

SPEAKER : For dominion belongs to the Lord, and he rules over the nations. Yea, to him shall all the proud of the earth bow down; before him shall bow all who go down to the dust, and he cannot keep himself alive.

Psalm 22 : 28 - 29

We shall now take up our Business and may I call upon Pu L.N. Tluanga to ask the first question.

PU L.N. TLUANGA : Thank you Mr. Speaker Sir. Starred question No. 21 for favour of answer to be given by hon'ble Minister for Revenue Department.

- (a) From the families selected for the beneficiary of compensation on account of Insurgency, 30,271 families have already received the cash where as 8,000 families remain uncompensated. What is the reason?
- (b) Whether demand has yet been made in regard to those 451 church buildings that has been partially or fully damaged during the insurgency?

PU LALRINCHHANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, number of families who were already compensated were 29,242 and not 30,271 as being reported by the hon'ble Member and those who has not yet been compensated as in the record is 5,761 but not 8,000. To answer the question, I regretted to mention that there is no sufficient amount of fund to compensate the whole selected families at the same time, yet an urgent demand has been made to the Central government to release sanction for the remaining families.

Regarding the question of compensation of Church Buildings being damaged during insurgency, after discussing the matter with various church leaders, it is decided to make a demand to the Central government to compensate them as it is done to other houses which has been damaged. In pursuance of this discussion, the government is now processing the demand for compensation of 451 church buildings.

PU L.N. TLUANGA : Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker Sir, we have learned that there is no financial sanction for the above presently. It is believed that the main reason for non-availability of this sanction is due to failure of the State government to produce the demand of Central Ministry of Home Affairs of utilisation certificate of the previous sanction. My question is that of whether the state government really fails to produce the said certificate. If the answer is 'yes', why?

PU LALHMINGTHANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I supposed the hon'ble Minister could give answer to this question as it is also relevant to our main subject.

Our Government have once submitted land rate for the areas occupied by the Assam Rifles and the Central Home Ministry have even paid the rent upto August 1986 (i.e. for the period during insurgency upto the existence of Peace Accord). Since the Army continues to occupy those lands, assessment in respect of the rest of the

period has been prepared by a joint meeting of representatives from the Central Government and the Government of Mizoram (i.e. Rs. 19,81,24,357). After the Central Defence Ministry moves the sanction in accordance with the decision of the meeting, our Chief Minister brought home only Rs. 5,99,93,771.

May the hon'ble Minister explain the reason for bringing home such amount where as the Central Defence Ministry has been moving for the sanction as passed by the joint meeting ?

Dr. LALZAMA : Mr. Speaker Sir, during Village Grouping of 1977, various families occupied lands owned by others and even today such practise has been maintained by certain families. In this connection, I would like to ask whether the government consider payment of compensation to those owners of the occupied lands ?

S P E A K E R : I now call upon the hon'ble Minister to answer the question.

PU LALRINCHHANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, the Rules & Conditions laid down is that expenditure for this compensation has to be sent with the attachement of Audit Certificate. Since Director Accounts & Treasuries have not the power to do this, the sole authority is Auditor General yet it has not been done till today. Hence, we have made a request to the Central Government to accept utilisation certificate we have attached and also give additional sanction.

In regard to rental charge as the amount brought home by the Chief Minister i.e. 5 lakh rupees is not in accordance with the agreement of the joint meeting, State Government cannot accept it. We are not moving to give sanction according to the decision of the joint meeting.

In regard to occupation of others' land other than by the army, it's not included in the head of land occupied by the army. However, I would like to inform the House that necessary steps will be taken in this regard.

PU R. LALZIRLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to know the reason why C & AG could not issue certificate - Is it because of audit objection or the fund meant for compensation is being diverted for other purpose ?

PU LALHMINGTHANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, rental charge for the land and buildings occupied by army had been assessed by the representatives of the army and the Government of Mizoram on 4.3.1998 which amounted to more than 19 crore 81 lakh rupees. It is regretful that the Chief Minister brought home Rs. 5,99,30,771/- and this complicate things. I would like to ask whether the Chief Minister can withdraw his acceptance of 5 lakh rupees ?

PU LALRINCHHANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, as rental charge is not in the question I do not prepare the answer in detail. However, the hon'ble Chief Minister said he brought

home 5 crore rupees but did not said whether the State Government is going to accept it or not.

In the mean time, Government of Mizoram could not give 1.5 crore rupees of compensation within 10 years and this creates problem. The new Government finds out the reason for this and gives out that along with the fresh ones, there is no time to send expenditure to Auditor at Guwahati. We urge each DC to sort out this matter and we could get last pay certificate from each DC and we asked Central Government to accept these certificates and make additional sanction.

PU LALHMINGTHANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to ask one more question. Rental of land and building is a separate issue. During insurgency army were deployed to help civil authority, this matter was under Home Ministry but not Defence. Till August 1986, Rs. 14,95,74,098/- had been sanctioned out of which around 1 crore rupees had not been distributed for some times but this too had been cleared. But after this, as armies were no more deployed to help civil authority, from 1986 December to 2001 it was under Defence Ministry. The said 5 crore rupees is also from Defence. I regret that the Minister mixed up this.

Therefore, I would like to know why the Chief Minister said he brought home some amount from Defence Ministry while we are claiming more than 19 crore rupees. Can he himself tell his denial of such amount?

PU LALRINCHHANA MINISTER : Mr. Speaker Sir, the questions are of two kinds - one is about compensation while the other one is about rental of land for which Joint Committee made an estimate from 1986 to 1997. From that estimate, the Chief Minister said 5 crore rupees had been sanctioned. But as we can not accept this 5 crore rupees we are moving again the Defence Ministry to sanction the amount as demanded.

SPEAKER : I now call upon Pu Sanghmingthanga H. Pautu to ask starred question No. 2.

PU SANGHMINGTHANGA H. PAUTU : Mr. Speaker Sir, starred question No. 22 is - Will the hon'ble Minister in-charge Transport Department be pleased to state -

- (a) Is there any appointment given in Transport Department during MNF-MPC coalition Government.
- (b) If yes, who are they with their designation.

SPEAKER : I now call upon Pu K. Sangthuama Transport Minister to answer.

