

PROCEEDINGS (ENGLISH) OF THE THIRTEENTH AND BUDGET SESSION
OF THE MIZORAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY HELD AT THE ASSEMBLY
HALL FROM THE 22ND MARCH, 1977 TO 30TH MARCH, 1977.

7th Sitting on the 30th March, 1977

Shri Vaivenga, Speaker in the chair,
Chief Minister, six Ministers, and 22nd Members.

BUSINESS

1. Questions.

LAYING OF PAPERS ETC.

2. Shri P.B. Nikhuma, Deputy Minister i/c, Health & Family Planning to lay a copy of Notification No. MHAC. 35/75/75-76 dated the 22nd March, 1977 regarding Amendment to Rules of "Advisory Committees for Govt. Hospitals, Dispensaries and Primary Health Centres".

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

3. Shri Saitlawma, MLA to move the following Resolution :
" This Assembly is of the opinion that SUSPENSION FOOT BRIDGE be constructed by the Mizoram Government (PWD) over the River KALADYNE at Darso Ferry, that is, between Hnahthial Grouping Centre and South Vanlaiphai Grouping Centre within the fiscal year of 1977 - 78 positively ".

contd 2/-

SPEAKER : And He said unto them when you pray, say :
Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy
name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, as in
Heaven, So also upon the earth. Give us day by
day our daily bread, and forgive us our sins,
for we ourselves also forgive ev ryone who is
indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation,
but deliver us from evil.

Now, we will take up question No 14.
Pu Saitlawma to ask.

INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

SHRI SAITLAWMA : * 14 : Will the Hon'ble Minister i/c.
Industries Department be pleased to state-

The total number of grantees under Grant-
in-aid Scheme of Industries Department, during
1975-76 (fiscal year) for the different trades
i.e. Blacksmithy, Carpentry and Tailoring
(District - wise)

SPEAKER : Due to the absence of the Minister concerned,
we will take up later. Here comes the Minister
concerned. However, we will take up later.

Now, we will take up question No. 15 first. Pu Lalhira to
ask.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Proposal for construction of roads under Champhai PWD

Sub - Division:

contd 3/-

SHRI LALHLIRA to ask :

* 15 : Will the Hon ble Minister i/c P.W.D be pleased to state -

- (a) Is there any proposal for construction of the following roads :-
(1) Champhai to Ruantlang.
(2) Champhai to Zote Under Champhai P.W.D. Sub-Division.
(b) If so, what is the position. ?

SHRI H. THANSANGK : Mr. Speaker, Sir, there were proposals for constructions of roads between Champhai and Ruantlang and Champhai and Zote. The Budget Estimate was Rs 4.72 lakhs and it can be seen in the Budget work Schedule.

SHRI LALHLIRA : Mr. Speaker Sir, supplementary question. In 1972-73, there was a budget provision of Rs 2 lakhs for the construction of road between Champhai and Khaubung, i.e. 0 km. to 24 kms. and it was seen in the schedule of the Budget. But the works had not been taken up. As such, I want to know as to whether the Government intends to fulfil the proposal this time.

Further, the Electrical Construction Department had intended to carry electric light posts and other materials to the Ruantlang village but the materials would be carried upto Ruantlang Village due to the difficulties of road conditions and the Tuppui River also had blocked them. The materials had been carried by headloads by the villagers concerned and there were many complaints. Hence, I am raising a supplementary question as above. The Government had intended to construct that road long long time back and I want to know when this work would be completed.

SHRI H. THANSAGA :
MINISTER

Mr. Specker Sir, Government had decided to construct that road. I cannot say when this work would be completed.

SPEAKER :

Question No. 16. Has any member been authorised to ask this question ?.

If not, Pu Saitlawm-a ma-y now ask question No. 14 and the minister concerned will reply to it.

INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT

Total number of grantees under Grant-in-aid Scheme of Industries Department during 1975 - 76.

