

**URBAN LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT:  
A STUDY OF ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR MIZORAM**

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment for the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) in the Department of Public Administration, Mizoram University, Aizawl.

By

Mr. SAKHAWLIANA

Department of Public Administration

Registration No. MZU/Ph.d/72/23.5.2006

Dr. Lalrintluanga

Supervisor

Prof. C. Lalkima

Joint Supervisor

Mizoram University

Department of Public Administration  
Aizawl : Mizoram

**URBAN LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT:  
A STUDY OF ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR MIZORAM**

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment for the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) in the Department of Public Administration, Mizoram University, Aizawl.

By-

Mr. SAKHAWLIANA  
Department of Public Administration  
Registration No. MZU/Ph.d/72/23.5.2006

Dr. Lalrintluanga  
Supervisor

Prof. C. Lalkima  
Joint Supervisor

Mizoram University  
Department of Public Administration  
Aizawl : Mizoram



**MIZORAM UNIVERSITY**  
**TANHRIL, AIZAWL – 796009**

*Gram: MZU Ph:0389-2331612 Fax : 0389-2331606 website : [www.mzu.edn.in](http://www.mzu.edn.in)*

**Dr. Lalrintluanga**  
**Associate Professor,**  
**Department of Public Administration**

**CERTIFICATE**

This is to certify that **Mr. Sakhawliana** has prepared a Thesis under my Supervision on the topic *Urban Local Self-Government: A Study of Its Implication for Mizoram* in partial fulfillment for the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) in the Department of Public Administration, Mizoram University, Aizawl.

This Thesis has been the outcome of his original work and it does not form a part of any other thesis submitted for the award of any other degrees.

He is duly permitted to submit his thesis for examination.

(Dr. LALRINTLUANGA)  
Supervisor

Dated Aizawl,  
The 14<sup>th</sup> February 2011.

(Prof. C. LALKIMA)  
Co-Supervisor

## **DECLARATION**

I, Sakhawliana, Research Scholar (Rgn. No. MZU / Ph.D / 72 / 23. 5. 2006), Department of Public Administration, Mizoram University do hereby submitted a thesis title 'Urban Local Self-Government: A Study of Its Implication for Mizoram' in partial fulfillment for the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D) in the Department of Public Administration, Mizoram University, Aizawl.

This thesis has been the outcome of my original work and it does not form a part of any other thesis submitted for the award of any other degrees.

Dated : Aizawl

The 14th February 2011

(SAKHAWLIANA)

Research Scholar

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I am deeply indebted to my research Supervisor Dr. Lalrintluanga, Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration, Mizoram University for his kind help and supervision throughout my research. His extraordinary help is not only for supervision, but a sheet of anchor to young researcher, like me.

My sincere gratitude goes to my Joint Supervisor, Prof. C. Lalkima, his valuable advice is encouraging even when there is nothing to expect any help from others.

I express my profound sense of thankfulness to Prof. Srinibas Pathi, Head, Department of Public Administration, Mizoram University. I am very fortunate in receiving support and encouragement from him. His help, affection and sometimes admonitions were father-like, which gave me strength, understanding and comfortable research atmosphere.

I am grateful to all the faculty members of the Department of Public Administration, for their help and affection. All the staffs of Mizoram University Library were kind to me. They were friendly and very supportive to find out relevant Data for researchers. Without their help this work would never be completed.

Dated Aizawl

The 14th February 2011

## CONTENTS

<b>Chapters</b>		<b>Pages</b>
Chapter - I	Introduction	1 - 27
Chapter - II	Development of Local Self-Governments in India	28 - 46
Chapter - III	Impact of the 74th Constitution Amendment Act in the North Eastern States of India	47 - 70
Chapter - IV	Rural Government Machineries in the Urban Areas and the Need for their Transformation in Mizoram	71 - 103
Chapter - V	Problems for the Introduction of Urban Local Self-Government Structure in Mizoram	104 - 121
Chapter - VI	Role of Local Voluntary Organisations for the Introduction of Urban Local Bodies in Mizoram	122 - 131
Chapter - VII	Conclusion	132 – 147
	Bibliography	i-ix
	Annexure	

## ABBREVIATION

AD	-	Anno Domini.
ADC	-	Autonomous District Council.
AH&Vety	-	Animal Husbandry & Veterinary.
AMC	-	Aizawl Municipal Council.
BC	-	Before Christ.
BJP	-	Bharatiya Janata Party.
BPL	-	Below Poverty Line.
BSUP	-	Basic Services to the Urban Poor.
CAA	-	Constitution Amendment Act.
CDP	-	Community Development Project.
CEO	-	Chief Executive Officer.
CO	-	Circle Officer.
CSS	-	Centrally Sponsored Scheme.
CT	-	Census Town.
DAN	-	Development Authority of Nagaland.
DC	-	Deputy Commissioner.
DLAO	-	District Local Administration Officer.
DUDA	-	District Urban Development Agency.
DWCUA	-	Development of Women and Child in Urban Areas.
E	-	East.
EWS	-	Economically Weaker Section.
FCS&CA	-	Food, Civil Supplies, and Consumers Affairs.
FICORM	-	Forum for the Implementation of Constitutional Rights in Mizoram.
GAD	-	General Administration Department.
GLWS	-	Greater Lunglei Water Supply.
GOI	-	Government of India.
GSS	-	Gilead Special School.
GSWS	-	Greater Serchhip Water Supply.
HEP	-	Hydro Electricity Project.
IHSDP	-	Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme.



ILP	-	Inner Line Permit.
ILR	-	Inner Line Regulation.
INA	-	Information Not Available.
INC	-	Indian National Congress.
Infra.	-	Infrastructure.
IPC	-	Indian Penal Code.
JNNURM	-	Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission.
JPC	-	Joint Parliamentary Committee.
Km	-	Kilometre.
LAD	-	Local Administration Department.
LDC	-	Local Development Committee.
M	-	Metre.
M&W	-	Motor Workshop (Mechanic).
MB	-	Municipal Board.
MC	-	Municipal Council.
M.Corp.	-	Municipal Corporations.
MIPAA	-	Mizoram Public Administration Association.
Mm	-	Millimetres.
MNF	-	Mizo National Front.
MoU	-	Memorandum of Settlement/Understanding.
MPC	-	Mizo People Conference.
MP-LAD	-	Member of the Parliament Local Area Development.
MUDA	-	Manipur Urban Development Agency.
MW	-	Megawatts.
N	-	North.
NA	-	Not Available.
NDC	-	National Development Council.
NEFA	-	North East Frontier Agency.
NER	-	North Eastern Region.
NES	-	National Extension Service.
NGO	-	Non Government Organisation.
NHG	-	Neighbourhood Group.
NP	-	Nagar Panchayat.
NPI	-	Non-Profit Institution.

NT	-	Notified Town.
NTs	-	Notified Towns.
OBC	-	Other Backward Classes.
OBs	-	Office Bearers.
OG's	-	Outgrowths.
P&E	-	Power and Electricity Department.
PHED	-	Public Health Engineering Department.
PHQ	-	Police Headquarters.
PIB	-	Press Information Bureau.
Populn.	-	Population.
PPP	-	Public Private Partnership.
PRI	-	Panchayati Raj Institution.
PWD	-	Public Works Department.
RCV	-	Residence Community Volunteer.
Rgn.	-	Registration.
RO	-	Returning Officer.
S	-	South.
SAs	-	Slum Area.
SC	-	Schedule Caste.
Secy.	-	Secretary.
SFC	-	State Finance Commission.
SJSRY	-	Swarna Jayanti Sahari Rozgar Yozna.
Sq.Km	-	Square Kilometre.
Sq.Mile	-	Square Mile.
ST	-	Schedule Tribe.
SUDA	-	State Urban Development Agency.
TC	-	Town Committee.
TIC	-	Town Improvement Committee.
TNT	-	Thutak Nunpuitu Team.
TPC	-	Town Planning Committee.
Tr.	-	Treasurer.
Trg.	-	Training.
UA	-	Urban Agglomeration.
UA's	-	Urban Areas.

UC	-	Under Consideration.
UCs/Ts	-	Urban Centres/Towns.
UD&PA	-	Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation.
UIDSSMT	-	Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Town.
UIG	-	Urban Infrastructure and Governance.
ULB's	-	Urban Local Bodies.
UP	-	United Provinces.
USEP	-	Urban Self Employment Programme.
UT	-	Union Territory.
UWEP	-	Urban Wages Employment Programme.
VC	-	Village Council.
VCM	-	Village Council Member.
VCP	-	Village Council President.
VO	-	Voluntary Organisation.
VP	-	Vice President (Village Council).
W	-	West.
YMA	-	Young Mizo Association.
ZNP	-	Zoram Nationalist Party.

**CHAPTER - I**  
**INTRODUCTION**

# CHAPTER-I

## INTRODUCTION

### I. Concept of Local Self-Government

Local Self-Government occupies the bottom, but possibly the most important place, of modern democratic Government and is an integral part of the Government through which the public can have the opportunity to avail themselves of participation in the administration. To be more precise, the structure of Indian administration is hierarchical - the Union (Central) Government is at the top while the State Governments at the middle and the Local Self-Governments at the bottom of Governance structure. This implies that Local Self-Government is the fundamentals of decentralised administration and advanced Governments discharge their Constitutional responsibilities through the institutions of Local Self-Government.

By way of clarifying the meaning of Local Self-Government, different writers and scholars have given definitions to the term in their own ways as follows:

According to B.K. Gokhale, “Local Self-Government is the Government of a specified locality by the local peoples through the representatives elected by them.”<sup>1</sup>

G.M. Harris defined the Local Self-Government as a “Government by Local Bodies, freely elected while subject to the supremacy of the National Government; are endowed in some respect with power, discretion and responsibility, which they can exercise without control over their decisions by the higher authority. The extent of power discretion and responsibility which the Local Bodies possess is a matter of degree, which varies considerably in various countries.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Sandhu G.S, Kumar Manoj, *Local Government Rural & Urban* (2004), By-Anmol Publications, Pvt. Ltd. 4374/4B, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, N.Delhi 110002, p-1.

<sup>2</sup> Sachdeva, Pardeep., *Urban Local Government, and Administration in India*, (1993), Published by Kitab Mahal 22-A, S.N. Marg, Allahabad – 211001, p-2.

L. Golding said, “Local Government is the management of its own affairs by the people of a locality.”<sup>3</sup>

John J. Clarke opined that, “Local Government appears to be that part of the Government of a Nation or State which deals mainly with such matters as concern the inhabitants of a particular District or place.”<sup>4</sup>

According to K. Venkatarangaiya, Local Government “is the administration of a locality - a Village, a City or any other area smaller than the State - by a body representing the local inhabitants, possessing a fairly large amount of autonomy, raising at least a part of its revenue through local taxation and spending its income on services which are regarded as local and, therefore, distinct from State and Central Services.”<sup>5</sup>

Prof. W.A. Robson coined that “Local Government may be said to involve the conception of a territorial, non-sovereign community possessing the legal right and the necessary organisation to regulate its own affairs...”<sup>6</sup>

All the above definitions have clearly determined that Local Self-Government is a Government of a particular region, smaller than the Sovereign Country or State, which is setup by the local inhabitants for the management of their own local affairs.

As opined by B.K. Gokhale about Local Self-Government, the people have elected representatives to administer the local affairs, with a certain amount of autonomy. This autonomy, however, does not authorise Local Self-Governments to disturb the Sovereignty, Unity, and Integrity of the Nation. Their powers and concerns do not extend beyond the welfare of the local inhabitants. In other words, Local Self-Government is one important facet of ‘Decentralisation of Powers.’ In fact, it is the strength of the National Government because local residents are entitled to exercise their autonomy and administer themselves through their elected representatives. As stated by De Tocqueville, “Local Institutions constitute the strength of free Nations...”

---

<sup>3</sup> *Op.cit.*, Sandhu, G.S, Kumar Manoj, p-3.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, . p-4.