PU K. SANGTHUAMA MINISTER : Mr. Speaker Sir, answer for starred question No. 22 is -

- (a) Yes.
- (b) 22 appointments had been given. The following is their names with their designation -

1.	Lalhminganga	-	Driver
2.	Vanchhunga	-	Driver
3.	N.K. Lalringa	-	Driver
4.	V.L. Finga	-	Driver
5.	Zoramliana	-	Driver
6.	K. Lalropuia	-	Driver
7.	Zoramthanga	-	Driver
8.	F. Lalzarliana	-	Driver
9.	Lalropuia	-	Driver
10.	Tawnliana	-	Driver
11.	Kawlthangpuia	-	Driver
12.	Vanlallawma	-	Conductor
13.	Vanlazarliana	-	Conductor
14.	R. Lalrinkima	-	Turner
15.	David Rokhuma	-	Turner
16.	Benjamin Zoram	-	Turner
17.	K.L. Zothanzuala	-	Electrician
18.	H. Lalrinsanga	-	Electrician
19.	H. Zothansanga	-	Peon
20.	Ramropuia	-	Handiman
21.	Laltlankima	-	Handiman
22.	Lalhriatpuia	-	Officiating Booking Clerk.

Thank you.

PU SANGHMINGTHANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, as the Government is facing financial problem, Cabinet meeting also passed H. PAUTU not to give appointment. I would like to know whether these appointments were given or the posts created while the Government ban appointment. Secondly, whether these appointment were through Employment Exchange or not and thirdly, if not, this means misuse of power, so shall we terminate them ?

PU H. LALTANPUIA : Mr. Speaker Sir, as my supplementary question is about Transport Department, I think it will be relevant. Transport Department has Pumping Station at Chaltlang Workshop both for POL and Diesel. I would like to know whether the Minister and those who have POL from Government use to take from Chaltlang ?

S P E A K E R : Let us not ask which is not relevant with the main question. If you ask relevant to the main question, I will surely accept it.

PU VANLALHLANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, has the appointment given at Transport Department before or after the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed ?

PU J. LALTHANGLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I am glad that we had an efficient Minister during MNF - MPC Ministry who could give 22 appointments for drivers, Handiman & Technicians within one year. After this how many appointments had been made under Transport Department till today.

PU R. LALZIRLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, if that is misuse of power, I would like to know whom shall we terminate - the then Minister or the present Minister, I also would like to know the number of appointments given during the sole MNF Ministry.

PU ZAKHU HLYCHHO : Mr. Speaker Sir, the present hon'ble Minister visited Transport Workshop, Chaltlang when he became a Minister and found out that there are many unworthy/unfit Government servants according to Government Press Release. What action had been taken against those ?

PU K. SANGTHUAMA : Mr. Speaker Sir, as we do not know the exact date of ban of post creation, and as we do not know the exact date of these appointments, I can not answer the question asked by Pu Sanghmingthanga. However, this matter will be looked into.

Regarding taking petrol and diesel from Chaltlang pumping station, there is a question to be answered in this session. So, I will not answer it now. In regard to the question asked by Pu Vanlalhlana, as I said earlier, it is difficult to answer if we do not know the exact date of these appointments. The reason is we are not prepared for these supplementary questions. I will later inform the House the exact date of ban of post creation and the exact date of these appointments. In regard to the questions asked by Pu Thangliana and Pu Zira - 22 appointments had been given in Transport Department and no appointment had been given since the sole MNF Ministry is formed because Central Government bans post creation. Regarding unfit Government servants steps had been taken in various ways and now they are well prepared and fit to work diligently.

SPEAKER : I now call upon Pu Z.H. Ropuia to ask started question no. 23.

PU Z.H. ROPUIA : Mr. Speaker Sir, starred question no. 23 -

Will the hon'ble Minister in - charge Trade & Commerce Department be pleased to state -

- (a) Is the location for Border Trade at Tlabung been selected.
- (b) The amount of fund received from Cental Government for this and
- (c) When.

SPEAKER : I now call upon Pu Aichhinga, Minister Trade & Commerce Department to answer.

PU AICHHINGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, answer for starred question no. 23 is-

- (a) Kawrpuichhuah has been selected for Border Trade at Tlabung.
- (b) Central Government estimates 2.48 crore rupees for this from which 1.13 crore rupees had been released.
- (c) It was released on 26th March, 2001.

PU LALRINZUALA : Mr. Speaker Sir, we now know that it was released on 26th March, 2001. I would like to know the works done so far.

PU H. LALTANPUIA : Mr. Speaker Sir, had an MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) been signed by the Government of Mizoram with Central Government in regard to Border Trade we are going to have with Bangladesh.

At the same time, the hon'ble Chief Minister visited Bangladesh and even Bangladesh Ministers came to Mizoram. Do they have proper agreement in this regard.

PU J. LALTHANGLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to know the area of Kawrpuihuah.

S P E A K E R : I now call upon Pu Aichhinga to answer.

PU AICHHINGA MINISTER : Mr. Speaker Sir, our hon'ble member Pu Lalrinzuala's question can be answered as follows: We have received the fund for this purpose since a long time but we cannot use it due to the absence of approach-road. This place, Kawrpuihuah lies in the midst of thick forest just beyond Thekamuk the border front of Mizoram. The place has not yet been connected by any road, the plan fund is for the purpose of building Houses for Bank, Custom Duty post, etc., it is not for making Roads. So, we cannot start such work there. We search for fund for this road from BADP and Rural connectivity fund, but they are not suitable. So, we turned to NEC for fund and we hope we can start work soon.

And, regarding MOU, Border Trade is under the power of the Union Government. This is also the result of the agreement between Bangladesh and Central Government. As far as I know, no MOU is being signed between Indian Government and Bangladesh Government, but this place, Kawrpuihuah is chosen by the two Governments. The previous choice spot is cancelled as it is a wet place. And, the total area of Kawrpuihuah is 250 hectare.

COL. LALCHUNGNUNGA SAILO: Mr. Speaker Sir, I ask starred question No. 24. Let the Agriculture Minister be pleased to reply.

S P E A K E R : Let us call upon the Minister of Agriculture.