SHRI SAITLAWM A to ask -

* 14. Will the Hon'ble Minister i/c. Industries Department be pleased to state -

The total number of grantees under grant-in-aid scheme during 1975-76 (fiscal year) for the different trades i.e. Blacksmithy, Carpentry and Tailoring (District-wise)

SHRI ZALAMA :
DEPUTY MINISTER :

Mr. Specker Sir, a statement has been placed on the Table of the House and may be seen accordingly.

contd5/-

SHRI SAITLAWMA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have something to say on Blacksmithy and Carpentry tools. During 1975-76 financial year Grant-in-aid for Blacksmithy and Carpentry tools had been sanctioned. According to Government records, grant-in-aid for blacksmithy and Carpentry tools had been distributed to the applicants concerned but the grant-in-aid had not been received in kind by the applicants concerned till date. Hence, I want to know as to whether the Government will give that grant-in-aid during this financial year, (1976-77) to the applicants concerned.

SHRI ZALAWMA : Mr. Speaker Sir, there were 7 persons
DEPUTY MINISTER : (applicants) who could not be given grant-in-aid, 5 applicants and another 16 applicants who could not be given Carpentry and blacksmithy tools respectively due to paucity of funds. It has been decided to give tools to such applicants during the year 1977.

SHRI. LALHLIRA : Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary question:
As Mr. Sangkhuma had raised a question last year, is it a fact that knitting and sewing machines had been allotted to the applicants i.e. wives of high officials at 80 % and 20 % to the applicants of interior Villages ?

contd.6/-

SHRI ZALAWNA : Mr. Speaker Sir, before the inception
DEPUTY MINISTER : of the Mizoram Union Territory, such
machines had been distributed by the
Deputy Commissioner and after 1972

by the Department. Any how, there had not been favouritism to the high officials' wives or to some persons, but the Government had given priority to the persons who had established Industrial Units and who had received training in knitting and Tailoring from the Industries Department, since the inception of Union Territory in 1972. The question raised relates particularly to the past time i.e. before 1972.

SHRI LALRINLIARA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I want to ask a question and I presume it is relevant. In the past some Rice Hullers had been supplied to some firms but the machines were old and unserviceable. The cases were considered by the Assurance Committee. Is the Government aware of the cases? If so, how the Government intends to take actions?

SHRI. ZALAWNA : Mr. Speaker Sir, the said Rice Hullers
DEPUTY MINISTER : had been supplied by the lowest Tenderer, Mr. Lalhruaia of Chaltlang, Lizawl in 1972-73.

Some firms had delivered the machines without prior checking, probably because they were very glad being given the machines by Government. Later, they found the machines unserviceable and they had submitted complaints to the Government. The Government had sent mechanics and some of the machines had been set right but two or three of them could not be repaired. The firms requested the Government to replace machines with new ones and replacements are being considered by the Government accordingly.

contd 7/-

SHRI LALHLIRA : Mr. Speaker Sir, the Minister's reply to my question was not correct. My question concerns the time after the inception of the Mizoram Union Territory, 1972 but not before 1972.

Another supplementary question :

Cobbler tools and blacksmithy tools had not been supplied to persons belonging to the Chhimituipui District and why ?

SHRI ZALAWA : Mr. Speaker Sir, the said tools had been given to applicants after verification by Government. Henceforth, such grant-in-aids should be distributed District-wise according to Government verification.. As a matter of fact, applicants were few and it may also be because they had not applied for.

Regarding my reply to the question of Shri Lalhlira, the distribution of Knitting machines was according to records. However, reports regarding distribution of knitting machines among favourites or high officials, wives or some persons have not been received till date. The Government had given priority, as I have said, to the trained applicants and who had established Industrial Units.

SHRI K.L.ROCHAMA : Mr. Speaker Sir, this grant-in-aid is the sole way of the Governments, relief ~~direct~~ to the poor people and it had been spoken of in every Session. The Minister concerned has said just now that henceforth, grant-in-aid will be allotted district-wise. I want to mention that such grant-in-aid had been allotted to some persons every year for two or three years. If so, what arrangements would be made by the Government in future, ?.

