

PROCEEDINGS OF THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE MIZORAM
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY HELD AT THE ASSEMBLY HALL
FROM 23.9.1975 TO 3.10.1975

6th sitting on 3rd October, 1975 (Friday) at 11:00 A.M.

P R E S E N T

Pu H. Thansanga, Speaker in the Chair. Chief Minister,
six Ministers and twenty five Members.

BUSINESS

1. Questions.
2. Consideration and passing of Government Bill -
Pu Ch. Chhunga, Chief Minister i/c General Adminis-
tration Department to move -
 - (a) that the Mizoram Urban Areas Rent Control
(Amendment) Bill, 1975 be taken into consideration.
 - (b) that the Bill be passed.

SPEAKER: (read verses from the Bible)
Now, question No. 67,
Pu Sapliana's question.

SUPPLY & TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

*67. PU SAPLIANA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the Hon'ble
Minister i/c of Supply & Transport
Department be pleased to state -

What is the progress made in
regard to opening of Mizoram House at Silchar ?

PU LALSANGZUALA: Mr. Speaker Sir, P.W.D. had been
MINISTER. requested to take over the
possession of land during 1974.
It is gathered that the P.W.D. is preparing Plans and
Estimates for works to be undertaken there. Construction
will be started as soon as fund is available for the
purpose.

SPEAKER: Question No. 68, Pu Vanlalhruaia's
question.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT

*68. PU VANLALHRUAIA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the Hon'ble
Minister i/c of Political Depart-
ment be pleased to state -

(a) How many Security Check Gates have been made between the following Villages and where are the places?

- (i) Aizawl - Lunglei Road.
- (ii) Aizawl - Champhai Road.
- (iii) Aizawl - Silchar Road.

(b) What kind of powers has been given to the Security Forces on duty at such gates ?

(c) Is it the fact that the powers have been conferred upon them for that?

PU CH. CHHUNGA:
CHIEF MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir,

(a) (i) Aizawl - Lunglei Road - 5 - Lunglawn, Mat Bridge, Hnahthia, Serchhip, Seling.

(ii) Aizawl - Champhai Road - 1 - Seling.

(iii) Aizawl - Silchar Road - 2 - Bawngkawn, Kolasib.

(b) & (c) Security Forces have the power of search, arrests etc., given to them under the Armed Forces (Special Power) Act.

PU VANLALHRUAIA:

Mr. Speaker Sir, I think there is one mistake in question 68(c).

Could the words 'Is it the fact that the powers have been conferred upon for that' be changed like this - Is it the fact that the powers of the custom have been conferred upon them for that and can this be answered ?

PU CH. CHHUNGA:
CHIEF MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir, Mizoram being disturbed area, Security Forces here are conferred powers to check, arrests etc. under Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act.

PU VANLALHRUAIA:

Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary question - Have the Govt. informed Security Forces their incapability

of issuing Identity Card to civilians at present, for civilian passengers are stopped at every check-gate where they are asked to produce Identity Card ? If not, can Government inform them ?

PU CH. CHHUNGA:
CHIEF MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir, Government is aware of the activity of Security Forces in certain check-gates. Order had

often been issued to Security Forces especially to those who are on duty at check-gates not to demand Identity Cards from the public passengers. The trouble is that wherever photographers went for taking the photos of civilians, Security Forces used to think that Identity Card is issued.

SPEAKER:

Question No. 69, Pu Vanlalhruai's question.

- 3 -

SUPPLY & TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

*69. PU VANLALHRUAIA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the Hon'ble Minister i/c Supply & Transport Department be pleased to state -

(a) Did the Supply Department find out the G.C.I. Sheets lost in transit last year ?

(b) If not, why ?

PU LALSANGZUALA:
MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir,

- (a) No.
(b) The investigation is in progress.

PU CHAWNGKUNGA:

Mr. Speaker Sir, in previous session, some of our members mentioned the selling of G.C.I. sheets at Vairengte.

At that time, the Government have stated as having investigation. Now, six months have passed and the answer is still 'investigation is in progress'. Does this mean that Government is still having investigation ?