PU AICHHINGA MINISTER : Mr. Speaker Sir, my answer to question (A) regarding the proposals for economic self-sufficiency are as follows:

- (1) Land Development by Machinery - 140 hectare, Land Development by Manual Labour - 174.50 hectare had been completed during this year 2001 - 2002.

- (2) The rate of Land Development has been categorised into 3 categories on the basis of the land (slope side). According to which Category A is 0-5, where the rate of Land Development is Rs. 24650/- per hectare. Category B is 5-8 where the rate is Rs. 40820/- per hectare. Category C is 8-10 where the rate is Rs. 50804/- per hectare. These flat rates are used whether the work is done with Machinery or Manual Labour.
- (3) New 4 Minor Irrigation Projects are initiated besides the existing 10 projects.
- (4) Bio-fertilizer Unit is inaugurated on 30.8.2001 at Neihbawi. Its production capacity is 75 tonne per year.
- (5) Awareness campaign is given to cultivators on the harvested crops in a year.
- (6) Strong proposal is made to grow winter crops during this coming winter at any convenient place.
- (7) Aizawl East Agriculture District is too wide, so proposal is made to create Champhai Agriculture District.
- (8) Agriculture Department takes steps to provide permanent livelihood under the integrated watershed (IWBPS) projects.
- (9) Positive steps are also taken for self-sufficiency in oilseeds and pulses.
- (10) To encourage farmers, campaigns, training and tours are carried out. Besides, Refresher Training is also given to Departmental Staffs.

And my answer to question (b) is that Agriculture Department took steps according to 2001-2002 Budget.

COL. LALCHUNGNUNGA SAILO: Mr. Speaker Sir, according to our Budget, the rate of Land Development is proposed as 50 lakhs for 334 hectare in WRC and Rs. 50 lakhs for 336 hectare in hill slope. This proposal is contrasted by our Minister's speech, what is the reason? And under which project does this step is taken?

PU NIRUPAM CHAKMA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to know the requirement of food grains, the food stuff in Mizoram, the productions from within that state and what is the additional requirements from outside the state. Can the hon'ble Minister give us the figure right now not by tomorrow or there after because until now the Department of Agriculture has been working vigorously to make the state self-sufficient in food grains. It also appears that many hectares of land has been developed, still the requirement of food stuff is increasing. We are relying more on the supply of food stuff from outside.

I would like to know what is the present position? What is the actual requirement? What is local production here? I think that will be more enlightenment on the subject. Mr. Speaker Sir, the actual requirement of this state and the local production. I think our Minister should kindly inform us.

PU AICHHINGA MINISTER : Mr. Speaker Sir, here is the answers to questions made by hon'ble Member from Aizawl W-I that Land Development had been done in Champhai, Tuichhuahen and Bilkhawthlir last year and year before last year. From this year onwards, Land Development should be done in the whole state, so, it cannot be said the names of particular places. Our Department Officers had submitted their reports. So, we will cover the whole state.

And, regarding the questions made by hon'ble Member from Chawngte Constituency, I cannot point out the exact figure of our required food stuff and local production. Anyway, let me try to give my answer during this session.

S P E A K E R : Now, let us call upon Pu Sanghmingthanga H. Pautu to ask starred question No. 25.

PU SANGHMINGTHANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, thank you. This is my question to be answered by Minister of General Administration Department.
H. PAUTU

- (a) What amount of money had been received by this Ministry to make roads in the proposed site for 1st A.R. at Zokhawsang ?
- (b) Is it true that the work should be done by BRO ? How long had they finished ?
- (c) When can they finish the total work ?

S P E A K E R : Now, let us call Pu Tawnluia on behalf of our Chief Minister.

PU TAWNLUIA : Mr. Speaker Sir, the following are the answers.
MINISTER

- (a) Mizoram Government had asked for financial assistance from Central Government for making roads in Zokhawsang, Rs. 8.62 crores is agreed by the Central Government and till now they have released Rs. 5 crores.
- (b) The Government entrusts BRO to make approach road and internal roads. The total length of the road is proposed to be KM 13.12.
- (c) Regarding the completion of the work, it is expected to complete it during this Spring season. Their work is visited and assessed by our Chief Minister on 25, September this year.

PU R. LALZIRLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, regarding the question of our Vice Chairman, I think that he will be the one who knows this best. Has he not been told about this by the Government ?

PU SANGHMINTHANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, regarding this Zokhawsang site, where the Assam Rifles are to be shifted, what steps are being taken up by the government ? When shall they go to that place ?
H. PAUTU

S P E A K E R : Let us call upon Pu Tawnluia to give answer.

PU TAWNLUIA : Mr. Speaker Sir, now the Home Ministry of Central Government called tender for construction of camp building and any other necessary works from B.R.O., Central PWD and MES (Military Engineering Serv-
MINISTER

ices). They were told how the work is to be done by the Home Minister. So, they also made estimates and submitted their reports to the Ministry of Home. It is now scrutinized by the Home Ministry. The work is expected to be started soon.

S P E A K E R : Now, let us call upon Pu Vanlalhlana to ask starred question No. 26.

P U V A N L A L H L A N A : Mr. Speaker Sir, I ask our common question with Pu L.N. Tuanga, Starred Question No. 26 to be answered by Minister of School Education Department.

S P E A K E R : Let us call upon Pu F. Malsawma, Minister of School Education.

P U F. M A L S A W M A M I N I S T E R : Mr. Speaker Sir, these are the answers to Starred Question No. 26 -

- (a) Investigation is still going, so, the report is not yet received.
- (b) Investigation is done by the Task Force and ACB.
- (c) No reports has been received by the Government.
- (d) No reports has been received.
- (e) It has not been found out as no reports has been received.

P U H. L A L T A N P U I A : Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary Questions. Regarding this investigation, it is still searched by the Task Force, is it needed to involve ACB? Do the government agencies suspicious of each other?

In my constituency, Ruallung, the pay Roll Savings of H/S Teachers are picketed by the Cashier. They said that they will make him repay but he did not, he was then transferred to other place. Now, I ask whether that amount of Money is to be repaid or not?

S P E A K E R : Let us call upon Pu F. Malsawma, Minister, this is very interesting for our members.

P U F. M A L S A W M A M I N I S T E R : Mr. Speaker Sir, Investigation should be done by the Task Force. Our Department did not know about the investigation done by ACB too, because they are from different Department. ACB is Vigilance Department.

