plays a significant role in promoting social cohesion in Switzerland.

The Federal Constitution establishes the authority of the Confederation and the cantons. The cantons, in turn, establish the powers of the communes. The division of powers between the Confederation, the cantons, and the communes is determined by subsidiarity. The Confederation only takes on tasks that the cantons are unable to do or that necessitate uniform Confederation regulation.

The subsidiarity notion states that nothing that can be done at a lower political level should be done at a higher one. If a commune is not able to fulfil a certain task, for example, the next higher political authority, the canton, must provide support.

Wherever the Federal Constitution grants it jurisdiction, the Confederation is in charge. For instance, the following policies are as follows:

- Foreign and security policy.
- Customs and monetary matters.
- Legislation that applies nationally.
- Defense

The cantons are in charge of duties that the Federal Constitution does not specifically assign to the Confederation. Certain domains, including tertiary education, include shared duties.

Every canton is granted equal status and privileges under the Federal Constitution, specifically in the following areas of policy:

- Budget
- Political system
- Taxation

Every canton has its own laws, acts, legislature, executive branch, and judicial system. The people also elect the cantonal governments, usually using a first-past-the-post method. There are still people's assemblies in the Inner Rhoden cantons of Appenzell and Glarus.

The commune is the smallest unit of government in Switzerland. There are about 2300 communes now. Approximately 25% of communes, which are often cities or bigger towns, are home to their own parliaments.

Conversely, forty-five percent make choices in the direct democratic forum of the community assembly, where all eligible voters participate. In these communes, citizens choose a community

executive to carry out their choices rather than electing representatives to make them for them.

The communes have their own duties in addition to those allocated to them by the Confederation and the cantons in which they are located (such as maintaining a resident registration or setting up a civil defense force). Some of these duties include:

- Schools and welfare provision
- Energy supplies
- Roads
- Local planning
- Local taxation

## CONCLUSION

The Latin word feuds, which means "treaty, pact or covenant," is the source of both the phrases "federalism" and "confederal." Up until the late eighteenth century, they were commonly understood to refer to a straightforward league or intergovernmental association between sovereign nations that was founded on a treaty. As a result, they became synonymous. James Madison described the new United States as "neither a national nor a federal Constitution, but a composition of both" in Federalist No. 39. During the 1800s, the definition of federalism changed and became exclusively associated with the new complex political structure, whilst the definition of confederalism remained as a league of states. This Project so has to do with the "federalism" that exists among many nations.

The modern form of federalism is a shared form of governance between the federal and provincial governments, founded on democratic institutions and principles. Depending on the context, the term "federalist" can refer to a variety of political views throughout the globe. Federalism is sometimes viewed as "the best system for integrating diverse nations, ethnic groups, or combatant parties, all of whom may have cause to fear control by an overly powerful centre" in the context of international talks. But in certain nations, those who are wary of central directives think that more regional autonomy would probably result in secession or the breakup of the country. Federalization plans in Syria have not taken off, partly due to the concern held by Syrians that these boundaries would end up being the same as the ones now drawn by the warring parties.