PU VANLALHRUAIA:

Mr. Speaker Sir, supplementary question-

Have Government discovered some of the lost G.C.I. Sheets or they have not had any discovery?

PU LALSANGZUALA:
MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir, as it is not known where these sheets are lost, the case is quite complicated, and the

investigation also takes longer time. Besides having informed Chief Vigilance Officer, one I.A.S. Officer is detailed for this case. So far, none of them submitted their reports.

PU VANLALHRUAIA:

Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary question -

Though our hon'ble Minister stated as not knowing the place where these sheets are lost, in our previous session I think some of the members mentioned the place where these sheets were lost. That was in the Train. Have not Government inquired from Railway authorities ?

PU LALSANGZUALA:
MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir, Yes, it is true that the sheets were lost in Train transit. The quantity of

G.C.I. sheets conveyed from Calcutta Station was not altogether delivered at Silchar Station. What I meant to say was that we have not found out the place where the sheets were disposed of from the train.

SPEAKER:

Question No. 70, Pu Vanlalhruaia' question.

*70. PU VANLALHRUAIA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the Hon'ble Minister i/o of Supply & Transport Department be pleased to state -

- (a) Has the Supply Department given the G.C.I. Sheets and Cement which they received from P.W.D. to the public at the rate fixed by P.W.D. for their Contractor?
- (b) What is the rate of Cement and G.C.I. Sheets given by the Supply Department?

PU LALSANGZUALA: Mr. Speaker Sir,
 MINISTER.

(a) No.

(b) Cement: i) Rs. 29.37 per bag
 ii) Rs. 30.37 per bag.

G.C.I.
 Sheets: i) Rs. 505.50 per quintal.

PU VANLALHRUAIA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary question- Are the rates stated by the Minister average rates?

How many quintals arrived from Silchar and how many are taken from P.W.D. Godown?

PU LALSANGZUALA: Mr. Speaker Sir, though such questions are coming later, I might as well answer them as supplementary :

From P.W.D. Godown - 5000 bags
 From Aizawl Godown - 1000 bags
 and from Silchar - 4000 bags. The rate of Cement taken from Silchar was as I have said (i) Rs. 29.37 per bag (ii) Rs. 30.37 "

At Silchar rate is Rs. 16.84, but for conveyance Rs. 7/- is charged, Re. 1/- for handling charge, Storage charge- 0.53, dealer profit margin 10% - Rs. 2.53, administrative charge Rs. 1.50 and administrative charge taken by the Department- 6.25 p.c. For your information though it is not much problem now; Mizoram Government moved Central Government to subsidize the transit rate of Cement. Hence, we can now reduce the rate as per head -

Silchar - Aizawl = Rs. 47.70 per Metric ton.
 Silchar - Lunglei = Rs. 89.90 " " "
 Silchar - Saiha = Rs. 104.30 " " "

It is now possible to give for Rs. 27/- per bag. Besides this, Mizoram Govt. is requesting Central Govt. to bear the conveyance charge upto Aizawl.

SPEAKER: Question No. 71, Pu Vanlalhruaia's question-

*71. PU VANLALHRUAIA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the Hon'ble Minister i/c of Supply & Transport Department be pleased to state -

How many G.C.I. Sheets and Cement bags did the Supply Department get from P.W.D. during this year ?

PU LALSANGZUALA:
MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir,

Cement - 5,000 bags

G.C.I. Sheets - 77 bundles.

PU VANLALHRUAIA:

Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary question- I would like to know the reason why Supply Department obtained cement from P.W.D. For I know there are Liaison Officers at Delhi, Calcutta and at Silchar who are to see to the conveyance of supply commodities. Have Liaison Officers fail to see to supply transit that we have never had enough Cement to be issued to Civilians while P.W.D. have more than they actually required.

Our Hon'ble Minister said that Cement bags taken from P.W.D. Godown are sold at the rate of P.W.D. which means about Rs. 20/- per bag. So, have 1000 bags taken from P.W.D. Godown been sold at the rate of Rs. 20/- per bag ?

PU LALSANGZUALA:
MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker Sir, regarding Cement, I think I have given definite explanation in the last year's

Sessions - September & March.