<sup>5</sup> *Op.cit.*, Sachdeva, Pardeep, p-2.

<sup>6</sup> *Op.cit.*, Sandhu, G.S, Kumar Manoj, P-3.

Different subjects that are of diversified nature, e.g., system of Government, Defence, Law & Order, Economic Policy, etc, bind any sovereign Nation. Therefore, the Local Self-Government is not only the strength of a free Nation but also the foundation of Good Governance with many important legal validations for its roles.

Local Self-Government can ensure judicious and unbiased socio-economic and political destiny of the citizens. Its importance is more pronounced in democratic countries like India where the administration is characterised by vast geographical area of land, large population and many diverse communities. Local Self-Government is term as 'The cradle of democracy' for the reason that the general people can exercise their democratic rights at the local level through this grassroots level of administration.

It is the responsibility of the Local Self-Government to provide urgent relief to the local people. Neither the National Government nor the State Government is able to do this due to their haphazard tasks of administration. Today, Government's functions have increased at a rapid rate with its roles multiplying with the change of times. Either the Union or the State Governments lack sufficient time to attend to the local problems in a timely manner. Hence, the role and importance of Local Self-Government become pronounced when natural calamities like Fire, Earthquake, Landslide etc., occur, and in times when public faces water shortage and sanitation problems.

In the word of Lord Bryce, "Local Government is the basis of training in democracy... the best school of democracy and the best guarantee for its success is the practice of Local Self-Government." In a democracy, individuals have equal opportunity to provide services to the Nation and to participate in building of the country. There are no separations based on Caste, Sex, Religion, Colour, and place of Birth etc. People may be ignorant of the National administration and politics of the State; however, they can test their knowledge and National consciousness through Local Self-Government. As envisioned by Lord Bryce, this is the basic training

ground for democracy and the goal of democracy cannot be accomplished without Local Self-Government.<sup>7</sup>

In India, Local Self-Governments can broadly be classified into two:<sup>8</sup>

- (1) Local Self-Government for the Rural Areas; and
- (2) Local Self-Government for the Urban Areas.

Different names are given to these two types of institutions by politico-administrative organisations of our country, supported by the Constitution of India.<sup>9</sup> *Firstly*, the Rural Local Self-Government is known by different names-

- (i) *Zila Parishad*,
- (ii) *Panchayat Samities*, and
- (iii) the *Gram Panchayat* - which signify Local Self-Government Bodies at the District, Block, and Village levels respectively.

*Secondly*, Local Self-Governments in the Urban Areas are called by different names, they are:

- (i) Municipal Corporation;
- (ii) Municipal Council;
- (iii) Municipality;
- (iv) Town Area Committee/Town Committee;
- (v) Notified Area Committee;
- (vi) Cantonment Boards;

---

<sup>7</sup> Rai, B.C., - *Local Government - England, France, America, USSR & India* (1999), Published by Prakashan Kendra, Lucknow 226020, p-2.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p-27.

<sup>9</sup> Avasthi & Avasthi, *Indian Administration* (1997-1998), Pub. Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Hospital Road, Agra-3, p-549.



- (vii) Townships;
- (viii) Port Trust;
- (ix) Nagar Panchayat; and
- (x) Special Purpose Agencies etc.

While Municipal Corporation is to be constituted for a larger Urban Area, Municipal Council is for a smaller Urban Area and *Nagar Panchayat* (by whatever name called) is for a Transitional Area, that is to say, an area in transition from a Rural Area to an Urban Area.<sup>10</sup> Town Area Committee is constituted for the administration of Small Towns while Cantonment Boards are for Cantonment or Military Areas. Public Sector Undertaking (PSU) also has to provide civic amenities to its employees living in Township established by it. On the other hand, Port Trust is formed to manage and protect Ports and to provide civic amenities to the Port Area. Other than these, the State Government may establish Special Purpose Agency to perform some specific functions of Municipalities and this Agency functions as a separate Body and not under the control of Municipalities.

### **Criteria for Urban Areas**

For the first time in India, the Census of 1951 made a clear clarification of Urban Centres or Urban Towns. In this Census, population statistics were also presented separately for Rural and Urban Areas and this was identified as the beginning of population distribution based on Rural and Urban Areas. Since then, this classification of Rural and Urban Areas has been recognised, helping to bring out the spatial distribution of the people in terms of Social, Economic, Cultural, and Demographic characteristics. Until the 1961 Census, a uniform definition of Urban Areas as developed by the 1951 Census was used over all of India. Likewise, the 1981 Census adopted the same criteria of 1961 and 1971 Censuses for Urban Areas with minimal variations. All the previous decadal Census Reports put the male working activities such as Fishing, Logging etc., as Non-Agricultural activity. However, all these activities were placed at par with Cultivation and Agricultural labour in the

---

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p-549.

1981 Census. The criteria of Urban Areas in the 1981 Census are highlighted in detail as follows:

- (a) All places with a Municipality, Corporation or Cantonment Board or Notified Town Areas;
- (b) All other places, which satisfy the following criteria –
  - (i) A minimum population of 5,000;
  - (ii) At least 75% of the male working population engaged in Non-Agricultural activity;
  - (iii) A population of at least 400 per Sq. Km (or 1,000 per Sq. Mile)

Similar to the previous Census, the 1991 Census adopted the criteria of Urban Areas developed for 1981 Census, but a few thorough clarifications were made to elucidate the meaning for the readers and policy makers. They are:<sup>11</sup>

- (a) All Statutory Towns i.e. All places with a Municipal Corporation, Municipal Board, Cantonment Board or Notified Town Area etc.
- (b) All other places, which satisfy the following criteria:
  - (i) A minimum population of 5,000;
  - (ii) Seventy-five per cent of the male working population engaged in Non-Agricultural (and allied) activity; and
  - (iii) A density of population of at least 400 per Sq. Km. (1,000 per Sq. mile)

Moreover, the Director of Census Operations was allowed to include, in consultation with the concerned State Government/Union Territory Administration and the Census Commissioner of India, some places having Urban characteristics as

---

<sup>11</sup> *Census of India*, 1991, General Population Table, Series 17, Directorate of Census Operation, Mizoram, p-6.

‘Urban Areas,’ even if such places did not satisfy all the criteria mentioned under category (b) above. All the same, as acknowledged by the Census of India 2001, all the 22 (twenty-two) Towns in Mizoram are Statutory Towns, hence included under Urban Areas.

Viewing from the 1981 Census, one can identify some alterations in the 1991 Census. *Firstly*, the word ‘Statutory Places’ was added; and *Secondly*, in lieu of the word ‘All other places’ the word ‘Places satisfying the following criteria...’ was adopted in the 1991 Census for identification of Urban Areas. In addition, for qualifying places to be classed as ‘Urban,’ all Villages, which, as per the 1991 Census, had a population of 5,000 and above, a population density of 400 persons per Sq. km and having at least 75% of male working population engaged in Non-Agricultural activity, were considered. To work out male working population as referred to above (b) (ii), the term ‘Main Workers’ is surrogated. Though a few alternative changes had been made by the previous Census, the 2001 Census consented to the criteria of ‘Urban Areas’ adopted by the 1991 Census.

### **Urban Agglomeration**

One important new word ‘Urban Agglomeration’ was adopted for the first time by the 1991 Census. It put forward a clear definition of ‘Urban Agglomeration’ as a mushroom growth in the country. An ‘Urban Agglomeration’, says the 1991 Census Document, is “a continuous Urban spread constituting a Town and its adjoining Urban Outgrowths (OGs) or two or more physically contiguous Towns together and any adjoining Urban Outgrowths of such Towns.” Example of OGs are (a) Railway Colonies; (b) University Campuses; (c) Port Areas etc., that may come up near a City or Statutory Town outside its statutory limits,<sup>12</sup> but within the revenue limits of a Village or Villages contiguous to the Town or City. Each such particular area, by itself, may not satisfy the minimum population limit to qualify it to be treated as an independent Urban unit, but may deserve to be clubbed with the Town as a continuous Urban spread.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Census of India 2001*, Primary Census Abstract, 16 Mizoram, Directorate of Census Operations, Mizoram, P-xi (vi).

The Census of India 2001 re-allocated the criteria adopted for defining Urban Areas. By way of conceptualising the latest criteria of Urban Areas, the definition adopted by 2001 Census is reproduced as follows:

- (a) All statutory places with a Municipality, Corporation, Cantonment Board or Notified Town Area Committee, etc.
- (b) A place satisfying the following three criteria simultaneously:
  - (i) A minimum population of 5,000;
  - (ii) At least 75% of male working population engaged in Non-Agricultural pursuits; and
  - (iii) A density of population of at least 400 per Sq. km. (1,000 per Sq. mile).

Without any modification or alteration of the definition regarding the meaning of 'Urban Agglomeration,' the 2001 Census adopted all the criteria and definition of 1991 Census. However, 2001 Census delineated the precondition for an 'Urban Agglomeration' by the following points:

- (a) The core Town or at least one of the constituent Towns of an Urban Agglomeration should necessarily be a Statutory Town; and
- (b) The total population of all the constituents (i.e., Towns and Outgrowths) of an 'Urban Agglomeration' should not be less than 20,000 (as per 1991 Census).

Meeting these two basic criteria, the following types of 'Urban Agglomeration' exist in our country:

- (i) A City or Town with one or more contiguous Outgrowths;
- (ii) Two or more adjoining Towns with their Outgrowths; and

- (iii) A City and one or more adjoining Towns with their Outgrowths all of which form a continuous spread.

As have been adopted by the previous Census Years, the 2001 Census treated Towns with a population of 1, 00,000 (one lakh) and above as Cities. The 2001 Census incorporated a new word 'Slum.' However, no previous Censuses defined any place 'Slum' or 'Slum Area.' Though 'Slum' has come to form an integral part of the phenomena of Urbanisation in India, this type of Residential Areas was found anywhere in the record of the preceding Censuses. Thus, for the first time in Indian Census history, the 2001 Census specifically defined 'Slum' or 'Slum Area'. This Residential Area is a cluster of Slum Houses and the detailed dimension of 'Slum Area', adopted by the 2001 Census is shown as follows:

(i) All specified areas in Town or City notified as 'Slum' by State/ Local Government and Union Territory Administration, under any Act, including a Slum Act;

(ii) All areas recognised as 'Slum' by State/Local Government and Union Territory Administration. Housing and Slum Boards which have not been formally notified as Slum under any Act;

(iii) A Compact Area with at least a population of 300 or about 60 - 70 Households of poorly built congested tenements, in unhygienic environment usually with inadequate infrastructure and lacking in proper Sanitary and Drinking Water facilities.

**Table-1.1**  
**Categories of Towns<sup>13</sup>**

<b>Population</b>	<b>Class</b>
1,00,000 and above	I
50,000 – 99,999	II
20,000 – 49,999	III
10,000 – 19,999	IV
5,000 – 9,999	V
Below – 5,000	VI

<sup>13</sup> *Census of India-1981*, Mizoram Primary Census Abstract, Directorate of Census Operations, Mizoram.

In the 1981 Census, recognised Towns were classified into 6 (six) categories on the bases of their population. In order to declassify different categories of Towns, the Census Year 1991 borrowed the classification adopted by the 1981 Census. Consequently, the 1991 Census' definition has drawn out a clear demarcation of an Urban Agglomeration. As categorised by the 1991 Census, all the Towns which have the population of one lakh and above are classified as Class-I, while Towns between 50,000 to 99,999 populations are under Class-II; Towns with a population of 20,000 to 49,999 are under Class-III; 10,000 to 19,999 populations are Class-IV; 5,000 to 9,999 populations are Class-V; and below 5,000 populations are Class-VI Towns respectively.