Next, regarding the date when investigation is done, it is not known as it is not the steps taken by the Department. It cannot be known from the Department because investigation is initiated by Planning Department. They have submitted their report to the Committee and it has not yet arrived at the Government.

P U V A N L A L H L A N A : Mr. Speaker Sir, why did he say that the Report has not yet been submitted?

PU F. MALSAWMA MINISTER : Mr. Speaker Sir, regarding submission of the report, here I meant it is still there in the hands of the Committee and that Committee will appoint the investigator.

PU VANLALHLANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, does it mean that ACB had finished their investigation ?

PU F. MALSAWMA MINISTER : Mr. Speaker Sir, the Committee has not submitted the Reports which they got from the Task Force to the Government. And regarding this Ruallung issue, I was not informed before, I will verify this.

S P E A K E R : Question Hour has finished. Today, our Chief Minister Pu Zoramthanga begged leave of absence as he has to go to NEC Meeting. Do we agree with this ? Yes, we agree.

Now, we shall go to our next business. It is laying of papers. Let us call upon Er. K. Thangzuala, Minister, to lay Annual report of Zoram Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. for the year 1997 - 1998.

Er. K. THANZUALLA MINISTER : Mr. Speaker Sir, all the corporations are bound to lay their Annual Reports in the House. So, it is good to do this for Government, Company and other Corporations.

S P E A K E R : Now, let us call upon Pu K.L. Lianchia to present the 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee.

PU K.L. LIANCHIA : Mr. Speaker Sir, with your permission, I, hereby present the 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee on the table of this August House. This Report had already been submitted to the Speaker on 17th August, 2001 while session is not going on. Today, I present here for the fulfillment of our Rules.

Thank you.

S P E A K E R : Let the copy be distributed. Now, I shall call upon Pu C. Sangzuala to present 1st Report of Public Undertakings Committee.

PU C. SANGZUALA : Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir, with your permission Sir, I present in this August House 1st Report of Public Undertakings Committee.

Thank you.

S P E A K E R : Let the copy be distributed. Pu Z.H. Ropuia will now present 2nd Report of Committee on Government Assurance.

PU Z.H. ROPUIA : Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir. With your permission Sir, I do present 2nd Report of Committee on Government Assurance in this August House.

Thank you.

SPEAKER : Let the copy be distributed. I am glad to say that our various Committees are working hard and have many reports to present and papers to lay in the House.

Today, we have Official Resolution submitted by Pu F. Malsawma which reads - That this House ratifies amendments to the Constitution of India falling within the perview of clauses A & B of the Proviso to clause 2 of Article 368 proposed to be made by the two Constitution 91st Amendment Bill as passed by the two Houses of Parliament. Now, I shall call upon Pu F. Malsawma to move his resolution.

PU F. MALSAWMA : Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir. Though I had submitted
MINISTER my Official Resolution as follows - That this House ratifies amendments to the Constitution of India falling within the perview of clauses A & B of the Proviso to clause 2 of Article 368 proposed to be made by the two Constitution 91st Amendment Bill as passed by the two Houses of Parliament - I would like to request the House to allow me to withdraw my resolution according to our Rules 127 for the benefit of our Country and Nation.

SPEAKER : Can you explain more clearly why you want to withdraw it.

PU F. MALSAWMA : Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir. This is about the
MINISTER number of members for Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha, Legislative Assembly, Legislative Council. According to this, number of these members will be in accordance with the year just before census which means the number of these members can not be increased till 2016. If that is the case, it will be too long to wait for small State legislatures like Mizoram and Goa who have less than 60 members. So, I think it is better to move another resolution before we rectify this hence I ask the House to allow me to withdraw this resolution.

SPEAKER : The hon'ble Minister asked the permission of the House to withdraw the resolution and explained his reason. What is the opinion of the members ?

PU LALHMINGTHANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I thought he is going to move another resolution after withdrawing this rectification but if it is not, our group allow him to withdraw.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to ask the hon'ble Minister for clarification. I do not understand that the Minister said I shall move another resolution if the House allows me to withdraw this resolution. If a resolution is withdrawn once, it is withdrawn for all.

SPEAKER : Other resolution is a different case. But our rules do not allow to ratify any in this connection - even an amendment.

PU LALHMINGTHANGA : I understand in that case it should not be ratified in any case. Is it contradictory to our Rules to move another resolution ?

SPEAKER : In ratification, even an amendment is not allowed, it should be accepted as it is. Therefore, it is best if members of the House allow him to withdraw.

PU LALHMINGTHANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, if the Minister who is the mover asks the permission the House to withdraw, our group allow him to withdraw it.

SPEAKER : Do we all agree ? According to our Rules No. 121(a) it can be accepted if the mover does not move and withdraw it. However, I would like to know the opinion of the House. So, he withdraws it.

Now, we shall proceed to our next business i.e. Legislative Business. Pu Lalrinchhana, Revenue Minister had introduced The Mizoram Public Demand Recovery Bill, 2001. Now, I shall call upon him to ask for consideration.

PU LALRINCHHANA MINISTER : With your permission, Sir, I beg leave of the House to consider The Mizoram Public Demand Recovery Bill, 2001.

Thank you.

SPEAKER : Do we agree to consider it. Then I now call upon the Minister to move it.

PU LALRINCHHANA MINISTER : Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir, for giving me the opportunity to move my Bill and I would like to request all members to think it carefully as it is the need of our state and pass it.

The Mizoram Public Demand Recovery Bill, 2001 is being prepared as various financial institutions and corporations like KVI, ZIDCO are facing problems due to poor recovery of loans. They can not function as they should be. So, it is important to have proper recovery law.

In 1986, we adopted Bank Loan Public Demand Recovery Acts but that did not include our Financial Institutions and Corporations as they do not want to take steps according to this Act. Therefore, in order to punish those who neglect to repay loan and to open door for more loan, it is important to have our own Recovery Law. The initiative had been taken by Revenue Department in this regard.

However, this Law does not concern only Revenue Department, we use Law Department as our ground while preparing it. So, this Public Demand Recovery Bill is prepared by adding some more provisions which are not included in Bengal Public Recovery Act.