contd8/

I also want to say that some ignorant and back-ward persons in the interior places did not know that such grant-in-aid can be applied for. A budget provision of Rs. 1 lakh had been made every year for such grants under the disposal of the Assistant Director, Cottage Industries, Mizawl. Besides, there was a separate Budget provision for soem grant to be distributed District-wise under the Directorate of Industries. I think, this means that there are double chances for some persons, particularly for persons who are living in Mizawl town, who are well known to the Assistant Director, Cottage Industries. Hence, there had been a proposal, since last year that these Budget provisions (separate provisions) be amalgamated so that such grants could be distributed equally to the interested persons belonging to the Mizawl District, Lunglei District, and the Chhimitupui District. If I am not mistaken the proposal had not been implemented. If so, allotments of grants cannot be made equally to the different Districts. Hence, I want to suggest that the separate Budget provisions be amalgamated and partial allotment be also made since some persons had not given such grants two or three times while some interested persons had not been allotted even once.

SHRI SAITLAFMA :

Mr. Speaker Sir, supplementary question : I have learnt that money has been given to the interested/selected persons for purchasing Rice Huller to purchase Machines by themselves from the approved firm. Is the Government aware that some persons have not purchased Rice Hullers but spent the money as they liked ? If I am not mistaken, the mortgage is the Rice Huller itself. If so, what action would be taken against such persons by the Government ?

contd9/-

SHRI ZALAWMA : Mr. Speaker Sir, there were separate
DEPUTY MINISTER : sanctions of such grants in the past
but in 1976 - 77, there is no more
sanction under the Directorate of

Industries for grant in-aid as the central Planning
Commission has rejected our proposals. However, there are
such sanctions under the Cottage Industries Department and
the Rural Industries Project.

Regarding allotments of grants :
Although the grants had not been distributed district-wise
in the past since Industries Officers had been posted at
Lunglei and Saiha, the officers concerned had collected the
applications and forwarded to the Assistant Director,
Cottage Industries, Disoml. Selections from all the
applications had been made with the help of the Director con-
cerned and then sent to the Ministry through the Secretary
concerned for approval.

Regarding re-consideration of allotments
of grants given in the past I think it is not necessary to
reconsider since all the applications had been considered at
one occasion by the authorities carefully and grants had been
distributed to the deserving applicants according to the
spot verifications. Since the administration of the Department
grows bigger and in order to distribute grants equally, the
Government decided to allot grants district-wise. I think,
allotment of grants should be made on the basis of the
density of population. The allotments made during 1975-76
along with list of applicants and the different tools
applied for can be checked by the members. I think, there is no
better way of allotments of funds for the present, since
it has already been decided to make allotments of grants
district - wise so that every district may enjoy its
respective share.

Regarding Rice Huller, the machines
had been supplied by inviting quotations and after selecting
approved firm. There had been some problems due to some
unserviceable machines. Hence, policy has been changed and
it was decided that the selected applicants should be
supplied in kind, and not in cash, by the approved supplier.
The amount had not been paid in cash to the selected
applicants as Pu Seitlawma has complained (SHRI SAITLAWMA)

Mr. Speaker Sir, I know clearly that it had been paid in cash to the selected applicants and most of the loanees had purchased Rice Huller but very few of them had not. For example, total allotment of funds for purchase of Rice Huller was Rs 10,000/-. A selected applicant had drawn first instalment of Rs 8,000/- and he had not spent the money for purchase of Huller but he spent as he liked.

Besides, he had neglected the remaining loan. But the mortgage of the loan was the machine itself. Hence, I want to know what actions would be taken against him by the Government under Loan Rules? Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government has not received reports in this matter. In order to make our discussion clear, I have to make clear the meaning of "hire-purchase" under which supply of Rice Huller is to be effected. "Hire-purchase" means the loanee has to invite quotations from different firms and he has to choose a firm he likes best and then he has to refer to the Government the case. Then the Directorate concerned has to issue supply order to the firm and after delivering machine to the selected applicant, he has to submit Bill to the Directorate, and payment will be made accordingly by the Government itself.

SHRI LALHLIN :

Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary question:
As I have learnt, most of the applicants who applied for loan and grant-in-aid under the Rural Industries Project are

the inhabitants of the Hamhlon Veng, Mizawl. I want to know as to whether it is possible for the Government to publish such matters in the interior places widely.