## REFERENCES


1. The Constitution gives explicit supremacy to the central government in Article VI, Paragraph 2: 'This Constitution,and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the Land;' In 1946, scholar Kenneth Wheare asserted the two levels of government in the US are 'co-equally supreme'. In this, he echoed the perspective of the one of the founding fathers, JamesMadisoninFederalist39 having seen the several states as forming' distinct and independent portions of the supremacy' in relation to the general government. Wheare, Kenneth (1946) Federal Government, Oxford University Press, London, pp. 10-15. Madison, James, Hamilton, Alexander and Jay, John(1987) The Federalist Papers, Penguin, Harmonds worth, p. 258
2. Law, John (2013) 'How Can We Define Federalism?', in Perspectives on Federalism,Vol. 5, No. 3, pp.E105 http://www.on-federalism.eu/attachments/169_download.pdf
3. Wheare, Kenneth (1946), pp. 31-2.
4. See Law, John (2013), p. 104. http://www.on-federalism.eu/attachments/169_download.pdfThisauthoridentifiestwodistinctfederalforms, where before only one was known, based upon whether sovereignty (conceived in its core meaning of ultimate authority) resides in the whole (in one people) or in the parts (in many peoples). This is determined by the absence or presence of a right of secession for the parts. The structures are termed, respectively, the federal state (or federation) and the federal union of states (or federal union).
5. Jackson & Jackson: p. 189
6. DanielJ Elazer, Althusius and Federalism as Grand Design, Jerusalem: Centre for public affair, 1992, available on Journals.cambridge.org
7. http://www.mapleleafweb.com/features/federalism-canada-basic-framework-and-operation.html (Nov 01, 2023,11:00AM),
8. Daniel Ziblatt (2008). Structuring the State: The Formation of Italy and Germany and the Puzzle of Federalism. Princeton University Press.
9. http://www.mapleleafweb.com/features/federalism-canada-basic-framework-and-operation.html (Nov 01, 2023,11:30AM)
10. https://blog.ipleaders.in/difference-us-indian-federalism/Nov02,2023,01:38AM)
11. http://www.halfmantr.com/display-polity/161-indian-federalismNov02,2023,01:49AM)
12. Amaresh Bagchi—Fifty Years of Fiscal Federalism in India–An Appraisal

13. Prakash Karat—Federalism and the political system in India
14. Prakash Karat—Federalism and the political system in India
15. State of Rajasthanv Union of India (1977)3SCC592
16. SR Bommaiv Union of India AIR 1994 SC 191
17. State of Haryanav. State of Punjab
18. Shamsher Singh & Anrv. State of Punjab 1974 AIR2192
19. State of West Bengalv. Union of India 1963 AIR1241
20. Patrick Hoenig-Federalism and identity in India
21. Surendra Singh and Satish Misra-Federalismin India: Time for a Relook
22. Copland and Rickard,1999
23. "Federalist No. 46," James Madison
24. Wood, 1998 p. 208
25. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/US_federalism (Nov 03, 2023, 11:50AM)
26. The Amalgamated Society of Engineersv Adelaide Steamship Co Ltd. 28CLR129 (1920)
27. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australia_federalism
28. http://www.mapleleafweb.com/features/federalism-canada-basic-framework-and-operation.html
29. https://www.ch.ch/en/demokratie/federalism/federalism/(Nov 08, 2023, 11:39PM)

## WEB LINKS

1. http://www.mapleleafweb.com/features/federalism-canada-basic-framework-and-operation.html
2. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canadian_federalism
3. www.theusgov.com/
4. https://www.thoughtco.comHumanities IssuesU.S.Government
5. https://www.ch.ch/en/demokratie/federalism/federalism/
6. https://blog.ipleaders.in/difference-us-indian-federalism/
7. shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/11719/4/c-chapter-i.docx

## ARTICLES REFERENCES

1. Law, John (2013) 'How Can We Define Federalism?' in Perspectives on Federalism, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. E105-
2. Daniel J Elazer, Althusius and Federalism as Grand Design, Jerusalem: Centre for public affair,1992, available on Journals. cambridge.org
3. Daniel Ziblatt (2008). Structuring the State: The Formation of Italy and Germany and the Puzzleof Federalism. Princeton University Press.
4. Surendra Singh and Satish Misra-Federalism in India: Time for a Relook?
5. Amaresh Bagchi -FiftyYears of Fiscal Federalism in India– An Appraisal.
6. Prakash Karat-Federalism and the political systemin India.
7. PatrickHoenig-Federalism and identity in India
8. Surendra Singh and Satish Misra-Federalism in India: Time for a Relook.

## BOOKS REFERENCES

1. Shukla V.N., Constitution of India, 12thEdition, Eastern Book Company.
2. Rai Kailash, Constitution of India, 10th Edition, Allahabad Law Agency.