Central Government do not issue Cement both for public and P.W.D. separate. Mizoram quota is 30000 bags per 3 months. So, when these arrived, Mizoram Government need to make distribution both for public and P.W.D. consumption. Hence, Cement taken from P.W.D. Godown too are Mizoram Quota. Once there was some difficulty in booking for Civil Supply. At that time, more Cement was sent in the name of P.W.D. But, when the Cement bags reached Aizawl, some portions were diverted for public. And, as I have told you, Mizoram quota of Cement had been increased to 80000 bags per 3 months. At present, we cannot even use up all our quota. In fact, some bags were surrendered. And the P.W.D. rate of Cement is Rs. 23.87 per bag, not Rs. 20/.

SPEAKER:

Question No. 72, Pu Ngurdaula's question.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

*72. PU NGURDAULA:

Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the hon'ble Minister i/c P.W.D. be pleased to state -

Whether there is any difficulty for the Government in the implementing of Aizawl Water Supply Scheme?

PU CH. CHHUNGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, No.
MINISTER.

SPEAKER: Question No. 73, Pu Hrangvela's question.

EDUCATION & SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT

PU HRANGVELA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the Hon'ble Minister i/c of Education & Social Welfare Department be pleased to state-

- (a) What is the teacher-student ratio of Mizoram L.P. & M.E. Schools at present ?
- (b) What is the prescribed physical target in regard to teacher-student ratio during the Fifth Plan ?
- (c) Does the Govt. propose to keep the ratio at par with that of other States in India ?

PU VAIVENGA: Mr. Speaker Sir,
MINISTER. (a) 1:37 for L.P. Schools.
1:20 for M.E. Schools.

- (b) An average of 1:30 for L.P. Schools; 1:20 for M.E. Schools (as agreed to by the Planning Commission in case of Mizoram).
- (c) All India Pattern is 1:40 for Class I-V and 1:30 for higher classes. The over-all pattern for Mizoram is proposed to be kept slightly better.

SPEAKER: Question No. 74, Pu Hrangvela's question.

PU F. HRANGVELA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the Hon'ble Minister i/c of Education & Social Welfare Department be pleased to state -

- (a) To whom does the Govt. usually pay building grants for M.E. Schools & L.P. Schools ?
- (b) Who are authorised to keep the money and the expenditure accounts ?
- (c) Is there any arrangements for checking these accounts?
- (d) Does the Department give copies of sanctioning letters of such grants to Village Council Presidents concerned ?

PU VAIVENGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, (a) Building grants
MINISTER. are sanctioned to Non-Govt. institutions.
The grants are usually paid to the
Secretaries of the respective M.E./L.P.Schools as the
case may be, who happened to be usually Heads of the
Institutions concerned.

(b) The Managing Committee of the M.E./L.P.Schools
concerned are authorised to keep the money. It is the
Managing Committee which is authorised to decide who will
actually keep the money. The treasurer of the Committee
is, however, usually entrusted with this responsibility.
In view of the disturbed condition of the territory, a
circular has been issued to the effect that all money
should be deposited in the nearest Security Post for
safe custody.

The expenditure accounts are maintained
by the Security of the Managing Committee concerned.

(c) Yes. The expenditure statements are to be submitted
to the Dy. Inspector of Schools concerned for necessary
checking and record. Besides, the schools have to keep
these accounts carefully for checking as and when the
schools are inspected by the Inspecting Officer/Inspe-
cting auditor.

(d) Copies of sanctioning letters are given to all
Drawing and Counter signing Officers concerned. In case
of M.E. and L.P.Schools, the Dy. Inspectors of Schools
are the drawing and countersigning officers for the
purpose and they are the officers who have to communi-
cate information regarding the sanction to the Managing
Committees of the Schools concerned which are mostly
headed by Village Council President as the Chairman/
President of the Managing Committee.

PU R. DOTINAIA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary question-
Are Head Teacher and Board Building
Committee given sanctioning letter when
Primary School grant is granted? And supposing the grant
is issued to L.P. School I but wanted to divert for L.P.
School II, are Head Teachers and Managing Committee
Chairmen given the order letters?