**Table 1.2**

**Size/Groups by Population<sup>14</sup>**

One Million and Above
500,000 to One Million
1,00,000 to 4,99,999
50,000 to 99,999
20,000 to 49,999
10,000 to 19,999
5,000 to 9,999
Below 5,000

Table (1.2) is the new classification system of Town and Urban Agglomeration. In view of this, all the Urban Centres with population that cross one million are notarised as 'Metropolitan City' and these are hugely populated 'Million-Plus Cities.' According to the Constitution of India, 'Metropolitan City,' and a 'City' that cross 5, 00,000 (Five lakh) population can set up Municipal Corporation for their Urban Administrative devices. Unlike the preceding Census of India, the Census of India 2001's Document called all Towns with a population of 1,00,000 (One lakh) as a 'City'.

<sup>14</sup> Office of the Registrar & Census Commissioner, India. [www.censusindia.gov.in](http://www.censusindia.gov.in).

Different States enact their own State Law and fix population for the Municipalities in their respective States. After drawing authority from the Constitution, different States have introduced Urban Local Self-Governments as deemed necessary. It is mandatory under the Constitution that all the Bodies should conform to the principle of Urban Administration enshrined in Part-IX (A) of the Constitution of India.<sup>15</sup>

### **Review of Existing Literatures**

The researcher has carried out an extensive review of the following literatures on Mizoram.

S.K Chaube's '*Hill Politics in North East India (1973)*' and V. Venkata Rao's '*A Century of Tribal Politics in North East India (1976)*' which deal with Government and Politics in Mizoram only as a part of the North Eastern politics and hence do not contain any specific study of Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram.

A.C Ray's '*Mizoram: Dynamics of Change (1982)*' mainly deals with some problems connected with administrative development in Mizoram from the perspective of National Integration and hence does not include any aspect of Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram.

Nirmal Nibedon's '*Mizoram: The Dagger Brigade (1982)*' is focused on the Mizo National Front (MNF) movement with some journalistic elements.

V.I.K Sarin's '*India's North-East in Flames (1982)*' also deals with hostile activities of the Mizo National Front (MNF) in the context of Insurgency in North-East India.

R.N. Prasad's '*Government and Politics in Mizoram (1987)*' deals with the evolution of Mizoram politics with an emphasis on the politics of the Pawi-Lakher Region of Mizoram.

---

<sup>15</sup> *Proceeding of the Seminar on Five Years Municipal Development Plan*, March 11-13, 1968, New Delhi, Printed at Everest Press, Delhi-110,006, p-4.

Another book, titled '*A Century of Government and Politics in North-East India, Volume III, Mizoram (1987)*' written by V. Venkata Rao and his companions mainly deal with the historical development of Mizoram politics.

K.M Zakhuma's '*Political Development in Mizoram from 1946-1989: A Study with Special Reference to Political Parties in Mizoram (2001)*' is a historical study of political development with reference to political parties in Mizoram.

Commendable though they are in their respective areas, the above-published works under review have not dealt with the implications of Urban Local Self-Government for Mizoram.

### **Objective of the Present Study**

The present study has been carried out with the following objectives:

- (i) To look into the reasons why there is continuation of Village Councils in the Urban Areas of Mizoram.
- (ii) To examine whether the Urban dwellers in other parts of North Eastern India have received Political and Economic benefits by the introduction of Urban Local Self-Government-like Municipal Corporation / Council / Board - in their respective States.
- (iii) To explore the kinds of benefits that the introduction of Urban Local Self-Government Structures could give to the Urban settlers in the first three recognised Towns of Mizoram.
- (iv) To unearth the possibilities of supplanting the existing Village Councils by Urban Local Self-Governmental Structure with a view to transforming inconsistent Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram.
- (v) To suggest appropriate measures to replace the existing unsuitable and improper Urban Administration in the Urban Areas of Mizoram with appropriate ones.



## **Scope of the Study**

While carrying out this research, profound attention has been paid to the three premier Urban Centres or Urban Towns namely Aizawl, Lunglei, and Saiha. A study of this kind has been felt necessary because Village Councils, which were designed for the politico-administrative machineries of the Villages at the initial stage of democratisation of the polity, still subsist in these Urban Centres.

## **Research Questions**

It is intended that the following research questions be answered -

- (1) Has the continuation of Rural Government Structures in the Urban Centres given rise to many problems for the Urban poor?
- (2) Has the State Government faced problems in receiving Funds for Urban Development from the Ministry of Urban Development or the Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation, Government of India for not introducing Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram?
- (3) Has many Civic problems been faced by the Urban poor due to the absence of appropriate Urban Local Bodies in the Urban Areas of Mizoram?
- (4) Do politicians and administrators were responsible for restraining the introduction of appropriate Urban Local Self-Government.

## **Methods of Data Collection**

The Researcher has collected the required Data for the present study through Primary Sources of Information such as Interview Method - Structured and Unstructured, Questionnaire Method, Official Documents of the Government of India and the State Government of Mizoram. In addition, Secondary Data collected from Books, Journals, and Newspapers have extensively been utilised for the present study.

## **Chapterisation:**

The whole study has been divided into seven chapters as follows:

The *first* Chapter is an Introductory Chapter, which has dealt with the concept of Local Self-Government from different perspectives and the Profile of Mizoram with a view to exploring different variables within the present study. It has also studied the criteria for Urban Centres/Towns (UCs/Ts) and Slum Areas (SAs) set by Census of India in 1951 for use as the basis for defining human settlement in the country till date.

The *second* Chapter has made an in-depth study of the origin and development of Local Self-Government in India. It has unravelled its origin from the Indus Valley Civilisation, about 3,000 B.C., which flourished afterwards to different Empires. It has also traced the beginning of Urban Local Self-Government in India in its present form.

The *third* Chapter has made an exhaustive examination of the impact of the 74th Constitution Amendment Act in the eight North-Eastern States of India in general and Mizoram in particular.

In the *fourth* Chapter, an attempt has been made to study the reasons responsible for the continuity of Rural Government machineries in the Urban Areas and the need for their transformation in Mizoram.

The *fifth* Chapter has carried out the study of different problems that stood on the way to introduction of Urban Local Self-Government Structures in the Urban Centres of Mizoram.

The sixth Chapter has evaluated the role of Local Voluntary Organisations for the Introduction of Urban Local Bodies in Mizoram

The *seventh* Chapter is the concluding chapter, which has brought out the summary and findings of this Research Work. It has also made suggestions for solving the problems connected with introduction of Urban Local Self-Governments in the Urban Centres of Mizoram.

## II. Growth of Population and Urbanisation in India

Population growth is now a natural phenomenon. The higher the growth rate, the higher is Urbanisation. As portrayed by the following variation of Indian Population Table (1.3), there has been a gradual increase in Urban population at an accelerated rate.

**Table-1.3**  
**Variation of Population in India since 1901<sup>16</sup>**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Rural</b>	<b>Urban</b>
1901	238,396,327	212,544,454	25,851,873
1911	252,093,390	226,151,757	25,941,633
1921	251,321,213	223,235,043	28,086,170
1931	278,977,238	245,521,249	33,455,989
1941	318,660,580	274,507,283	44,153,297
1951	361,088,090	298,644,381	62,443,709
1961	439,234,771	360,298,168	78,936,603
1971	548,159,652	439,045,675	109,113,977
1981	683,329,097	523,866,550	159,462,547
1991	846,302,688	628,691,676	217,611,012
2001	1,028,610,328	742,490,639	286,119,689

As portrayed by Table (1.3) the population of India was 238.4 million in 1901. While the entire decadal Census depicts higher growth, the 1921 Census shows that there has been a negative growth to the population of India. Moreover, the entire Census of India records higher growth rate and the population of India have crossed one billion marks in 2001.

The following Table (1.4) clearly portrayed 2001 Census figure for Rural and Urban settlers in India. While population in the Rural was 74, 24, 90,639, it is 28, 61, 19,689 in the Urban Areas. The percentage of Rural and Urban population to the total population is 72.2% and 27.8% respectively.

---

<sup>16</sup> *Op.cit.*, Office of the Registrar & Census Commissioner.

**Table-1.4**  
**Rural – Urban Population of India (2001 Census)<sup>17</sup>**

1.	<b>Rural</b>	<b>742,490,639</b>	<b>72.20%</b>
2.	<b>Urban</b>	<b>286,119,689</b>	<b>27.80%</b>
3.	State with highest proportion of Urban Population	Goa	49.76%
4.	State with highest proportion of Rural Population	Himachal Pradesh	9.3
5.	UT with highest proportion of Urban population	Delhi	93.18%
6.	UT with lowest proportion of Urban population	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	22.89%

As shown in the above Table (1.4), the percentage of Urban settlers to total populations of the country is merely 27.80% in 2001 Census. Among the States, Goa has the highest proportion of Urban population with a record of 49.76%, while the lowest proportion of Urban population is possess by the Northern State of Himachal Pradesh with 9.30%. On the other hand, the capital City of New Delhi has a record high of 93.18% Urban population; on the other hand Centrally Administered Union Territory of Dadra & Nagar Haveli has only 22.89% Urban population.

### **Urbanisation**

Along with the growth of population, Urbanisation has gradually been taking place because of normal population growth and migration of people from the Countryside to the Town and Cities, which are the major Commercial or Industrial Centres of the economy. Because of huge migration of population to the Urban Areas, Urban problems have cropped up with regard to the provision of different civic amenities to the people, such as Water Supply, Drainage and Sewerage, Urban Renewal and Housing, Urban Development, Transportation, Road Construction, Electricity Supply, etc.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*,

Urban population in India quadrupled in four decades from 61.6 Million in 1951 to 212.9 Million in 1991 and 286.1 Million in 2001. The figure of Urban population was increases by more than 50 Million at the dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.<sup>18</sup> Although the level of Urbanisation fell to more than half percent, from 11.00 percent in 1901 to 10.4 percent in 1911, India Urban population accelerated to a higher level in the subsequent entire decadal Census. On the other hand, the decadal growth percent did not remain within the range of three digits from each of the preceding Urban population Census.

**Table – 1.5**  
**Growth of Urban Population in India 1901 – 2001<sup>19</sup>**

Census	Number of Towns	Total Urban Population (In million)	Level of Urbanisation (Percent)	Decadal growth of Urban population (%)
1901	1811	25.6	11.00	-
1911	1754	25.6	10.4	0.0
1921	1894	27.7	11.3	8.2
1931	2017	33.0	12.2	19.1
1941	2190	43.6	14.1	32.1
1951	27.95	61.6	17.6	41.3
1961	22.70	77.6	18.3	26.0
1971	24.76	107.0	20.2	37.9
1981	3245	156.2	23.7	46.0
1991	3609	212.9	26.1	36.3
2001	5161	286.1	27.8	34.4

Though a gradual increase is present in every Census, the 1981 Census attained the highest decadal growth of 46.0 percent. Besides, decadal growth of 2001 Census from the preceding Census is 34.4 percent. This lower growth rate indicates that the tempo of Urbanisation in India slowed down during the 1980's. The decline in Urbanisation rate can be explained by analysing the contribution of various components of population growth like Natural Increase, Net Migration from Rural to

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*,

Urban and Urban to Urban Areas and changes in the Status of Areas as a result of re-classification and declassification, Horizontal Extension or the change in Territorial Jurisdiction of Towns.

However, it was unveiled by Table (1.5)'s that the Annual Growth of Urban population over the last five decades has been on an average 3.8 million. Urban population in India is at present almost twice the total combined Urban population of France, Germany, and the United Kingdom. No other Country in the world, except China, has an Urban population larger than India. The fast pace of Urbanisation has imposed increasing pressures on the level of services in Urban Centres. Consequently, positive role of Urbanisation has overshadowed by deterioration in the physical environment and quality of life in the Urban Areas.