PO L.P. THANGZIKI :

Mr. Speaker Sir, I want to raise a question for the Minister's reply at a time. On seeing the list of grant-in-aid distributed

during the year 1975-76, I feel it hard to understand. The minister has said just now that the applicants were very few. I think he is mistaken, because, I know that some persons had applied for such grants during 1975-76 but none of them had been allotted. Hence, I want to know whether it is possible for the Government to distribute the list of grant-in-aid allotted during the said year with individual applicant's name and address among the Members.

Regarding allotments of Knitting and Sewing machines, I want to request the Government not to have any favouritism in this regard.

contd ... 11/-

I have learnt that grant-in-aid will be distributed District-wise from the year 1976-77. If so, whether the Government intends to distribute grants at the respective towns in the Districts. I request the Government that such grants should be allotted to the applicants of the respective District equally. I myself know clearly that there were many applicants for such grants from the interior places but they had not been allotted and all of the grants had been allotted to the applicants who were inhabitants of Aizawl Town.

SHRI ZALAWMA :

DEPUTY MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir, Mr. Lalhira, our Member has said just now that all the grants had been allotted to the persons of Ramhlun Veng, but that was not correct. It can be seen from the list also that the grants had been allotted to the applicants who were living in different places of Mizoram.

Pu Thangzika, has suggested just now that the grants be disbursed at the respective Town of the Districts. As I have said the grants will be allotted District-wise on the basis of density of population, Industrial Units etc. For example : A sum of Rs 5,000/- each has been allotted to the Lunglêi District and Chhimitupui District and Rs 10,000/- for Aizawl District. "Whatever may be the place of disbursement, there will be no inconvenience. The most important thing is the total allocation of funds/grants. Allocation of grants will be made District-wise and applications will be considered District-wise as well according to spot verification made by our Industries officers who are posted at Lunglêi and Sgêha and disbursement of grants will also be made accordingly. Regarding list : The list which is laid on the Table of the House is only for the year 1975-76. The lists for the year from 1972-75 and for 1976-77 were not included since the started question concerns only for the year 1975 - 76.

Hence, some applicants who have not yet received grants in the past may be allotted if they deserve during this financial year, but I am not sure because disbursements of grants will be made according to spot verification. Any way, the Government intends to give priorities to the applicants who established Industrial Units and who had passed Training Course. Besides, priority will be given

contd ... 12/-

to the MIZORAM HMEICHHHE INSUJIKHAWE PAWL if and when they applied for. This is the principle of allocation of Grant-in-aid.

SPEAKER :

Speeches delivered by Pu Thangzika and the Minister concerned may be put together that Pu Thangzika suggested that grants be disbursed by respective authorities of the Districts at their respective towns and the Minister has said that Grants will be allotted District-wise. And hence, I think, it is the same idea.

SHRI L.P. THANGZIKA :

Mr. Speaker Sir, I do not believe that our points are alike. I think if the grants are disbursed in Aizawl Town, most of the applicants from outside Aizawl will come to convince the authorities and disbursement of grants will not be fair. Hence, I request the Government to entrust the work of disbursement of grants to the respective District authority.

SHRI ZALAWHA :
DEPUTY MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir, some of the applicants had come to Aizawl to remind the authorities their positions but that does not mean that grants will be given to them. Grants had been allotted district-wise and disbursements will be made according to the spot verifications made by the entrusted officers in each District. Since there is paucity of funds, it is not possible to please all the applicants in this regard. If the grants are to be disbursed in each District, the respective authorities have to come to Aizawl to get final decision from the Department since the Department is the approving authority. I want to give an example in this regard. Rupees fifteen thousand each is allotted to Aizawl District and Lunglei District. If the applicants from Lunglei District are more than the Aizawl District, the grants allotted to Aizawl District may be re-allotted to the Lunglei District according to the position of the applicants. That was the principle of the allocation of Grant-in-aid. Hence, it is not correct to have an idea that the applicants belonging to the Aizawl District have been favoured in allotting grants than the others.

contd.... 13/-

SHRI SAITLIANA :

Mr. Speaker Sir, Industrial Loan and grant-in-aid had always been distributed by the Rural Industries Project, Aizawl but these loans and grants

given to the Lunglei District and Chhimitupui District are very less. In seeing sanctioning letter, it has been noticed that most of the loans and grant-in-aid had been distributed within the area of the Ramhlun Veng, Aizawl. I want to know as to whether these loans and grants had been disbursed by the officer concerned without consideration by the Board. I also want to know whether there is a proposal that the grant-in-aid under R.I.P. be distributed District-wise.