PU VAIVENGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, as I have said, Secretary
MINISTER. and Managing Committee Chairman are given
the sanctioning letter. In case of
diversion too, I think they should be informed.

PU R. DOTINAIA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary question-
If Secretary and Managing Committee
Chairman are to be informed, are Head of
Teachers of L.P.Schools I & II of N. Vanlaiphai and
Secretaries/Managing Chairmen given diversion letter when
Rs. 6,000/- out of Rs. 12,000/- sanctioned for L.P. School I
was diverted to L.P. School II?

PU VAIVENGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, for his particular case, I can say nothing. However, what we can do for Primary and M.E. Schools grants are as I have said before.

PU R. SANGKHUMA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Supplementary question- From what I gathered, it appears that there can be misappropriation of money, not that I distrust all the Head Teachers. As Head Teachers is all in all- Treasurer, Secretary, etc., I think there is a big loophole for corruption if he wants to do so. Even if the Head Teacher is the one who utilizes school grant, is there not Treasurer in the Managing Committee, or perhaps Financial Secretary? What is the formation of Managing Committee ?

PU VAIVENGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, as I have said, Head Teacher and Headmaster are detailed as Secretary and Treasurer. It is ~~the~~ that there can easily be corruption somewhere and there might also be some defects. But the reason why Govt. detailed Head Teacher/Headmaster as Secretary and Treasurer is that when there is misappropriation of School Fund, action can easily be taken against the responsible person who handles the money, usually the Headmaster/Head Teacher, by deducting money from his salary which we cannot do in case of Village Council President or any Board Member as they do not have regular salary from which to recover money. If the Headmaster/Head Teacher spends school fund without the knowledge of Managing Committee, it won't be right, for both Managing Committee and Head Teacher/Headmaster are expected to work together.

PU VANLALHRUAIA: Mr. Speaker Sir, supplementary question- How did Government distribute building grants ? Do they have proper Plan for distributing grants or they distributed it gratuitously?

PU VAIVENGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, School grants are distributed precisely. Though, we are aware of the necessity of enlarging school where enrolment of students is large, we do not simply give building grant if the School is well-facilitated. Building grant is distributed according to the condition and necessity of School.

SPEAKER: Question No. 75, Pu Hrangvela's question.

PU HRANGVELA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the Hon'ble Minister i/c of Education Department be pleased to state -

- (a) How many High Schools are there that do not produce any successful candidate in the H.S.L.C. Examination, 1975 ?
- (b) What are the names, of those schools if any ?

(c) Does the Government propose to take steps against such Schools ?

PU VAIVENGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, (a) 20 (twenty).
MINISTER. (b) AIZAWL CENTRE:

- 1) Thingdawl High School
- 2) Sihphir " "
- 3) Democratic " "
- 4) Kawrtethawveng High School
- 5) Chhingchhip " "
- 6) Sairang " "
- 7) Darlung " "
- 8) Kangmun " "
- 9) I.G.M. Khawdungsei High School.

LUNGLEI CENTRE:

- 1) Theiriat High School
- 2) Tawipui High School
- 3) Zobawk High School
- 4) Lungsen High School
- 5) Demagiri " "
- 6) S. Vanlaiphal High School.

CHAMPHAI CENTRE:

Kawlkulh High School.

SAIHA CENTRE:

- 1) B.M. High School, Sangau
- 2) Bualpui (NG) High School
- 3) Vawmbuk High School
- 4) Lungtian High School.

(c) Enquiry Committee headed by Rev. Zairema has been formed by the Government to enquire into the causes of the extremely unsatisfactory results of the High Schools in Mizoram in the H.S.L.C. Examination, 1975. On receipt of the report from the Committee which will be routed through the Estimates Committee, the Government proposes to take such action as may be deemed necessary.

SPEAKER: Unstarred Question No. 12,
Pu J. Thanghuama. Though we never have time for others, now other members too can ask questions.

APPOINTMENT DEPARTMENT

PU J. THANGHUAMA: Mr. Speaker Sir, Will the Hon'ble Minister i/c Appointment Department be pleased to state -

(a) Names and particulars of Mizoram Government Employees (Gazetted and Non-Gazetted) now placed under suspension.

(b) Reasons for suspension.