### **III. Profile of “Mizoram”**

Mizoram, the name of the State, is a combination of two words- ‘*Mizo*’ and ‘*Ram*.’ The word, ‘*Ram*’ means Country or Land while ‘*Mizo*’ is the generalised name of the inhabitants. Thus, Mizoram means the Land of the Mizos. The generic term Mizo means ‘Hillman’ or ‘Highlander.’<sup>20</sup> The name of the State otherwise is synonymous with its geographical topography. Situated approximately between 22.12’ and 24.9’ North Latitude and 92.20’ and 93.90’ East Longitude, Mizoram occupies the North Eastern corner of India. It has a Geographical Area of 21,081 Sq. Km with North to South length being 277 Km and the breadth from East to West being 121 Km.<sup>21</sup> Mizoram occupies the 21st position in regards to area and 26th position in regards to population in the country.<sup>22</sup> The State is distributed into 8 (eight) Districts, 23 (twenty-three) Sub-Divisions and 26 (twenty six) Rural Development Blocks. In addition, there are 3 (three) Autonomous District Councils constituted under the 6<sup>th</sup> Schedule of the Constitution.

Sandwiched between Myanmar and Bangladesh, Mizoram State has 722 Km of International boundary. It shares a common boundary of 404 Km with Myanmar on

---

<sup>20</sup> Zakhuma, K.M., *Political Development in Mizoram from 1946 to 1989 - A study with special reference to political parties in Mizoram* (2001), Printed at J.R. Bros’ Offset Printers & Paper Works, Zuangtui, p-14.

<sup>21</sup> Government of Mizoram, *Statistical Handbook, Mizoram* (2006), Aizawl., p-xv.

<sup>22</sup> Rao, V.V. - *A Century of Government and Politics in North-East India*, Vol.III Mizoram, (1987), S.Chand and Co. (Pvt.) Ltd., New Delhi, p-2.

the East and South, and 318 Km with Bangladesh on the West. The State is bound to the North by 123 Km and 95 Km by Assam and Manipur and 66 Km in the West by Tripura respectively.<sup>23</sup>

Due to the British expedition in 1890, Mizoram State fell under the sweeping British Imperialist Rule.<sup>24</sup> This Imperial Government introduced a variety of Rules and Regulations comprising of the Assam Frontier Tract Regulation, 1880, Scheduled District Act, 1870, Chin Hills Regulations, 1896, Government of India Act, 1919 and Inner Lines Regulations (Bengal and Eastern Frontier Act) 1873.<sup>25</sup>

The British divided the whole of Mizoram into North Lushai Hills District and South Lushai Hills District. While the Northern District falls under the Chief Commissioner of Assam, the Bengal Lieutenant Governor governed the Southern District. The British merged the two Districts on 1st April 1898 and Re-named it Lushai Hills.<sup>26</sup> Strictly speaking, the British were in the Lushai Hills for less than a Century and had failed or neglected to develop a native-based administration.<sup>27</sup>

When India was given Independence by the British on 15th August 1947, Mizoram (erstwhile Lushai Hills) continued to remain under the Assam Government. This Government granted Autonomous District Council to Mizoram (then known as Mizo Hills) in April 1952 and the newly created District Council had 24 Members.<sup>28</sup> This Council was later elevated to the Centrally Administered Union Territory (UT) Status in January 1972 and again to Statehood on 20th February 1987. As for its name, the present State of Mizoram was known as Lushai Hills till the 1951 Census, it was then called Mizo Hills in 1961 and as Mizo District till 1971.<sup>29</sup> The whole Area of Mizoram State was declared a 'Disturbed Area' in 1966 and the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act, 1958 was enforced to counter Insurgency that enveloped

---

<sup>23</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Statistical Handbook, Mizoram* (2006). P-xv

<sup>24</sup> Prasad, R.N. *Government and Politics in Mizoram 1947 – 1986* (1987), Pub. Northern Book Centre, 4221/1, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi 110002, ISBN 81-85119-23-6, p-26.

<sup>25</sup> Prasad, R.N., and Agarwal, A.K., (Edited), *LANDMARKS: A Study of Public Administration in Mizoram, (1995)*, Published by Indian Institute of Public Administration, Aizawl Local Branch, Mizoram. Printed at Lengchhawn Press, p-6.

<sup>26</sup> Lalnithanga, P. IAS (Rtd), *Emergence of Mizoram* (2005), Printed at Lengchhawn Press, Bethel House Khatla, Aizawl 796001, p-26.

<sup>27</sup> Chaube, S.K., *Hill Politics in North-East India*, (1973), Published by Orient Longman Ltd., Calcutta, p-45.

<sup>28</sup> Nibedon, Nirmal., *Mizoram: The Dagger Brigade*, (1981), Published by Lancers Publishers, New Delhi, p-28.

<sup>29</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Census of India, 1991*. p-41.

Mizoram from March 1966.<sup>30</sup> The State was under Militancy for more than 20 years, from 1st March 1966 to 30th June 1986. The Guerrilla War waged between Indian Forces and Mizo National Front (MNF) Militants ended due to the successful 'Peace Accord' signed between the Government of India and MNF Militants on June 1986. Consequently, the 53rd Constitution Amendment Act, 1986 granted the Status of State to Mizoram, which now is one of the most peaceful States in the Country.

## Population

In Mizoram, the first population Census was carried out during the British Rule in 1901 to synchronise with the Census of India. At this first Census, only 82,434 persons lived in the whole Area. The Male and Female composition was 39,004 Males and 43,430 Females. The total decadal increase of population figures are portray in Table (1.6) below:

**Table -1.6**  
**Population trend in Mizoram 1901-2001<sup>31</sup>**

Sl. No	Year	Male	Female	Total	Decadal Variation %
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1901	39,004	43,430	82,434	x
2	1911	43,028	48,176	91,204	10.64
3	1921	46,652	51,754	98,408	7.90
4	1931	59,186	65,218	1,24,404	26.42
5	1941	73,855	78,931	1,52,786	22.81
6	1951	96,136	1,00,066	1,96,202	28.42
7	1961	1,32,465	1,33,598	2,66,063	35.61
8	1971	1,70,824	1,61,566	3,32,390	24.93
9	1981	2,57,239	2,36,518	4,93,757	48.55
10	1991	3,58,978	3,30,778	6,89,756	39.70
11	2001	4,59,109	4,29,464	8,88,573	28.82

Surprisingly, the population of Mizoram increases at an accelerated rate. While the lowest Decadal Growth was record at 7.90% in 1911-1921, it, however, accelerated to 48.55% in 1971-1981, which was trace as the all time high for

<sup>30</sup> Ray, A.C. *Mizoram: Dynamics of Change (1982)*, Pearl Publishers, Calcutta, p-2.

<sup>31</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Statistical Handbook, Mizoram -2006*, p-1.



population variation in India. However, there was a Negative Growth in the 2001 Census, which stood at 28.82 % from 39.70 % growth in the 1991 Census.

As shown in Table (1.6) the population of Mizoram shows a Moderate Growth from the First Census Year which, however, hurtled to 48.55% growth in the 1981 Census from the preceding Census. It is also relevant to mention that Female population was higher than the Male for half a Century. When the first population Census was conducted in 1901, Female population exceeded the Male by 4,426 or 10.2%. This Status remained stagnant until the 1961 Census.<sup>32</sup> After the highest Decadal Growth in 1981 Census, the growth percentage decreased substantially in the 2001 Census that fixed it at 28.82% only.<sup>33</sup>

The total population of Mizoram was 8, 88,573 in 2001 Census. There are 3, 25,676 (36.65 percent) persons in Aizawl District, 1, 37,223 (15.44 percent) persons are in Lunglei District. On the other hand, Champhai District has 108,392 (12.20 percent) population, Lawngtlai District 73,620 (8.29 percent), Kolasib District 65,960 (7.42 percent), Mamit District 62,785 (7.07 percent), Saiha District 61,056 (6.87 percent) and Serchhip District 53,861 (6.06 percent) populations respectively.<sup>34</sup>

As portrayed by 2001 Census the Highest Density of 95 persons Per Sq. km is observed in Aizawl District while the Least Density of 21 persons per Sq. km is in Mamit District.<sup>35</sup> Among the eight existing Districts, Serchhip District had the highest Sex Ratio of 967 Females per 1,000 Males, while Mamit District record the lowest Sex Ratio of 896 Females. According to the 2001 Census, 1, 76,134 household existed in the State of Mizoram, out of which 64,753 households (36.76 percent) are located in Aizawl District alone. The least number of households was found in Serchhip District, which has only 10,116 (5.74 percent).

For the coming 2011 Census, the Census Registrar of India has started enumerations since June 2010. Though 2011 Census is not yet completed, the Government of Mizoram Economic & Statistic Department has prepared a projected population trend.

---

<sup>32</sup> Government of Mizoram, *Statistical Handbook-2001*, Directorate of Economic and Statistics, p-7.

<sup>33</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Census of India 2001*, p-29.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p-3.

<sup>35</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Statistical Handbook, Mizoram-2002*, p-6.

The following data Table (1.7) shows the projected population of Mizoram for the upcoming decadal Census of 2011.

**Table-1.7**  
**Projected Population of Mizoram<sup>36</sup>**  
*(For the Year 2002 – 2011)*

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>MALE</b>	<b>FEMALE</b>	<b>PERSONS</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
2002	4,70,773	4,41,061	9,11,834	2.61
2003	4,82,773	4,53,013	9,35,786	2.62
2004	4,95,118	4,65,329	9,60,447	2.63
2005	5,07,816	4,78,023	9,85,839	2.64
2006	5,20,884	4,91,106	10,11,990	2.65
2007	5,34,325	5,04,587	10,38,912	2.66
2008	5,48,155	5,19,870	10,68,025	2.8
2009	5,62,386	5,34,236	10,96,622	2.67
2010	5,77,024	5,4,9043	11,26,067	2.68
2011	5,92,088	5,64,305	11,56,393	30.14

Accordingly, it was projected that there might be at least 30.14 percent Annual Population Growth rate for the decadal year between 2002 and 2011. The total population of Mizoram is only 8, 88,573 in the 2001 Census, but it was projected to increase to 11, 56,393 persons in the Census Year 2011. Indeed, this higher growth rate shall bring about drastic geographical land pressure for Habitation and Economic activities of the people. This would push up the density of population from the present

<sup>36</sup> *Op.cit., Statistical Handbook, Mizoram-2006, p-3.*

42 Per Sq. km to 54 persons Per Sq. km, while the land remains at 21,081 Sq. km only.<sup>37</sup>

### Growth of Urban Population in Mizoram

Mizoram has experienced rapid growth of Urban population too. Such a growth may largely attribute to the mushrooming of settlements that have acquired Urban Status under Statutory Provisions of the State. Hence, Geographical factors that play an important role in the diversification of economy enhancing the growth of Urban Centres do not appear to be very important. Very few settlements, as a result, conform to the Census definition of ‘Towns’ in Mizoram.<sup>38</sup>

**Table – 1.6**  
**Progress in Urban Population of Mizoram 1901-1991<sup>39</sup>**

State /District	1991	1981	1971	1961	1951	1941	1931	1921	1911	1901
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
<b>Mizoram Total</b>	3,17,946	1,21,814	37,759	14,257	6,950	...	...	...	...	...
Aizawl	2,59,721	97,591	31,740	14,257	6,950	...	...	...	...	...
Lunglei	44,556	17,205	6,019	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Chhimituipui	13,669	7,018	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Until the 1941 Census, there was no Town in Mizoram. By the Census year 1951, Aizawl was recognised as the first Town with the population of 6,950.<sup>40</sup> It continued to be the only Town in the State until the 1971 Census.<sup>41</sup> However, in 1971 Census, another New Town i.e., Lunglei, was added bringing the number of Notified Towns (NT) in Mizoram to 2 (two). In the 1981 Census as many as 4 (four) more Towns were added and the total number of NT in the State reached 6 (six).<sup>42</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Kumar, Girindra., (Edited), *Urbanisation in Mizoram, Retrospect and prospects* (1999), Linkman Publications, 45 Annapurna Devi Road, Titagarh- 743188, North 24 Parganas, W. Bengal. ISBN 81-86129-16-2, p-69.