I also want to say that while the Assistant Director of Cottage Industries, Aizawl has been provided a Vehicle, Vehicle had not been provided to the Industries officer of the rank of Assistant Director in Lunglei District and the Chhimitupui District. The said two Districts had been neglected in many respects. For example : The Industries officer in those Districts had never received tenders/ quotations in time. Hence, I want to request the Government not to neglect such backward people in future.

SHRI SAFLIANA :

Mr. Speaker Sir, during the year 1975-76, machines like sewing machines had been allotted District-wise, and while 168 applicants of Aizawl District

had been allotted, only 30 applicants of the Lunglei District and 8 applicants of the Chhimitupui District had been allotted. How could such large variations occur ? On another occasion, while 328 applicants of the Aizawl District had been allotted sewing machines only 44 applicants and 12 applicants of the Lunglei District and the Chhimitupui District had been allotted such machines. I want to know on what basis the Government had distributed such grants ? Machines allotted to them during 1974-75 had not been received by them till date. If such was the position, there will be a very great variation, if we calculated from the year 1972. This meant that the two Districts had been neglected by the Mizoram Government. I want to request the Government to allot grants more

contd...14/-

to those Districts in recoupments of less allocation in the previous years. Such grants had been disposed of by the rural Industries Project Department, Cottage Industries Department and the Director of Industries respectively. While there are three such Departments in Mizawl there is only one officer each in Lunglet District and Chhimituipui District. Hence, I want to request the Government to give facilities to the officers of those Districts as given to officer in Mizawl.

SHRI ZALANMA : Mr. Speaker Sir, the State level Loan Board of Mizoram had considered the applications for loan under the R.I.P. and made recommendation to the Government of Mizoram and disbursement of loans had been made accordingly. As I have said just now, applications for loans had been collected by the Industries officers of those Districts and then forwarded to the Government of Mizoram after they had spot verifications. All the applications from the three Districts in Mizoram had been considered by the Government of Mizoram at a time according to spot verifications and disbursements had been made accordingly.

SHRI SAPLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I beg your permission to ask my question No. 16 (Speaker : There is time and he may ask his question.) Mr. Speaker Sir, I am thankful for your permission.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Allotment of Vehicle (Jeep) to Community Development Block

SHRI SAPLIANA to ask -

- * 16 : Will the Hon'ble Minister i/c. Community Development Block be pleased to state -
- (a) Is it a fact that a vehicle (Jeep) has been allotted to Community Development Block, Lawngtlai.

contd 15/-

(b) If so, what is the present position of the said Vehicle ?

SRI. CH. SAPRAWNGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, (a) Yes, it is a fact that Vehicle (Jeep) ZRG -62 had been allotted to Lawngtlai Development Block on 22.8.1974. (b) The Vehicle, ZRG-62 with met an accident on 11th September, 1975 near Thiltlang Village and it was badly damaged and needs major repair. A procedure for sanction of expenditure for the repair has to be followed which has been under process.

SHRI. LALHLIRA : Mr. Speaker Sir, supplementary question : It has been said that Jeep had been allotted to Lawngtlai Community Development Block which met accident in September, 1975. I want to know what was the reason for the accident. Is it a fact that the Jeep Driver and the passengers had drunk liquor the night before and on the next day the Jeep met with an accident as the driver was sleeping while driving the Vehicle ?

SHRI CH. SAPRAWNGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, the reason for the accident has to be verified by the Police but the Government has not received any report till date.

SHRI SAPLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, the Vehicle met with an accident in September, 1975 and hence, it is hard to understand why the Police had not submitted any report till date.

I want to know the name of that driver and was he a real driver ? I also want to know why this Block Vehicle met with an accident near Thiltlang Village and had he got Government permission to go to that Village ?