Since, we prepared a new one we thought it will be good to have Mizoram Public Demands Recovery Bill of our own instead of Bengal Public Demands Recovery Act though most part of Bengal Recovery Act is taken. As Revenue Department takes the initiative, we mean the Commissioner will be Revenue Commissioner which could be changed by the Government if necessary. If this Bill is passed, it will open door in repayment of various loans either from the Government or Corporation or even from an individual. Bearing all these in mind today, I move this Bill in this House and I would like to request all members to consider wholeheartedly.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, we shall discuss the Bill moved by the hon'ble Minister. Each member will be allotted 5 minutes.

PU NIRUPAM CHAKMA : Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, if we look at the definition of this Bill, it reads - "Public Demands means any arrear or money payable or due to the Government or to any Scheduled Bank or any Financial Institution approved by Reserve Bank of India where the amount due to such Banks or Financial Institution is less than 10 lakh rupees and included any money recoverable as arrear of land revenue by any law enforced or by any agreement". This means those who take loan upto 10 lakh will have to make recovery. But there is not provision for those who take more than 10 lakh. I, therefore, cannot accept it from the definition itself. I call it Dragonian. Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, what I would like to propose is to refer it to Select Committee.

PU L.N. TLUANGA : Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, the hon'ble Minister moved The Mizoram Public Demand Recovery Bill, 2001. I regret that our State and our people are in a condition to move this kind of Bill and I think even our Minister and his colleagues do regret about it.

If we look at other states of India, poor states where the standard of people is low make poor recovery of loan. To some extent, I understand the Government for making this kind of Law if people do not make proper recovery. At the same time, I feel it will be too burdensome for the Government.

One point I would like to raise is about execution of certificate at page no. 5 a,b,c - if the certificate officer said the debtor has made default payment, the interest will be charged at the rate of 18% which is too much. Besides this, 'all charges incurred in this respect of' can be interpreted as that the debtor will have to pay all other charges like expenditure to serve notice and others. This is too much for the debtor.

PU H. LALTANPUIA : Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir. It is clear that the Government is facing great problem due to poor recovery of loan from various financial institutions, corporations like ZIDCO, KVI, HUDCO etc. Because of this I appreciate the principle of The Mizoram Public Demands Recovery Bill. However, if we look at the provisions of this Bill, I feel it is a bit dragonian as mentioned by the hon'ble Member from Chawngte constituency. I do not support this Bill as this is made for those who take less than 10 lakh rupees. Those who can take more than 10 lakh rupees are rich people and it seems they are not going to be effected by this Bill. On the other hand, poorer section of the people who can take loan below 10 lakh will be greatly affected. So, it will be a great burden for poorer section of the people. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker

Sir, as the definition itself does not include more than 10 lakhs, I find it difficult to accept. Truly speaking, we the politicians are in the habit of using loans as political rehabilitation which destroys our morality, I think we have to stop this procedure immediately. Therefore, as I said earlier, I can not accept this Bill considering its provisions as it is to put more burden on poorer section of the people.

Thank you.

PU LALRINZUALA : Thank you, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I would like to say my appreciation of the efforts and enthusiasm showed by the Revenue Minister regarding legislation.

As already mentioned by my colleagues, the bill itself is unsatisfactory. The hon'ble Minister had made the definition of the bill. This bill mainly focused on the lower section of the people as it will be a bill for the demand or recovery of loan below an amount of 10 lakhs rupees. However, our obstacle lies in the weak recovery of loan above 10 lakhs.

On the third chapter, we have seen that a certificate debtor may be given chance for a period of 6 months where the certificate is for a demand of an amount exceeding five thousand rupees. As this is the case, I have come to consider about the poorer section of the people who are given loan on ginger. Ginger loan has been disbursed at the rate of Rs. 6000/- per person. If these loanees failed to repay the loan within the prescribed times, they may be arrested on the basis of this bill. And now ginger cultivation has become barren. The future of those poor people becomes bleak. The same fate has awaits the housing loan debtors. As I have stated earlier, housing loan and ginger loan are mostly taken by the under privileged population. Therefore, I am afraid that they will be the victims of this bill.

I have comprehended that Mizoram has been under financial crisis and it is the duty of the government to find a way for the improvement of that condition. As for this bill, we cannot help enacting it if there is no alternative.

Another point I would like to emphasize is the provision made in cases where the certificate officer is satisfied that the debtor has made default in payment of the dues and without reasonable cause, an interest of 18% per annum may be charged. If this is the case, the bill has paved the way for the officers to take unfavourable advantages. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the bill may better be reviewed.

Thank you.

PU H. RAMMAWI : Mr. Speaker, this bill is the first of its kind to be enacted for Mizoram. It has been clearly defined in the Statement of objects and reasons. As the name of the bill is 'Public Demand Recovery bill', it mainly aims to enact penalty and action to be taken by the government against defaulter of loan. To some extent, it may be true that this bill is rather severe for the debtor. However, we have to note that eventho' this bill is being moved, Mizoram has already adopted 'Bengal Public Demand Recovery Act, 1913'. The aims and objectives of the Bill under consideration has already been in force as 'The Bengal Public Demand Recovery Act, 1913' was adopted. Even if this bill is withdrawn or rejected by the House today, it is being in force within Mizoram. As for now, due to steps taken by the hon'ble Minister, the idea of having our own act arose. This bill, though new for us, the provisions of the Bill are not new. In fact, it has already been in force at present. After adopting it, if any provision is found unsatisfactory, we, the legislators can make amendments.

Regarding the definition of 'Public Demand', let us assume that the

Minister incharge will clarify it afterward. What I would like to stress is that the provisions in this which is regarded as severe has been in force, but, we may not be aware of it. With the proposal of this bill, we will have our own Act and be able to amend whenever necessary as a bill may not be satisfactory at the initial stage. After it becomes an Act, this House can make amendment if it is necessary and the Bengal Public Recovery Bill which is being adopted by Mizoram could be repealed. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a must to have our own Act and I suggest that the bill be passed by the House.

Thank you.