<sup>38</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Census of India-1991*, p-69.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p-26.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*,

The number of Towns in Mizoram rose to 22 in 1991. Up to the 1991 Census, there were only 3 (three) Districts in Mizoram, Viz., Aizawl District, Lunglei District, and Chhimtuipui District. Thus, all the identified NTs are scattered in these three Districts. As shown in the following Table (1.7), there were 18 (eighteen) NTs in Aizawl District, 1(one) each in Lunglei District and Saiha District.<sup>43</sup> This data clarifies the fact that even a single Urban Centre or Urban Town have not yet found in the whole area of Mizoram before independence.

As shown in the following Table (1.7), there is a lone Urban Centre or Urban Town in the State for two consecutive decadal Censuses, i.e., 1951 and 1961. In the 1971 Census, however, one(one) New Urban Centre has recognised to bring the number of Urban Centres to 2(two). In the 1981 Census, there was an accelerated growth of 300 percent in the numbers of Urban Centres, i.e., 2(two) in 1971 and 6 (six) in 1981 Census. Hence, there were 3 (three) Urban Centres in Aizawl District, and 1(one) Urban Centre in Chhimtuipui District were identified, thereby bringing the total number of Urban Centres in Mizoram to 6 (six).

**Table – 1.7**  
**Growth of Urban Centres (District-Wise) 1901 - 2001<sup>44</sup>**

District/ UT	1901	1911	1921	1931	1941	1951	1961	1971	1981	1991	2001
<b>Mizoram</b>	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	2	6	22	22
Aizawl	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	1	4	18	4
Lunglei	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	3	3
Saiha	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	1	1
Lawngtlai	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Champhai	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4
Kolasib	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4
Serchhip	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3
Mamit	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3

Above Table (1.7) portrayed that the number of Urban Centres or Urban Town increases from 6 (six) to 22 (twenty-two) during the decade 1981-1991. In other

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>44</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Census of India-2001*, p-29.

words, the 1991 Census of India identified 22 (twenty-two) Urban Centres in Mizoram.<sup>45</sup> Despite the total number of NTs remaining stagnant at 22 (twenty-two) in the 2001 Census, it was, however distributed in seven different Districts. This is because the State Government created 5 (five) New Districts in 1998.<sup>46</sup> Of course, 4(four) New Districts, viz., Champhai District, Kolasib District, Serchhip District, Mamit District were create by dividing Aizawl District. On the other hand, Saiha District and Lawngtlai District were create from the erstwhile Chhimtuipui District. These new Districts brought about a difference in the spatial distribution of Towns in the State. Accordingly there were 4(four) Towns in Aizawl District, 3(three) in Lunglei District, 1(one) in Saiha, 4(four) each in Champhai, and Kolasib Districts, and 3(three) each in Serchhip and Mamit Districts respectively. However, Lawngtlai District has no Urban Centres. Even the District Headquarters i.e., Lawngtlai, have not yet given the Status of Town by the 2001 Census.

The trend of Urban population steadily progressed from 6,950 in 1951; 14,257 in 1961; 37,759 in 1971; 1, 21,814 in 1981; 3,17,946 in 1991 and 4,41,006 in 2001 Censuses respectively.<sup>47</sup> On the other hand, Saiha, Champhai, Kolasib, and Serchhip are given the Status of Town by the 1981 Census. With the addition of Sairang, Saitual, Darlawn, Khawzawl, Khawhai, Vairengte, Bairabi, N. Kawnpui, Tlabung, Hnahthial, Zawlnuam, Mamit, Lengpui, Thenzawl, Biate and N. Vanlaiphai there were 22 (twenty-two) NTs in Mizoram in 1991.<sup>48</sup>

Table (1.8) shows that the total population of all these 22 (twenty-two) recognised Towns was 3, 17,946 in 1991. While the biggest Town i.e., Aizawl, has 1,55,240 population; newly identified Town of Lengpui has only 1,808 populations in 1991 Census. As in 2001, the population of the largest Urbanised Town i.e., Aizawl, has been increases to 2,28,280, but Lengpui has merely 2,423 population. In terms of population, Lunglei followed Aizawl, with a population of 47,137. Champhai is the third most Urbanised Town with a population of 26,465, the Southern Town of Saiha

---

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>46</sup> *The Mizoram Gazette (Extra Ordinary)*, No. 64 of 1998, read with No. 137 of 1998.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>48</sup> *Government of Mizoram, Directorate of Economic & Statistics, Reports on Block Statistics-2001*, p- (ii).

followed Champhai with the population of 19,826. Nevertheless, the total Urban population in all the NTs of Mizoram was 4, 41,006 in the 2001 Census of India.<sup>49</sup>

**Table – 1.8**  
**Trend of Population Growth in Notified Towns of Mizoram 1901 - 2001<sup>50</sup>**

Notified Towns	2001	1991	1981	1971	1961	1951	1941	1931	1921	1911	1901
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<b>Mizoram Total</b>	<b>4,41,006</b>	<b>3,17,946</b>	<b>1,21,814</b>	<b>37,759</b>	<b>14,257</b>	<b>6,950</b>	...	...	...	...	...
Aizawl	2,28,280	1,55,240	74,493	31,740	14,257	6,950	...	...	...	...	...
Lunglei	47,137	35,599	17,205	6,019	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Saiha	19,826	13,669	7,018	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sairang	5,034	3,527	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Saitual	10,966	8,402	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Darlawn	3,865	3,609	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Khawzawl	10,954	7,104	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Champhai	26,465	20,809	7,487	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Khawhai	2,403	2,102	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vairengte	7,715	5,607	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bairabi	3,304	2,421	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kolasib	19,008	13,482	8,282	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
N.Kawnpui	6,472	5,290	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Tlabung	3,681	3,409	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Hnahthial	7,138	5,548	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Zawlnuam	3,120	3,455	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mamit	5,110	3,546	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lengpui	2,423	1,808	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Serchhip	17,096	13,688	7,329	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thenzawl	5,507	4,502	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Biate	2,227	2,325	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
N.Vanlaiphai	3,275	2,804	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>50</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Census of India 2001*, p-28.

Although the Constitution of India did not provide the exact population figure for different categories of Urban Government, the State Government is authorised to constitute Municipalities. Accordingly, the following type of Urban Local Self-Government can be constituted, they are: (a) Nagar Panchayat (by whatever name called) for a Transitional Area; that is to say, an Area in Transition from a Rural Area to an Urban Area; (b) Municipal Council for a smaller Urban Area and (c) Municipal Corporation for a larger Urban Area. The entire subject of Civic Administration falls largely under the responsibility of the State Government. Provisions relating to Public Health and Sanitation, Hospitals and Dispensaries are enshrined in entry 6 of the State List (*The Seventh Schedule of the Constitution*), while Roads, Bridges and Municipal Tramways are included in entry 13, Water Supply and Drainage under entry 17, 'Rights in or over land, Land improvement and Colonisation' under entry 18 of the Constitution.<sup>51</sup> Correspondingly, Local Self-Government itself is a State Subject, which falls under entry 5 of the State List.

---

<sup>51</sup> Singh, Mahendra. P., *Constitution of India* (2010) 11<sup>th</sup> Edition, Eastern Book Company, Lucknow. ISBN 81-7012-904-4, p-1079.

**CHAPTER - II**  
**DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENTS IN**  
**INDIA**



## CHAPTER - II

### DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENTS IN INDIA

The institutions of Local Government have flourished in India since time immemorial. The Panchayats or Village Governments, as they were called, were ancient institutions and were themselves small republics. They exercised power in various spheres such as industrial, commercial, administrative, and social including civic education and religious functions.<sup>1</sup> This chapter is an attempt to examine different phases of Local Self-Government from the furthest known history up to the current situation in India.

#### I. Local Self-Government in the Pre-British Period

The roots of Local Self-Government can be traced as far back as 3000 B.C. i.e., the period of Indus Valley Civilization.<sup>2</sup> During this period, basic civic services like maintenance of streets, providing of streetlights, water supply, drainage etc., were taken care of in a fashion of modern Local Self-Government. Reference to such a highly organised system of Local Government can also be found in the *Vedas*, in the Epics of '*Ramayana*' and '*Mahabharata*', in the '*Upanishads*' and in Kautilya's '*Arthashastra*.' Village was the basic unit of Local Government and the '*Gramini*' was the Village Headman and its Leader. However, State, being small, there was hardly any distinction between the Central and Local Government.<sup>3</sup>

Under different Empires in Ancient India, the basic unit of administration starts at the Village. But, the Village Panchayat was rarely representative of the Village as a whole. They were generally drawn from the member of the founding families, or from the '*Brahmins*' and superior cultivators. Under the Mughal Empire, the Villages were allowed to manage their own internal affairs in the ancient manner. Rural Local Self-Government continued to function without Governmental

---

<sup>1</sup> Maheshwari, S.R., *Local Government in India*, (2009) Published by: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Anupam Plaza, Block No. 50, Sanjay Place, Agra-282002, p-11.

<sup>2</sup> Singh, Sahib & Sing, Swinder., *Local Government in India – A study in Rural & Urban Development Administration* (2007), New Academic Publishing Co. Mai Hiran Gate, Jalandhar-144008, p-57.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*,

interference.<sup>4</sup> Mughals incorporated the Village into the administration as a unit for revenue and policing purposes only. The State dealt grassroot administration through the Headman or '*Muqaddam*' who was held responsible for the maintenance of law and order and the restitution of theft within the area of his authority. Another prominent writing about the life in the ideal Village includes the description by Sir Charles Metcalfe who referred to them as the 'Little Republics.'<sup>5</sup>

## **II. Urban Local Self-Government during the British Period**

The origin of Municipal Administration in India dates back to 1687 when a Municipal Corporation was set up in Madras, under a Charter Act passed by James II, the then British Monarch. It was modelled after similar institutions then in vogue in Britain and clothed with authority to levy specific taxes. The corporation consisted of 1(one) Mayor, 12(twelve) Eldermen and 60(sixty) Burgesses, who were appointed from the Europeans living in India. It was constituted to pass on a part of the financial burden of administration to the people.<sup>6</sup>

Following the setting up of the Corporation, there was resistance among people to pay taxes. Ultimately in 1726, the Corporation was replaced by a 'Mayor's Court' which had some judicial rather than administrative powers. A statutory status was not provided to the Local Self-Governments in India until 1793, when a Charter Act was passed and subsequently 'Justices of Peace' were appointed to look after Municipal Administration in the Presidency Towns of Madras, Calcutta and Bombay. Later, in 1814, 'Ward Committees' were set up in some other big cities. In 1842, the Bengal Act was also passed to set up 'Town Committees' for sanitary purposes. But, it was difficult for the people to accept this Act as it involved direct taxation.<sup>7</sup> With the passage of time, in 1850 to be precise, an Act was passed with the provisions of indirect taxation for the whole country. Following this Act, the Local Self-Government system received a boost in Bombay, and the United Provinces (UP) State

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p-58.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p-59

only while in other provinces, Voluntary Committees continued looking after the sanitation etc.<sup>8</sup>

As a result of the proposals of Financial Decentralisation and the creation of Provincial Legislatures, Lt. Governor of Punjab, Sir Robert Montgomery, issued a Resolution in 1862 for the creation of Municipal Committees to be composed of citizens chosen by Trade Panchayats or selected for their public spirit. In 1864, of the 49 Municipal Committees in Punjab, Trade or Caste Panchayats elected 28.<sup>9</sup>

**(a) Lord Mayo's Resolution of 1870**

In 1870, Lord Mayo declared the policy of Financial Decentralisation, which stressed the need of associating Indians in administration, decentralisation of certain responsibilities to the Provinces and strengthening of Municipal Government for this purpose. The motive that figured largest in Mayo's Resolution was, however, again that of Finance. The proposed remedy was to endow the Provinces with a share of the revenues, and to make them responsible for education, roads, and medical services. In turn, Local Authorities were to be liberalised and to accept enlarged responsibilities.<sup>10</sup>

**(b) Lord Ripon**

Lord Ripon, the erstwhile Governor General, and the Viceroy of India (1880-1884), pioneered modern Local Self-Government in India. He sought to revolutionise the basic approach to Local Self-Government. The visionary Viceroy deprecated the earlier approach and, instead, advocated the extension of the Local Self-Government, primarily as an institution of political and popular education. He thought of the application of local knowledge and interest to local administration.<sup>11</sup> On May 18<sup>th</sup> 1882, Lord Ripon's Government issued the historic Resolution on Local Self-Government. This Resolution is regarded today as a landmark in the development of

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p-58.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>11</sup> Bhattacharya. M., - *Management of Urban Government in India, 1976*. Published by B.S. Uppal, and Printed at Central Electric Press, 80-D, Kamla Nagar. Delhi-110,007. p-4.