Is it possible to use the Vehicle after carrying out major repair ? If not, does the Government intend to replace it by a new one ? There were Government rice godowns at Lawngtlai and the Government godown at Kawlchaw has to be looked after from Lawngtlai.

contd ... 16/-

Also, as Lawngtlai is an important place, it is always necessary for the officer to visit Saiha by Vehicle. Hence, Vehicle is badly in need for official duty. It has been rumoured that the Finance Department cannot give concurrence for repair of this Vehicle because this Vehicle needs a large sum of money for repair and it is un-economical. If so, I want to know whether it is possible to dispose of this Vehicle by public auction as early as possible and to allot new Vehicle to that Block.

SHRI. CH. SAPRAWNGA :
MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the Vehicle was driven by a person who was not a real driver. If I am not mistaken, his name is John Herry, Store Keeper of the Supply Department. It had been learnt that this John Herry has government driving licence. It had also been learnt that he had been discharged from his post by the Department concerned.

Estimated amount for repairing Charges was about Rs 9,000/-. Finance Department demanded Police verification but Police report had not been received till date. Unless and until the Police report is produced, Finance Department felt difficult to give financial sanction. That was the reason for not repairing the Vehicle till date.

Allotment of new Vehicle has also not been made till date.

SHRI. R. ZOLIANA :

Mr. Speaker Sir, the incident had occurred in 1975 but Police verification had not been received till date. I think it is shameful for the Department concerned. I want to know as to whether the concerned Department had pressed the Police Department to make verification and to submit report as early as possible.

SHRI. CH. SAPRAWNGA :
MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the Department concerned had always pressed the Police Department to do so but no effect till date.

contd.. 17/-

SHRI. LALHLIRA : Mr. Speaker Sir, was any person killed in that accident ?

SHRI. CH. SAPRAWNGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, no one was killed. Some persons were wounded but not very seriously. The wounded persons were admitted in Civil Hospital, Lunglet and I think they all re-covered and were released from the Hospital.

SHRI. SAPLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I think it is very shamful that the Minister concerned had not known that the Revenue Officer of the Lawngtlai District Council was killed in that accident.

SHRI. CH. SAPRAWNGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, some person may have been killed in that accident, but I did not know. I am sorry for that.

SHRI. SAPLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I feel it is shameful for the Government because the accident had caused by a person who was not the real driver and also for not receiving Police Reports till date. Besides, one Revenue Officer was killed and his younger brother, M.Sc., PH.D. of America was also badly wounded but the Government did not know such incidents. Hence, I think it will be very difficult for the Government to press upon the Police Department to submit report early.

The vehicle had not been repaired till date. It had been learnt that a certain number of Vehicles had been purchased in 1974. There were meant for Block Headquarters. As some Block Headquarters are not connected with Jeep Roads the concerned Jeeps had been allotted to other Blocks. As such, why the Government felt difficult to replace that damaged vehicle with such block vehicle ?

contd 18/-

SHRI. CH. SAPRANGA : MINISTER. Mr. Speaker Sir, such proposal had not arisen.

SHRI. R. ZOLIANA: Mr. Speaker Sir, if such proposal had not arisen, is it possible to consider it henceforth ?

SHRI CH. SAPRANGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I do not know whether it is possible because the Government had never considered such proposal.

SHRI. LALKUNGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, if the Government of Mizoram is effective and sensitive, I think it is necessary to look into that incident carefully since it was a serious accident in which one person/official had lost his life and some persons badly wounded.

And I also want to know as to how many Pool Jeeps had been allotted to the Directorate and for how many vehicles, they are entitled ?.

SHRI. CH. SAPRANGA: I will require notice for that question.

SPEAKER : Questions hour is over, but according to our Rule 50 A the ministers concerned have to give reasons for un-answered questions. Some private members' questions had not been answered yesterday. I will read out the questions and the members have to decide themselves as to whether they are content with not having received answers to their questions.

SHRI. LALHLIRA : Mr. Speaker Sir, during this Session, private members' questions are very few and it is hard to understand how even such very few questions remain un-answered.

contd ... 19/-

SPEAKER : I am reading out the first question an
" Quantity of Smuggled goods" - " How
much quantity of smuggled goods have
been recovered or detected in Mizoram
during 1975-76 and 1976-77 ? That was to be answered by the
Home Department.