PU R. LALZIRLIANA : Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In my opinion, it is the weakness of the Mizos, as a whole that we are very sluggish and irresponsive in the repayment of loan. It is our disadvantage that we are poor in loan repayment. We have to know that we, the politicians are partly responsible for this. Without proper and strict rules, there will be more trouble in the future. We need strict and stern act to regulate us. At the same time, the bill proposed today seems to target only the under privileged persons and with this bill the government can oppress the lower section of the people. If this bill is made just to recover the loans which is less than 10 lakhs rupees only I strongly opine that it is not to be accepted. Instead, this bill should aim to recover loan or any money payable or due to the government or any institution that has no prescribed amount of limitation. So that it can cover all the debts irrespective of the amount involved. The provision made for the interest to be charged against the debtor in case of default in payment of the dues also requires to be re-examined. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to suggest that, a group of MLA be set up as a committee to review the bill so that this bill could come out more satisfactory.

Thank you.

PU LALCHAMLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to deliver speech. Let me start with some points which are of a very important case. As said by our members, we, the Mizos are negligent in repayment of loans. This negligence made difficulties for our young generations. It is, therefore, my desire to organise campaigns in this regard from Church and other NGO's.

While MPC and MNF formed coalition government, the then Deputy Chief Minister asked for KVI loans and they went to Bombay. If I am not mistaken, 10 crore was allowed for KVI loan on condition of repayment of the previous loans. Thus, that loan sanctioned was useless till today. Similarly, ZIDCO and Housing loans are also like that. Therefore, this Rule is very important. This Bill comes from the Committee where about 5 MLA's and experts had taken part and I hope we will discuss this under good atmosphere but some of our members try to politicize it.

And, as this Bill contains some punishments it is not proper to say as dragonian. If it is dragonian so does the existing IPC which is also full of punishment. And, if we do not look at the context, as said by our member from Tlungvel Constituency, the main objective of this Bill is to punish those who do not want to repay their loans. It is written in the context as "will fully and without reasonable cause". So, Mr. Speaker, it is not good to distrust our officers to issue certificate in this regard. Most of our officers are truthful and trustworthy.

As we see in the definition, this Act will be effective for those who take loans less than 10 lakhs. And those who take loans above 10 lakhs can be dealt

with "The recovery of Debt dues to Bank Act 1993". So, there is separate Act for those who take above 10 lakhs. This Bill proposes to make such Act for those who take below 10 lakhs.

And, as said by Pu H. Rammawi, the hon'ble Member from Sangau Constituency, Bengal Public Demand Recovery Act 1913 is adopted in Mizoram, but it is not perfect enough and this Bill tries to make it perfect. Mr. Speaker Sir, this Bill might be imperfect but I propose to pass it and if necessary we can make amendment later. So, I support this Bill.

Thank you.

PU F. LALTHANZUALA : Mr. Speaker Sir, although this Bill is good it can but make heavy burden for the people. And regarding poor repayment of loans, we always blame the debtors but we also need to look at ourselves, the authorities and the politicians. The main reason for poor repayment is not due to their negligence or sin. Many politicians had promised to the people to write off their loans during election campaign, this can give our people wrong notion instead of encouraging them to repay their loans. So, we should not blame the people, who cannot speak here, in this House. We should realise that we too had many responsibilities here. Otherwise, it will mean that we make trap for whom we had misled. This Bill is not totally bad but the victims would be so pitiful. So, is there any other way to avoid this burden. If we look at the record of some political members of Assembly, loan recovery is not very good.

The other point in this regard is that, I am aware that the staff of that Department may not perform their duty perfectly. For instance while I was a member of COPU, the list of debtors and amount of debt was made by the staff of ZIDCO and was followed by strong order. Such was very effective. I point out this because only an Act is not enough but action is more important. Everything cannot be kept in written and it can even be abused according to the personality of the keepers/executors. I also hope that there will be other way to recover loans without using this Act. Thus, its enforcement is more important than the Act itself.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we can improve our condition by using the existing Act. Although I support recovery of loans I am aware that this Bill is too strong. So, I propose to use our existing Act for this purpose with proper enforcement.

Thank you.

Er. K. THANGZUALLA : Mr. Speaker Sir, we discuss a very important subject.
MINISTER We have many problems on loans under ZIDCO, KVI, PMRY and others due to poor recovery. In case of KVI loan, we even went to Bombay to discuss with the top most officer but they did not want to release loans for Mizoram for two years. The same is with PMRY loan. We tried our level best for recovery of loans by confiscating the assets of debtors such as vehicles, TVs, etc. The main reason for poor repayment is due to the promise made by some politicians during election campaign, they promised that they could write off loan/debt. This made negligence in the minds of the people/debts.

Besides this, some others thought that there is no punishment for those who did not repay their loans. And, as said by Pu Tanpuia, hon'ble member from Suangpuilawn Constituency, we often used loans to help poor people without knowing about its disadvantages. If we really know the disadvantage side of loan or its repayment, I think, we would not want to recommend our people to take loans. But today, our condition is not a desirable one.

Although we tried our level best to recover loans, it cannot be effective for long. Therefore, this Act is inevitable now. If we pass this Bill, many people will know about this and I hope they will try their level best to repay their loans. When we talked about this with some Bankers, their suggestion was to make strong Act on recovery of loans, otherwise they were not interested to release loans for our State. Therefore, I support this Bill and I want to pass here in this House now. I hope this Act will give the people serious thoughts about taking loans and the consequence for not repaying it.

DR. LALZAMA : Mr. Speaker Sir, thank you for allotting me time to speak. I really appreciate this Mizoram Public Demand Recovery Bill, proposed by our hon'ble Minister. It is good for our state, because this Bill is prepared by our expert teams to decrease our loan debts. But as we had listened earlier, this Act may not be perfect but it can be amended in future for its betterment. Therefore, there is existing Act on recovery of loan above Rs. 10 lakhs. If we look at only the punishment side, the Act may be dangerous, but I wish all of us to look at the whole context from the beginning to the end. Really, some debtors never try their best to repay their loans. So, punishment is inevitable for such persons.

I still remember one of our agendas in the Aizawl North Presbytery. This agenda contained the importance of repayment of loans and proposed to give teaching to the people in this regard. Then, the agenda was passed. It will further be referred to Synod. This clearly shows that our Church is also aware of the importance of loan recovery. Therefore, we must know that loan is not a kind of grant and it is very important to make punishment for those who do not want to repay their loans/debt.