(c) Length of period of suspension.

PU CH. CHHUNGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, (a) There are 147 Govt. employees under suspension at present as per list in APPENDIX.

(b) Out of 147 cases, 45 are for reasons of misappropriation/loss/defalcation of Government's money or other Government properties, 15 for unauthorised absence from duty, 52 negligencè of duty, misconduct and misbehaviours, 27 for being involved in Police cases of various nature, 7 for having connection with M.N.F. activity.

(c) The period of suspension varies from case to case.

There are :- (1) 3 cases 7 years and above

(2) 2 cases 5 years and above

(3) 5 cases 3 years and above

(4) 41 cases 1 year and above

(5) 96 cases below 1 year.

PU J. THANGHUAMA: Mr. Speaker Sir, though I have carefully studied the suspension list, I did not see the name of Pu R. Thangkanglova (Lawyer) who stated as still drawing his salary after ten years of suspension. I would like to know whether his case was dismissed or discharged or he is re-inatated. I would also like to know the names of the persons who are under suspension for more than 7 years, (3 cases) and 5 years (2 cases) and what is the complication in their cases ?

PU CH. CHHUNGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, I am sorry I do not know the case of Pu R. Thangkanglova in detail. I also cannot say now the nature of those cases you have mentioned.

PU SANGKHUMA: Mr. Speaker Sir, supplementary question- This suspension list does not also include the name of Pu Lallianzuala Sailo. Has his case been dismissed?

PU C. CHAWNGKUNGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, supplementary question- It appears that the persons in serial no. 129 & 130- Saithanga and Kapchhunga, Sub-Inspectors are suspended in connection with Saiha incident. If I am not mistaken I think they are re-instated after one or two days suspension where as their names are still included in the suspension list. What is the meaning of this ?

PU CH. CHHUNGA: Mr. Speaker Sir, as I do not have their cases in detail, I can say nothing now.

CONSIDERATION AND PASSING OF GOVERNMENT BILLS

SPEAKER: Now, we will proceed to Item No. 2- consideration of Government Bill. The Bill is Mizoram Urban Areas Rent Control (Amendment) Bill, 1975. The Minister in-charge may move it now for consideration.

PU CH. CHHUNGA:

CHIEF MINISTER. Mr. Speaker Sir, with your permission, I beg to move Mizoram Urban Areas Rent Control (Amendment) Bill, 1975.

PU K.L. ROCHAMA: Mr. Speaker Sir, what is to be done with amendment notice submitted by Pu Saitlawma ?

SPEAKER: Here, I believe you have seen amendment notice submitted by Pu Rochama as authorised by Pu Saitlawma, who could not attend today's sitting. So, we will call upon Pu Rochama to move the amendment of Mizoram Urban Areas Rent Control Bill, 1975.

PU K.L. ROCHAMA: Mr. Speaker Sir, I beg to move amendment of Mizoram Urban Areas Rent Control Bill, 1975, for House's consideration.

SPEAKER: If there is no objection, amendment Bill will be taken up now for consideration. The principal act of the Bill itself would not have to be much discussed. First of all, the member who has given amendment will be called upon.

PU K.L. ROCHAMA: Mr. Speaker Sir, thank you for allowing me to make suggestions for the amendment of Mizoram Urban Areas Rent Control Bill, 1975.

When studying the principal Act, we feel the necessity of changing the provision of section 2 of the Act which defines the meaning of pucca-structure dividing pucca-structure into three types- pucca structure, semi pucca structure and non-pucca structure. We strongly feel that there will be some difficulties for house-builders as well as for us the people to construct houses in Mizoram in such a detailed manner. Therefore, it is suggested that we follow the principal Act not section 2 which has only two classifications- pucca and non-pucca structures. The principal Act defines only pucca structure whereas the rest are treated as non-pucca structure. Besides this, we feel too that pucca structure as defined in the principal Act is un-adoptable in Mizoram due to differences in our way of living and building houses. If we amend the definition of pucca structure in the principal Act, we will have to amend the explanation under sub-section 2(E) also. In the principal Act, it is provided that depreciation for non-pucca structure will be 2% but there is no provision for pucca structure due to typing mistake. Our intention here is 1% depreciation for pucca structure and 2% for non-pucca structure.