Local Self-Government in India and its founder, therefore, as the Father of Local Self-Government. The main recommendations of Ripon's Resolution are as follows:<sup>12</sup>

- (i) That a network of Local Boards be spread throughout the country and the area of jurisdiction of every Local Board should be so small that both local knowledge and local interest on the part of the members of the Board could be secured.
- (ii) The number of non-officials was to be very large. The official element was not to exceed one-third of the whole.
- (iii) As far as practicable, the Local Governments were to introduce elections for the members of the Local Boards.
- (iv) That Boards should be entrusted not merely with expenditure of fixed allotment of funds but also with the management of local sources of revenue.
- (v) Non-Official Chairman, whose election should be subject to the approval of the Provincial Government, should be introduced.
- (vi) The District Engineer should help the local bodies in their work of supervision and maintenance of buildings. He should work as their servant and not as their master.
- (vii) The affixation of courtesy titles to the names of non-officials should be fixed with a view to giving them pride in local service and attracting more men with deep sense of responsibility.
- (viii) That the control should be exercised from within rather than from without. The Government should "revise and check the acts of the Local Bodies that dictate them." The control over Local Bodies was to be exercised in two ways -

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p-59.

- (a) Sanction of the Government was made necessary to legalise certain actions of the Local Boards, e.g., raising loans, levying taxes, etc.
- (b) Resolutions or proceedings of the Local Bodies could be set aside by the Government in certain particular or more appropriately, critical circumstances.
- (ix) The power of absolute suppression was to be exercised only with the consent of the Government of India. A general principle of guidance was put in these words: “It should be the general function of the Executive Officers of Government to watch, especially at the outset, the proceedings of the Local Boards, to point out to them matters calling for their consideration, to draw their attention to any neglect of duty on their part and to check, by official remonstrance, any attempt to exceed proper functions or to act illegally or in any arbitrary or unreasonable manner.”
- (x) The implementation of the recommendations should be according to local conditions.<sup>13</sup>

Lord Ripon’s Resolution was the first sincere effort to indianise the Local Self-Government by the imperialist. K.M. Pannikar remarks that, “Lord Ripon’s reform of Local Self-Government laid the basis of Local and Municipal Self-Government which soon took firm roots in India and became the ground work of democratic institutions in higher spheres. The resolution put forward the cases for the expansion of Local Self-Government in a very convincing manner.”<sup>14</sup>

A significant development since Ripon’s resolution came up in the year 1907, when pressure by the rising discontent among the Indian masses led the Britishers to appoint the Royal Commission on Decentralisation. The Commission presided over

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p-59.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p- 60.

by C.E.H. Hobhouse, submitted its Report in 1909. The Commission rectified a significant omission by Ripon regarding the strengthening of Village Panchayats.<sup>15</sup>

**(c) The Government of India Acts 1919 and 1935**

With the passing of the Government of India Act 1919, Local Self-Government was transferred to Indian Ministers who were anxious to make the pattern of Local Self-Government more effective. To them fell the task of implementing the Resolution, as they deemed proper. A number of Acts were passed by the Provincial Legislative Councils between 1921 and 1926. The overall growth of Local Self-Government up to 1935 was not much encouraging for the Urban Areas as opposed to the rural areas, on account of taxation problems in Urban Areas.<sup>16</sup>

Next phase of the growth of Local Self-Government in India is marked by the Government of India Act, 1935. This Act pushed the process of democratisation of the Government and Administration further. It replaced the diarchy system in the Provincial Government by Provincial Autonomy. Whatever hurdles stood in the way of development of Local Self-Government institutions were thus removed, and different Provincial Governments enacted fresh legislations to this effect. The component of nomination in legislation was completely done away with and the financial position of Local Bodies was strengthened. However, the latest Act created confusion in the sphere of taxation between the Local Bodies and the Provincial Government and created new problems concerning the devising of an adequate system of Local Taxation and Local Finance. Thus, the last opportunity offered by the Government of India Act, 1935 was too short-lived since the subsequent years were wholly devoted to a keen struggle for freedom by those Indians looking forward to a better self-governance. Whatever efforts being made towards the growth of Local Self-Government institutions came to a halt with the outbreak of the Second World War and the resignation of popular ministries in all the Congress dominated Provinces. The Governors assumed entire responsibility for the administration of their provinces and continued to do so until 1946.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p-62.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p-63.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p-64.

### III. Post-Independence Period

The independence of the country in 1947 ushered in a new period in the history of Local Self-Government in India. With the termination of alien rule, there was Self-Government at all the levels – Central, Provincial, and Local. In 1948, the Ministers of Local Self-Government in the Provinces met under the Chairmanship of the Central Minister for Health Smt. Amrit Kaur. This was the first meeting of its kind. Smt. Amrit Kaur, the Minister for Health, and Chairman of the Conference, observed: “I believe this is the first time that the Government of India has called a conference... Apparently, no conference of those responsible for Local Self-Government has been called so far... I felt it would be definitely beneficial if a forum could be provided where those responsible for this important arm of the administration all over India could meet together periodically, exchange ideas, and discuss problems of common interest.”<sup>18</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru, in his inaugural address, elucidated the significance of Local Self-Government in free India in the following words: “Local Self-Government is and must be the basis of any true system of democracy. We have rather into the habit of thinking of democracy at the top and not so much below. Democracy at the top may not be a success unless you build on this foundation from below.”<sup>19</sup> Subsequently, political leaders and legislators lost no time to process democracy from the grassroot level. The dream became true after the Constitution of India was enforced in 1950 and Village Panchayat clause was enshrined in Article 40.

The onward journey of Local Self-Government is marked by the appointment of a number of Commissions, Committees, or Conferences. In 1949, the Local Finance Enquiry Committee was appointed to look into the financial position of the Local Bodies and to give suggestions for improvement of the same. Having a broader perspective, the Committee recommended that the overall transfer of functions from Local Bodies to the State Government was a retrograde step and should be avoided.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, the Taxation Enquiry Commission, appointed by the Government of India, published its report in 1954, made some important observations regarding

---

<sup>18</sup> *Op.cit.*, Maheshwari, S.R., p-22.

<sup>19</sup> *Op.cit.*, Singh, Sahib & Sing, Swinder, p-65.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*,

the set-up and finances of Rural Local Bodies. Other important Committees appointed from time to time to enquire into the working of Local Self-Government and to make recommendations for their improvement. These include (i) Committee on Training of Municipal Employees, 1963; (ii) Committee of Ministers on Augmentation of Financial Resources of Urban Local Bodies, 1963; (iii) Rural-Urban Relationship Committee, 1966; (iv) Committee on the Service Conditions of the Municipal Employees, 1968, and so on. Apart from these, various State Governments also appointed a good number of Committees on similar lines.<sup>21</sup>

With the setting up of the Planning Commission in 1950, the era of planning socio-economic development started in India. The First Five Years Plan document Stated that, “The Panchayat as an institution has not yet become the instrument of Village reconstruction and development which it was intended to be... it is believed that it would be able to perform its civic functions satisfactorily only if the Panchayats are associated with an active process of development, in which the Village Panchayat itself is given an effective part.”<sup>22</sup> The point was emphasized in the Second Five Year Plan, which called specifically for a “well organised democratic structure of administration within the District” in order to evoke popular initiative and participation.<sup>23</sup>

The Community Development Programme (CDP) was launched on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 1952, to synchronous with the birth anniversary of Mahatma Gandhi, for integrated Rural Development.<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, the National Extension Service (NES) was also introduced in October 1953 with a view to extending the coverage of assistance to a greater number of rural communities. Towards the end of the First Plan period, it was found that CDP and NES had not succeeded in getting the participation of the people, which was one of the most essential requirements.<sup>25</sup> So, the Government appointed a Committee headed by Balwantrai Mehta in January 1957 to

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p-66.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>24</sup> Avasthi & Avasthi, *Indian Administration* (1997-98), Published by Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Hospital Road, Agra-3, p-548.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p-549.



review the working of the Community Development Programme and National Extension Service, popularly known as the Balwantrao Mehta Committee.<sup>26</sup>

This Committee was also responsible to examine the question of reorganisation of the District administration by providing for the association of popular organisations at the Village and the State level. The Committee submitted its report in the same year.<sup>27</sup> The recommendations of this Committee were accepted by the National Development Council (NDC) in January 1959, which includes a scheme of 'Democratic decentralisation' with a three tier structure of Local Bodies, namely, the directly elected Panchayat at the Village Level, the Panchayat Samiti at the Block Level and the Zila Parishad at the District Level.<sup>28</sup>

Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh were the first States to adopt the Panchayat form of Rural Local Self-Government in 1959. These were joined by other States in due course.<sup>29</sup> In December 1977, the Janata Government at the Centre appointed a Committee, under the Chairmanship of Ashok Mehta, to review the working of the Panchayati Raj set-up and recommend remedial measures.<sup>30</sup> Along with many other Reforms, the Committee recommended two-tier system of Panchayati Raj, in the place of existing three-tier with Zila Parishad as Executive Body at District Level and below it Mandal Panchayat constituted by grouping of a number of Villages and having a population of 15,000 to 20,000 etc.<sup>31</sup>

In 1984, the Planning Commission set up a 12(twelve) member Committee under the Chairmanship of G.V.K. Rao for reviewing the administrative arrangements for rural development and poverty alleviation programmes. The Government of India appointed another Committee during 1986 – 87 under the Chairmanship of eminent Jurist, L.M. Singhvi, to review the functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions. Similarly, Sarkaria Commission on Centre-State Relations (1988) too observed that most of the Local Self-Governing bodies were not functioning efficiently and

---

<sup>26</sup> Avasthi & Maheshwari, *Public Administration* (1997), Published by Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Hospital Road, Agra-3, p-168.

<sup>27</sup> *Op.cit.*, Avasthi & Avasthi, p-549.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p-550.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p-552.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*,

effectively. A Sub-Committee of Parliamentary Consultative Committee attached to the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances, and Pensions was also set up under the Chairmanship of P.K. Thungon (1988) to give exhaustive recommendations on this account.<sup>32</sup> Though many efforts were given by the Government for participative model of the Rural Administration, it took an Act of Parliament (the 64<sup>th</sup> Constitution Amendment Bill on Local Self-Government on May 15, 1989) to guarantee concrete measures were taken through Constitutional sanction on Panchayati Raj. The Bill was passed by the Lok Sabha, but sadly, it failed to go through the Rajya Sabha.<sup>33</sup>

In 1990, the issues relating to strengthening of the Panchayati Raj Institutions were considered afresh by the Cabinet Committee set up for this purpose. It was brought up before a Conference of Chief Ministers held in June 1990, presided over by the then Prime Minister Shri V.P. Singh.<sup>34</sup> The Chief Ministers' Conference endorsed the proposals for the introduction of a new Constitutional Amendment Bill. The Cabinet approved the Amendment Bill and Model Guidelines in July 1990. The Constitution Amendment Bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha on 7<sup>th</sup> September 1990, but could not be taken up as political changes took place leading to the dissolution of the Lok Sabha. Finally, the Central Government headed by Narasimha Rao was successful in enacting 'The Constitution 73rd Amendment Act, 1992 on Panchayats and The Constitution 74th Amendment Act, 1992 on Municipalities.'<sup>35</sup> This 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment Act (CAA) exhibited the beginning of Local Self-Government under adequate legal sanction in India.<sup>36</sup>

#### **IV. 74th Constitutional Amendment Act (CAA), 1992**

The development of Urban Local Self-Government, as compared to that of Rural Local Self-Government, has been very slow after independence. The first two Plans did not carry much for the improvement of Urban Local Bodies. It was only at the end of the Second Plan that the planners focused their attention on the Urban Local Bodies. In the Third Plan, it was suggested strengthening the Municipal

---

<sup>32</sup> *Op.cit.*, Singh, Sahib & Sing, Swinder, p-71.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>34</sup> [www.pmindia.gov.in](http://www.pmindia.gov.in)

<sup>35</sup> Basu, Durga Das., - *Constitutional Law of India- 7<sup>th</sup> Edition*, (2005) Published by Wadhwa & Co. Law Publishers, Agra, p-157.