SHRI CH. CHHUNGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I have not received the
CHIEF MINISTER. question as yet and it has not been seen
even in the ~~list~~.

SHRI. LALHLIRA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I think the minister
concerned should know because it had
been admitted in the Assembly a long
time back. I have enquired in the
Home Department and the Department concerned knew though
the Minister concerned does not know.

SPEAKER : This question had been sent to the
Home Department on 14th day of this
month and the minister concerned had
also been requested yesterday to
look into the matter. It is probably that the Department
concerned has not submitted the answer to the Minister
concerned. Answer should be approved by the Minister
concerned.

The second question was regarding
allotment of E.G.S. Fund for construction of Church
Building at Sangau and the text of the question was as
follows -

" Whether the Deputy Commissioner
of Lunglei is violating the
provision of the Constitution of
India in making allotment of E.G.S.
Fund for construction of a Church
Building at Sangau during 1976-77 ?"

This question had also been sent to the General Adminis-
tration Department on the 14th day of this month.

contd20/-

SHRI CH. CHHUNGA : The question relating to construction of church building can be answered as it was already discussed the other day but another one question could not be answered since the answer has not been received by me.

SHRI. R. ZOLIAMA : Mr. Speaker Sir, as one Hon! ble member has said just now, very few questions had been sent to the Departments concerned form the Assembly Secretariat in time but the answers had not been submitted to the Minister concerned by the Department. I think this means that the staff of the Departments concerned had neglected the matters.

SPEAKER : The third question related to allotment of Vehicles and it was to be answered by the General Administration Department. Text of the question was as follows :-

" Whether it is a fact that the Deputy Commissioner Lunglet is allowed to use the official Jeep/ Vehicle allotted to him for official duty for taking his children every-day to school. Everyday means from Monday to Friday in a week ".

Then, " Conversion of temporary posts into permanent posts " was to be answered by the Appointment Department. Text of the question - " Whether the Government of Mizoram intends to convert the temporary posts into permanent posts. Number of permanent post and present District-wise ."

SHRI. LALHLIRA : Mr. Speaker Sir, is it not possible to answer the simple questions you have read out just now, like the use of the Government Vehicle by the Deputy Commissioner, Lunglet for taking his children to school everyday, by the Minister concerned. ?.

contd21/-

SPEAKER : Our Amendment to Rules means that Minister has to give reasons for unanswered questions but not to answer the questions now. It seems that the answers to questions have not been submitted by the Departments concerned to their respective Ministers. However, the answers will be circulated to all the members later, and hence, I think it is better to understand the position now.

SHRI. SAPLIANA : Mr. Speaker Sir, the questions had been sent from the Assembly Secretariat to the Departments concerned in time but how is it that the Ministers concerned have not received answers till date? The cases may probably be kept pending with the Department of Parliamentary Affairs. Does the Government intend to find out whereabouts of the cases?

SHRI. CH. CHHUNGA : Mr. Speaker Sir, it might already have reached my table and I may have probably over-looked but as far as I know it has not been received by me. I do not blame the officers concerned in the matter since they were very very busy in the work of Committees these days. Mr. Speaker Sir, I want to know as to whether we can lay the answers on the Table of this House.

SPEAKER : The answers will be circulated later. Now, we will take up "laying of Papers" and let the Deputy Minister i/c. Health lay the papers on the Table.

SHRI. P. B. NIKHUNA : Mr. Speaker Sir, with your permission, I lay a copy of "Amendments to Rules of Advisory Committee for Government Hospitals, Dispensaries and Primary
DEPUTY MINISTER.

Health Centres ".

Thank You,

SPEAKER :

We will now take up Item No.3, that is, Private Resolution. The mover of the Resolution may move his Resolution now. According to our Rules, this

Resolution cannot be taken up since the mover of that Resolution is absent from the House.

Our session is coming to a close I am thankful for the good attendance of the members during this Session. Besides, various committees could submit good Reports. I am also happy when I think about the good Reports submitted by the various Committees in the past Assembly Sessions.

The House is now adjourned sine-die.

at 11.35 A.M.

D.C.PANDE,
Secretary,
Mizoram Legislative Assembly.

.....