DEPUTY SPEAKER : It is time to have a recess. Shall we go on with the business as there are still some members who have not had speech?

DR. LALZAMA : Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, we see at the end - Statement of objects and reasons, that this Bill is meant to solve the problem faced by our financial institutions. This will replace the recovery act we are using. This Bill is prepared to suit our culture and society and there will be no financial involvements there will be more benefits rather than financial involvement. If there is any limitations we can amend it. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I propose to pass it unanimously.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER : It's time now for recess. We shall resume our sitting at 2 : 00 P.M.

Sitting adjourned.

2 : 00 P.M.

S P E A K E R : We shall continue our business. Request I would like to make to you all is that it is not appropriate for legislators to defend defaulters. Even in our today's subject, it will be good to know that loanees have agreement with bank and they can

not be punished beyond the agreement. At the same time, it is also not good if the poorer section of the people suffer. Bearing these in mind, we shall continue our discussion. Now Pu C. Sangzuala please.

PU C. SANGZUALA : Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to thank the hon'ble Minister for arranging this kind of Bill which is very important to solve the problems faced by various corporations and for the development of our nation.

What I would like to say first is, whenever we plan to do good things do we really use our mind or simply take it as political game. From the discussion we have had so far, all members agreed to pass the Bill. But we used to counter what had the previous ministry done and I think this teaches us to be more careful in future.

I wonder why we are weak in repaying loan, either it is from the Government or other financial institutions. Our mentality in taking loan and repayment have to be amended. I think this Bill will be useful in this respect. In my opinion, if we do not change our mentality in taking loan, we, the Mizos are not worth to give loans. At the same time, it is important to be careful while selecting loanecs. The wrong done should be immediately corrected.

Some of us said that this Bill is not good for those who can not take big loans but this had been explained in our morning session. If this Bill is passed, one will hesitate to take loans and think carefully before taking loans. If a person takes loan bearing this in mind, I am sure it will not be necessary to impose penalty. However, I do agree that there are some amendments to be made. Yet, as we do not have proper Recovery Bill, it is good to pass this Bill as it is and if there is any amendments to be made, we, the legislators are the ones to amend.

Thank you.

PU AICHHINGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, it seems we are not clear about MINISTER
Mizoram Public Demand Recovery Bill. The hon'ble Minister said that we are still using W. Bengal Recovery Act. Since we do not have our own, we adopted W. Bengal Act but there are many clauses which are not applicable to our State. Therefore, instead of waiting for their amendment, it is better to have our own Act. Before introducing this Bill, a number of MLAs had been consulted thus it is not proper to refer it to the Committee. As the main function of this House is to legislate a Bill, the necessary amendments will also be done by this House. We all know that our moral in taking loan and its recovery is very bad, thus it is very important to have our own Act and I would like to express my gratitude to the hon'ble Minister for preparing this Bill. I, therefore, would like to say that it is to be passed unanimously without saying much.

Thank you.

PU C. LALRINSANGA : Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir. To have our own Act is MINISTER
good news for cooperative societies. It is the privilege of MLAs to legislate Bills. However, I feel we are a bit hesitant in passing bill I, therefore, would like to request the legislators to be more awoken in this regard.

The condition of our APEX Bank and MUCO is very bad. APEX Bank is booked according to Banking Regulation Act 1949 Sec 11(a) which means the

sum of Reserve fund and share capital should not be less than 1 crore rupees all the time and we can not afford this because our loan recovery is very bad. Though there is W. Bengal Recovery Act, it is important to have own own Act to suit our society and culture. I am glad that the Minister prepared this Demand Recovery Bill. Our mentality is wrong as we do not have stern Act. I, therefore, would like to request the legislators to stand firm for the good of our country. It is the duty/responsibility of legislators to legislate Bill for our country.

Thank you.

PU SANGHMINGTHANGA : Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to point out
H. PAUTU that Central Government had created 20 Mega watt
Thermal Power Plant for which 85 crore will be spent.

Mr. Speaker Sir, we all know about this Bill clearly. Luckily, I am also one of the members along with Dr. Lalzama, Pu Lalchamlia till he became Minister, Pu Lalziriana and Pu L.N. Tuanga. We all tried our best to draft this. Sometimes we consulted Law Secretary and other experts and reached this stage. Thus, this Bill is introduced after every representatives of all parties had accepted it. But today, some of our fellow members opposed to it and wanted it refer to Select Committee, this is very bad. Any Law we have made can not be perfect for all times to come thus it is possible to propose amendment if and when necessary.

Some words at page no. 5 which runs - 'officers are liable to fine 15 - 18%' is a wrong way to educate public. It is written in page no. 5 - In cases, where the certificate officer is satisfied that the certificate debtor have been made default in payment of the dues wilfully and without reasonable cause, such interest may be charged at 18% per annum. They had also agreed this when we discussed about it.

As pointed out by some members, failure in repayment of loan make problems for others. So, it is better to have our own act legislated than using 'Bengal Public Demand Recovery Act, 1913' and I appreciate the efforts taken by our Minister for the introduction of this Bill. I would like to point out that this Bill is not meant to suppress the poor but to punish those who do not want to repay their loans. Therefore, Mr. Speaker Sir, it is our duty to make law for repayment of loans given by the state. I request even the hon'ble opposition members not to oppose this Bill but pass it unanimously.

Thank you.

PU ZAKHU HLYCHHO : Mr. Speaker Sir, in my opinion this Bill is meant to
punish our loved ones. Some of the ruling members
are members of ZIDCO and KVI Board who give
loans to their favourites. Now we are going to make Bill to punish those loanees and we have to be careful in this regard. Most of the members said loan recovery is bad as we are using W. Bengal Act. If that is the case why don't they make recovery Act according to this.

Whenever we take loans, we signed an agreement to mortgage at least something. I, therefore, wonder why these financial institutions do not take action according to the agreement. The former Prime Minister announced to remit loan below Rs. 10,000/-. But according to this Bill, we are going to arrest one who took loan even only Rs. 5,000/- and imprison him for 6 months. I am afraid that we go against IPC. According to the Indian Court, if a man is convicted, his term in the jail is regarded as his payment of debt. According to this Bill, if a person cannot repay a loan of Rs.5,000/- he will be imprisoned for 6 months but this will not erase his debt. This

means even after he is released from prison, he can be arrested again and it is not written how long he will be in prison again. I feel the penalty is too heavy and that is why we suggest to refer it to Select Committee.