<sup>36</sup> *Op.cit.*, Singh, Sahib & Sing, Swinder, p-72.

Administration by the way of better Personnel and Finances and by enlarging their jurisdiction and functions. It was also suggested to cover all the Towns and Cities having a population of over one lakh under the scheme of planning in an organic way.<sup>37</sup>

Local Self-Government is a State subject with the Constitution recognising that Local Self-Government institutions are an essential part of the National Government (Article 12).<sup>38</sup> When the Constitution of India was inaugurated on 26<sup>th</sup> January 1950, neither the details of Urban Administration nor Management of Urban Areas was incorporated. Entry 5 of List-II of the State List simply enshrines that

*“Local Government, that is to say, the constitution and powers of municipal corporations, improvement trusts, District boards, mining settlement authorities and other local authorities for the purpose of Local Self - Government or Village administration.”*<sup>39</sup>

Different States Assembly made legislations for their Urban Administration by adopting different systems with their own terms. However, the 74th CAA solved the long pending problems by elaborating uniform urban mechanism in India. This Amendment Act added a new Part - IXA (Article 243-P to 243-ZG) to the Constitution of India and its legitimate powers are enshrined in Twelfth Schedule of the Constitution.<sup>40</sup> Salient features of the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act are:

**(i) Constitution of Municipalities-** It provides for the constitution of 3 types of Municipalities depending upon the size and area namely (i) a Nagar Panchayat – (by whatever name called) for a transitional area, that is to say, an area in transition from a Rural area to an Urban area; (ii) a Municipal Council - for smaller Urban area; and (iii) a Municipal Corporation - for a larger Urban area.

**(ii) Composition of Municipalities-** All seats shall be filled by direct elections. The Legislature of a State may, by law, provide for the representation in a

---

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p-73.

<sup>38</sup> Datta, Abhijit, - *Municipal and Urban India (Selection from NAGARLOK)-1980*, Pauls Press, Naraina Phase-I, New Delhi-110,028, p-76.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p-1079.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p-704.

Municipality, like, persons having special knowledge or experience in Municipal administration, the members of the House of the People and the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State representing constituencies which comprise wholly or partly of the Municipal area; the Members of the Council of States and the Members of the Legislative Council of the State registered as electors within the municipal area. The manner of election of Chairperson of Municipalities has been left to be specified by the State Legislature.<sup>41</sup>

**(iii) Constitution of Wards Committees-** The Act provides for the constitution of Ward Committees, consisting of one or more wards, within the territorial area of a Municipality, with a population of 3 lakhs or more.<sup>42</sup>

**(iv) Reservation of seats-** In order to provide for adequate representation of Scheduled Caste/ Scheduled Tribe (SC/ST) and of women in the Municipal Bodies, provisions have been made for reservation of seats in every Municipality. The proportion of seats to be reserved for SC/ST to the total number of seats shall be the same as the proportion of the population of SC/ST in the municipal area. The reservation would be made in respect of seats to be filled by direct elections only. Not less than one-third of the total number of seats reserved for SC/ST shall be reserved for women belonging to SC/ST. This is a mandatory provision. In respect of women, the seats shall be reserved to the extent of not less than one-third of the total number of seats. This includes seats reserved for women belonging to SC/ST. These reservations will apply for direct election only. This is also a mandatory provision. Under the optional provision, there will be no bar on State Legislatures from making provisions for reservation of seats in any Municipality or office of Chairperson in the Municipalities in favour of backward classes of the citizens.<sup>43</sup>

**(v) Duration of Municipalities-** The Municipality has a fixed term of 5(five) years from the date appointed for its first meeting. Election to constitute new body of Municipality is to be completed before the expiration of the duration of the Municipality. If the Municipality is dissolve before the expiry of five years, the

---

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p-705.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p-706.

election for constituting a new Municipality is required to be completed within a period of 6(six) months from the date of its dissolution.<sup>44</sup>

**(vi) Powers and Functions of the Municipalities-** All Municipalities would be empowered with such powers and responsibilities as may be necessary to enable them to function as effective institutions of Self-Government. The State Legislature may, by law, specify the powers and responsibilities that would be given to the Municipalities in respect of preparation of plans for economic development and social justice and for the implementation of schemes as may be entrusted to them. An illustrative list of functions that may be entrusted to the Municipalities has been incorporated at the Twelfth Schedule of the Constitution.

**(vii) Finances of Municipalities-** It have been left to the Legislature of a State to specify by law matters relating to imposition of taxes, such as:

- (1) Taxes, duties, fees, etc., shall be levied and collected by the Municipalities, and the procedures to be laid in the State Law;
- (2) Taxes, duties, fees, etc., which would be levied and collected by the State Government and a share passed on to the Municipalities;
- (3) Grant-in-aid that would be given to the Municipalities from the State;
- (4) Constitution of funds for crediting and withdrawal of moneys by the Municipality.

**(viii) Finance Commission-** The Finance Commission constituted under Article 243-I to review the financial positions of Panchayati Raj Institutions shall also review the financial position of the Municipalities and will make recommendations to the Governor. The recommendations of the Finance Commission will cover the following.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p-708.

- (i) Distribution between the State Government and Municipalities of the net proceeds of the taxes, duties, tolls and fees leviable by the State;
- (ii) Allocation of share of such proceeds between the Municipalities at all levels in the State;
- (iii) Determination of taxes, duties, tolls and fees to be assigned or appropriated by the Municipalities;
- (iv) Grants-in-aid to Municipalities from the Consolidated Fund of the State;
- (v) Measures needed to improve the financial position of the Municipalities.
- (vi) Any other matters referred to them by the Governor in the interests of sound finance of the Municipalities.<sup>46</sup>

**(ix) Election to Municipalities-** The superintendence, direction, and control of the preparation of the electoral rolls for, and the conduct of, all elections to the Panchayats and Municipalities shall be vested in the State Election Commission.<sup>47</sup>

**(x) Audit and Accounts-** The maintenance of the Accounts of the Municipalities and other audit shall be done in accordance with the provisions of the State law. The State Legislatures will be free to make appropriate provisions in this regards, depending upon the local needs and institutional framework available for this purpose.<sup>48</sup>

**(xi) Committee for District Planning-** There shall be constituted in every State at the District level a District Planning Committee to consolidate the plans prepared by the Panchayats and the Municipalities in the District and to prepare a Draft Development Plan for the District as a whole.<sup>49</sup> Provision has, therefore, been

---

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p-700.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p-701.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p-708.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p-709.

made for the constitution of a Planning Committee at the District level with a view to consolidating the plans prepared by the Panchayats and the Municipalities and preparing a Development Plan for the District as a whole. The District Planning Committee in preparing the Draft Development Plan shall have regard to:<sup>50</sup>

- (1) Matter of common interest between the Panchayats and the Municipalities including spatial planning;
- (2) Sharing of water and other physical and natural resources;
- (3) Integrated development of infrastructure and environment conservation;
- (4) Extent and type of available resources, whether financial or otherwise;

(xii) **Metropolitan Planning Committees-** It is provided in Article 243-ZE of the Constitution that there shall be constituted in every Metropolitan area a Metropolitan Planning Committee to prepare a Draft Development Plan for the Metropolitan area as a whole.<sup>51</sup> The Metropolitan Planning Committee shall take into account the followings for preparation of the Draft Development Plan:

- (1) The plans prepared by the Municipalities and the Panchayats in the Metropolitan area;
- (2) Matters of common interest between the Municipalities and the Panchayats including coordinated spatial plans of the area; Sharing of water and other physical and natural resources; the Integrated development of infrastructure and environmental conservation;
- (5) The overall objectives and priorities set by the Government of India and the Government of the State;

---

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p-710.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*,

- (6) The extent and nature of investments likely to be made in the metropolitan area by agencies of the Government;
- (7) To consult such institutions and organisations as the Governor may, by order, specify.

**(xiii) Bar to interference by courts in electoral matters:** - The validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies or the allotment of seats to such constituencies, made or purporting to be made shall not be called in question in any Court. Besides, no election to any Municipality shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority.<sup>52</sup>

**(xiv) Part not to apply to certain areas:** - Under Article 243-ZC of the Constitution, nothing in this part shall apply to Scheduled Areas referred to in clause (1), and the Tribal Areas referred to in clause (2) of Article 244. However, Parliament may by law, extend the provisions of Part IXA to these areas, subject to such exceptions and modifications as may be specified in that law.<sup>53</sup>

The elected Municipal representatives shall have a decisive role in the planning, provision and delivery of civic infrastructure and services. The Act also stipulates that if the State Government dissolves a Municipality, election to the same should be held within a period of six months. Newly elected members would serve for the remaining period of five years, on the other hand, election may not be required if the remaining Municipal period is less than six months to the date of dissolution.

After the implementation of the Constitution 74th Amendment Act in June 1993, many new Urban Local Self-Governments were inaugurated while ongoing institutions were renovated to synchronise with the new provisions embodied by the amendment of 1992. Citizens were looking for decentralisation of decision-making process, as a result of which the Local Self-Government came to the limelight. Somehow, the State Governments also took steps for decentralisation of more powers to the people through the Local Self-Government.

---

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p-711.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p-709.



## V. Trend of increase in the number of Urban Local Self-Governments after Independence

In 1947, there were only 3(three) Municipal Corporations, which were established in the Metropolitan Cities of Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. By 1975, the number rose to 34 (thirty-four) and up to 1986, the number had risen to 68 (sixty-eight) Municipal Corporations.<sup>54</sup> According to the 1981 Census, Urban India comprises 4,029 Towns and in 1991 India had 4,489 Towns.<sup>55</sup> The number of Urban Local Self-Governments has been increasing as a result of increase in Urban and Suburban population. The following Table (2.1) shows the number and various forms of Urban Governance:

**Table – 2.1**  
**Forms of Urban Local Government<sup>56</sup>**

Sl. No.	Form of Urban Local Government	No. in 1968	No. in 1971	No. in 1987	No. in 1990
1.	Municipal Corporations	30	34	73	73
2.	Municipal Councils	1,473	1,493	1,745	1,770
3.	Notified Area Committees	115	202	-	717
4.	Town Area Committees	385	385	-	229
5.	Cantonment Boards	59	58	62	62
6.	Townships	-	-	-	-

As portrayed by the above Table (2.1), there were 30 Municipal Corporations in India in 1968. Among other Local Bodies, 1,473 Municipal Councils, 115 Notified Area Committees, 385 Town Area Committees, and 59 Cantonment Boards were to be found in the same year, i.e., 1968. However, Urban Local Bodies had increased to a very high number in 1990. There were 73 Municipal Corporations, 1,770 Municipal

<sup>54</sup> *Op.cit.*, Avasthi & Avasthi, p-549.

<sup>55</sup> *Op.cit.*, Maheshwari, p-199.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p-200.