In the statement of objects and reasons, amendment bill interprets the provision of principal Act as not covering the conditions in Mizoram which I feel was not the case. Since it is due to typing mistake only that amendment Bill is needed, I suggest that we

totally erase statement of objects and reasons from Amendment Bill and instead interpret it this way that the provision of the principal Act proposed to be amended now do not provide for calculation of the depreciation of pucca structure. Mr. Speaker, if we do it this way I think our intention would be understood.

PU SAPLIANA: Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to say few things regarding this Bill and the amendments submitted by Pu Rochama.

Mizoram, as we know, is economically a poor country. There is hardly any pucca building especially in villages. Under such circumstances, I feel that amendment Bill submitted by Pu Rochama will suit the conditions in Mizoram. If pucca structure is classified into many different types, there will surely be difficulty for the owners as well as for those who do fixation of house rent. Therefore, I think we would do well in accepting the classification made in original amendment which defines pucca structure as Cemented/ wooden floor on concrete or masonry foundation supported by concrete beamer. And in the same definition (b), (c) and (d) pucca structure is stated as also Iron or R.C.C. Floor, Reinforced concrete roofing, Cement concrete stone or equal. But, nothing about the wall is mentioned. Hence it is not possible to know the structure of the building even if the posts are all cemented. If we are to accept the provision of the Act, this Assembly Hall too cannot be accepted as pucca structure though we all seemed to be accepting it as pucca building/structure. In view of the economical conditions of Mizoram, I feel we should accept the amendments submitted by Pu Rochama in which he clearly defined the meaning of pucca structure- Cemented or Wooden Floor, Iron; Wood Floor, roof of the reinforced concrete, galvanised iron, Aluminium or Asbestos sheet, one of Asbestos sheet, wooden plank, G.C.I sheet, Cement concrete stone or brick. According to this definition, a house the posts of which are cemented/concrete but Aluminium roof and tiled walls is acceptable as pucca structure. And as Pu Rochama had said, it appears that other States too are not strict in following the detailed provision of the Act. What he had also said regarding statement of object and reason and depreciation was a thing I too accept. I therefore request the House to accept the amendments submitted by Pu Rochama and as well pass this Bill.

PU SANGKHUMA: Mr. Speaker Sir, studying both the amendments and the extract from Mizoram Urban Areas Rent Control Bill which we have passed in 1974 October, it appears that we are making a fuss about nothing. In fact, I feel as though we are father and son who went to sell mule at Market place, the story of which we find in Aesop's Fables. The first time when the Bill was passed, our hon'ble Chief Minister submitted amendment Bill which was exactly like the original one. And now, we have again amendment Bill. It is obvious that none of us use our thinking power.

As a matter of fact, we seem to be bending this side and that side just like father and son who accepted the words of each and everyone they met on their way to Market. We said we do not like provisions of the Bill. But, what is the use of criticizing it if we again landed up at the same place ? I tell you, you must use your thinking power before you do anything. Perhaps, it is because you are easily swayed that public regard you as kings who had to carry their own thrones. If you had used your thinking power public might have stopped criticizing you. Maybe I don't understand that I think you have poured too much new wine into an old mussock of Congress. Though I don't particularly dislike the amendment, I don't know why none of you could stick to one thing.

SPEAKER: Anyone who wishes to say few things regarding this amendment ? If there is none, we will take vote of the House. If you accept the amendment say 'accept'. (Members- 'accept'). If no one objects, we will call the Minister incharge to move the Bill for passing.

PU CH.CHHUNGA: Mr.Speaker Sir, I think there is nothing more **CHIEF MINISTER.** to say regarding the amendment since our members have said enough and I don't intend to say anything either. However, as it is not a difficult thing, I request our members to accept and pass the Bill.

SPEAKER : Those who accept passing Bill No. 8 of 1975- The Mizoram Urban Areas Rent Control (Amendment) Bill, 1975 as amended, say 'accept'. (Members- 'accept'). If none of you objects to its passing our Bill is passed.

There is no more business for today. So, the House is adjourned.

Sine die.

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

....000....