In regard to its definition, in Public Demand Recovery Act, it is less than ten lakh rupees. It is said that above ten lakh rupees will be included in the Recovery Act of Financial Institution of 1993. It may be true but I do not understand it properly. Since the people of Mizoram are poor as a whole, we do not take big loans given by either ZIDCO or KVI. But today we are going to make strick Law for our people, that is why I suggest to examine it.

In No. 4 (a) (i) it is said 'any person' and there is no more definition for 'any person'. Does this mean any person whose money is owned will go to Magistrate and request him to collect his debt. If we go like this, it will be too burdensome for the Government.

In my opinion, now is not a proper time to pass this Bill considering the economic condition of the people of Mizoram. This will not effect non - Mizos but effect the Mizos whom we loved as its penalty is too much. Therefore, I suggest to refer it to Select Committee.

Thank you.

PU LALHMINGTHANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, first of all I would like to thank the Government for taking steps to minimize our debt. Anyway whether the debt is from the Bank or financial institution or Corporation, repayment is very important. I do admit that the bill is good for our State but it may be necessary to make amendment as the law will be enforceable to those who take loan below ten lakh rupees. As loans below ten lakh rupees are mostly concerned with common people, it makes distinction among loan debtors.

As pointed out by some of the hon'ble membes, though we can enforce Debt Recovery Tribunal Law to those who take loans more than ten lakh rupees it is rarely enforced. So, if we have Debt Recovery Law, I think it should cover every debtor without making any distinction.

I would like to know why the Government is in haste to make this law. We still can use Bengal Public Demand Recovery Bill 1913. Is this law inevitable today. We, the Mizos are obedient people. So, it is good to educate our people to pay attention to our debt through the Church and NGOs like YMA, MHIP and political parties so that we can follow progressive steps under the existing law.

I, therefore, can not support this Bill which can effect only those whose debt is below 10 lakh rupees as it will be a burden for the poorer section though I appreciate the spirit. Mr. Speaker Sir, we support the spirit to minimize our debt but we can not advocate this Bill not because we are opposition but only because the victims will be the poor people as this Bill can cause imprisonment for six months and it is to be enforced upon everyone. So we want to make Laws for every debtor without making any restriction. Therefore, Mr. Speaker Sir, as I said yesterday, we do not oppose the spirit to raise revenue but we are afraid of excessive steps including sales tax, but our ruling members neglected our speech. Even today, what we have said are very sincere about this, I am sorry for our decision is outnumbered by the ruling members. If vote is to be taken today, we will sit here but keep silence as abstention m by silence which is practised even in UNO assembly. Walk - out stage is not our choice but we did it yesterday due to an inevitable reason.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to request our ruling members to reform this Bill by remembering the condition of our poor people. I blame the Government for following strict measures to raise money, I wish our financial institutions to try their level best by using our agreement and the power of court so that many responsibilities put to the Government may be lessen, otherwise this House will take all the blame.

Thank you.

S P E A K E R : Now I will call upon mover of the Bill to wind - up and ask the House to pass it if we can not go as the opposition leader requested.

P U L A L R I N C H H A N A : Mr. Speaker Sir, 15 members participated in the discussion of The Mizoram Public Demands Recovery Bill, 2001 and I am glad that none had opposed the Bill itself. I will try to explain some points raised by hon'ble members and I do hope we will pass it after that.

The need to have this Bill has started since the previous ministry as Bengal Public Demand Recovery Bill is not applicable as a whole to Mizoram. Thus, draft had been made by our experts and a Committee consisting of members both from ruling and opposition parties which had been formed to examine the draft. After that it was passed by Cabinet to be moved in the House as a Bill. Committee members were Pu Lalnunluanga of Tlungvel MLA, Pu R. Lalzirliana of Saitual MLA, Pu Chama of Bilkhawthlir MLA, Pu Sanghmingthanga of Kawnpui MLA and Pu Lalzama of Aizawl N - I MLA. The draft was prepared by Pu S.R. Valla.

As mentioned earlier, we adopted W. Bengal Demand Recovery Act for Mizoram in 1986 and we are using this Act for many years. But we feel there are many clauses which are not applicable to the people of Mizoram. So we need to have our own Bill/Act to suit our living condition which can be amended by ourselves while we can not amend the Bengal Recovery Act. I would like to point out that most of the draft is taken from Bengal Recovery Act. Even in regard to imprisonment, interest and payment of loan we do not go beyond Bengal Recovery Act. So, it is hard to understand why some of our members are against this Bill.

Though our financial institutions are keen to give loans, they can not give it as there is no proper security. If we have this Bill, it will open door for our people to take loan. Therefore, it is good for the people if we pass this Bill as soon as possible.

Regarding imprisonment, it will be carried out by our expert magistrates according to this Bill. It is not a burden for the public, it will rather make security for them so that they can take more loans - whether it is less than 10 lakh or more than ten lakh rupees. Generally speaking, only few people do not recover their loans and this Bill is meant to prevent this. I, therefore, would like to request the House to pass this Bill.

P U Z A K H U H L Y C H H O : Mr. Speaker Sir, the imprisonment is for 6 months. Will a person quit his debt by his imprisonment and how long he will be in prison if he is re - arrested?

P U L A L R I N C H H A N A : Mr. Speaker Sir, I believe that a person who needs to

be imprisoned is not a good person and it will be done unless it is a serious case.

S P E A K E R : Since we are in a democratic country, we will go according to the decision of the majority. Those who agree to pass Chapter I-IV may say 'yes' and those who do not agree say 'no'. Those who agree to pass Short Title, Extend and commencement in Chapter I and those who do not agree may say again. Those who agree to pass and do not agree to pass? Definition in Chapter I, Symbol and Acting formula may say again. The voice of agreement is louder. Hence, I declare that The Mizoram Public Demand Recovery Bill, 2001 is passed by this House.

P U C. L A L R I N S A N G A : Thank you, Mr. Speaker Sir.

S P E A K E R : We've finished our business for today. We shall resume our meeting tomorrow 19.10.2001 Friday at 10:30 A.M.

Meeting adjourned.