Councils, 717 Notified Area Committees, 229 Town Area Committees, and 62 Cantonment Boards respectively.<sup>57</sup>

**Table - 2.2**  
**State-wise Data on Number of Urban Local Bodies in India**  
(As on Oct. 2004)<sup>58</sup>

		Number of Urban Local Bodies			
		Municipal Corporation	Municipal Council	Nagar Panchayat	Total
1	Andhra Pradesh	8	108	1	117
2	Arunachal Pradesh	0	0	0	0
3	Assam	1	29	55	85
4	Bihar	5	32	80	117
5	Chhatisgarh	10	28	72	110
6	Delhi	1	1	0	2
7	Goa	1	12	0	13
8	Gujarat	6	143	0	149
9	Haryana	1	24	43	68
10	Himachal Pradesh	1	20	28	49
11	Jharkhand	1	20	22	43
12	Karnataka	6	123	93	222
13	Kerala	5	53	0	58
14	Madhya Pradesh	14	48	48	110
15	Maharashtra	22	225	0	247
16	Manipur	0	7	20	27
17	Meghalaya	0	0	0	0
18	Mizoram	0	0	0	0
19	Nagaland	0	3	16	19
20	Orissa	2	35	66	103
21	Punjab	5	97	31	133
22	Rajasthan	3	11	169	183
23	Sikkim	0	0	8	8
24	Tamil Nadu	6	151	0	157
25	Tripura	0	1	12	13
26	Uttaranchal	1	31	31	63
27	Uttar Pradesh	12	194	422	628
28	West Bengal	6	117	3	126
	<b>Total</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>1,513</b>	<b>1,220</b>	<b>2,850</b>

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>58</sup> Mathur, M.P., *Impact of the Constitution (74th) Amendment Act on the Urban Local Bodies: A Review*, (Coordinator- National Institute of Urban Affairs), New Delhi 110,003, p-5.

There was a steady increase of Urban Local Self-Government in India. The State-wise numbers of different Urban Local Bodies were shown in Table (2.2). This Table unveiled the numbers of Municipal Corporations (MCs) in different States. There were 7(seven) MCs in Andhra Pradesh; 1(one) MCs each in Assam, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Uttaranchal and Chandigarh; 5(five) MCs each in Bihar and Kerala. Chhatisgarh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal has 6(six) each, 14(fourteen) in Madhya Pradesh, 19(nineteen) in Maharashtra, 2(two) in Orissa, 4(four) in Punjab, 3(three) in Rajasthan, 11(eleven) in Uttar Pradesh and 1(one) MCs in the National Capital of Delhi respectively.<sup>59</sup>

As revealed in the Table (2.2), there were 2,850 Urban Local Bodies of different kinds in India (excluding Union Territories). Out of these, 117 are Municipal Corporations, 1,513 Municipal Councils, and 1,220 Nagar Panchayats. Maharashtra State has the highest number of both Municipal Corporations and Municipal Councils. It may be pertinent to point out that Maharashtra surprisingly does not have any Nagar Panchayat. Maharashtra was followed by Madhya Pradesh with 14 Corporations, Uttar Pradesh with 12 Corporations and Chhatisgarh with 10 Corporations each. As far as Urban Local Self Government is concerned, Uttar Pradesh tops the total number of urban mechanism with 628 Urban Local Bodies, followed by Maharashtra with 247 and Karnataka with 222 Local Bodies respectively.

---

<sup>59</sup> *Op.cit.*, Maheshwari, S.R., p-243.

**CHAPTER – III**  
**IMPACT OF THE 74th CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT ACT IN**  
**THE NORTH EASTERN STATES OF INDIA**

## CHAPTER – III

### IMPACT OF THE 74th CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT ACT IN THE NORTH EASTERN STATES OF INDIA

#### I. Urban Profile of North Eastern Region

The North East India has three distinct regions: Assam Valley, Puruvanchal and Meghalaya – Mikir region.<sup>1</sup> The Northeast region of India comprising the States of Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Meghalaya, Manipur, Tripura, Mizoram, Nagaland and Sikkim, can be physiographically categorised into the Eastern Himalayas, Northeast Hills (Patkai-Naga Hills and Lushai Hills) and the Brahmaputra and Barak Valley plains.<sup>2</sup> Together, the eight States located in India's North - East cover an area of 2,62,179 Sq. km., constituting 7.9 percent of the Country's total geographical area, but having only 39 million people or about 3.8 percent of the total population of the Country.

Over 68 per cent of the population of the region live in the State of Assam alone. The density of population varies from 13 per Sq. km. in Arunachal Pradesh to 340 per Sq. Km. in Assam. The predominantly hilly terrain in all the States except Assam is host to an overwhelming proportion of tribal population ranging from 19.3 per cent in Assam to 94.5 percent in Mizoram. The region has over 160 Scheduled Tribes, over 400 other Tribal, Sub-tribal Communities, and Groups. It is predominantly rural with over 84 percent of the population living in the Countryside.<sup>3</sup>

As shown in Table (3.1), the aggregate urban population of the eight North Eastern State is 15.66 percent while the rural area is 84.34 percent. In other words, the area of North-East Region has 60, 86,613 urban population and the rural population is 32,771,156. Among the North East States, Mizoram has the highest percent of urban population at 49.63% while Sikkim has the lowest at 11.07% only. With regard to

---

<sup>1</sup> Rao, V.V., *A Century of Tribal Politics in North-East India 1874-1974*. (1976), S.Chand & Co., Ltd., New Delhi 110055, p-1.

<sup>2</sup> Chatterjee Sudipto & Saikia, Abhinandan, *et.al.*, *Background Paper on Biodiversity Significance of North East India*, 30<sup>th</sup> June 2006, WWF-India, 172-B Lodi Estate, New Delhi 110003, p-4

<sup>3</sup> North Eastern Region Vision, 2020, Ministry of DoNER & North Eastern Council, p-6.

urban population in other States, Assam has 12.90 percent, Tripura 17.06 percent, Nagaland 17.23 percent, Meghalaya 19.58 percent, Arunachal Pradesh 20.75 percent and Manipur 26.28 percent respectively. <sup>4</sup>

**Table - 3.1**  
**Population of all the 8 North Eastern States<sup>5</sup>**

State	Population	Males	Females	Rural	Urban	% age of Urban Populn.	% age of Rural Populn.
Arunachal Pradesh	10,97,968	5,79,941	5,18,027	8,70,087	2,27,881	20.75	79.25
Assam	2,66,55,528	1,37,77,037	1,28,78,491	2,32,16,288	34,39,240	12.90	87.10
Manipur*	21,66,788	10,95,634	10,71,154	15,90,820	5,75,968	26.28	73.42
Meghalaya	23,18,822	17,76,087	11,42,735	18,64,711	4,54,111	19.58	80.42
Mizoram	8,88,573	4,59,109	4,29,464	4,47,567	4,41,006	49.63	50.37
Nagaland	19,90,036	10,47,141	9,42,895	16,47,249	3,42,787	17.23	82.77
Sikkim	5,40,851	2,88,454	2,52,367	4,80,981	59,870	11.07	88.93
Tripura	31,99,203	16,42,225	15,56,978	26,53,453	5,45,750	17.06	82.94
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,88,57,769</b>	<b>2,00,65,658</b>	<b>1,87,92,111</b>	<b>3,27,71,156</b>	<b>60,86,613</b>	<b>15.66</b>	<b>84.34</b>

(\* Including estimate population of Mao, Maram, and Paomata of Purul Sub-Division in Manipur)

## II. 74th Constitution Amendment Act, 1992

The Constitution of India has made detailed provisions for ensuring protection of democracy in Parliament and in State Legislatures. However, the Constitution did not make Local Self-Government in Urban Areas as a clear-cut Constitutional obligation. While the Directive Principles of State Policy refer to Village Panchayats, there is no any specific reference to Municipalities except implicitly in Entry-5 of the State List, which places the subject of Local Self- Government as a responsibility of the State.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Census of India 2001, *Basic Statistics of NER 2006*, From: [www.nedfi.com](http://www.nedfi.com).

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>6</sup> Government of India, *Ministry of Urban Development*, From: [www.urbanindia.nic.in](http://www.urbanindia.nic.in)

Because of the inadequacy of Constitutional provision for Local Self-Government, Municipal Bodies were frequently suspended and superseded for other matters for indefinite periods. Frequent and indefinite suspensions or supersessions of Municipal Governments gradually eroded the very basis of Local Self-Government that had a negative effect on democracy at the grassroot levels. The general position of the Municipal Bodies with regard to their financial resources was also not satisfactory. Over the years, there was a steady encroachment on the assigned functions and revenues of Urban Local Bodies by specialised agencies of the State Governments. As a result, many Urban Local Bodies became weaker and were not able to perform their functions effectively. The weakened status of Urban Local Bodies crystallized the need for a Constitutional guarantee to safeguard the interests of Urban Local Bodies in order to provide for -

- (1) Regular and fair conduct of elections to these bodies;
  - (2) Holding of elections within a specified time limit in case of supersession;
  - (3) Adequate representation of SC/ST and women in the elected bodies;
  - (4) Placing on firm footing the relationship between the State Governments and the urban local bodies with respect to:
    - (a) functions and taxation powers of the urban local bodies;
    - (b) arrangement for revenue sharing between the State Government and the urban local bodies;
    - (c) Involvement of elected representatives at grassroot level in planning at the Districts and metropolitan levels.<sup>7</sup>
- (iii) In many States, Local Bodies have become weak and ineffective on account of a variety of reasons, including the failure to hold regular elections, prolonged supersessions and inadequate devolution of powers and functions. As a result, Urban Local Bodies are unable to function effectively as vibrant democratic units of Self-Government.

The Constitution 73rd Amendment Bill was introduced in the Parliament in 1991, which was referred to the Joint Parliamentary Committee comprising of

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.,

Members from both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha for consideration.<sup>8</sup> The Bill as reported by the Joint Parliamentary Committee(JPC) was taken up for consideration and passed by the Lok Sabha on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 1992 and by the Rajya Sabha on 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 1992 and it received the assent of the President on 20<sup>th</sup> April, 1993. The Act was then published in the Government Gazette on 20<sup>th</sup> April 1993 as the “Constitution (Seventy Forth Amendment) Act, 1992.” This Amendment Act came into force on 1<sup>st</sup> June 1993.<sup>9</sup>

The Statement of Objects and Reasons for introduction of the Bills of 74th Constitution Amendment Act stated that in many States, Local Bodies have been found weak and ineffective on account of a variety of reasons. This includes the failure to hold regular election, prolonged supersessions, and inadequate devolution of powers and functions. As a result, urban local bodies are not able to perform effectively as vibrant democratic units of self Government.

Having regards to the above inadequacies, it is considered necessary to incorporate in the Constitution provisions relating to Urban Local Bodies for –

- (i) putting on a firmer footing the relationship between the state government and the urban local bodies with respect to (a) the functions and taxation powers and (b) arrangements for revenue sharing;
- (ii) ensuring regular conduct of elections;
- (iii) ensuring timely elections in the case of supersessions; and
- (iv) providing adequate representation for the weaker sections like Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes (ST) and Women.

To synchronise with the 43<sup>rd</sup> Year of the Republic of India, the 74th Amendment Act of 1992 inserted a new Part, Part - IXA (Municipalities), after Part – IX, and the 12<sup>th</sup> Schedule to the Constitution of India. Addition of these two clauses in the Constitution deals with the subject relating to Municipalities.

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.,



Provisions relating to Urban Local Self-Government are incorporated in between Article 243-P to 243-ZG of the Constitution, which include functions exercisable by Urban Local Bodies (Article 243). Article 243 P (c) States that “Municipality means an institution of Self-government constituted under Article 243-Q.” The same Article authorised the Government to constitute three types of Municipalities, such as (a) Nagar Panchayat (by whatever name called) for a Transitional Area i.e., an area in transition from a rural to an urban area, (b) a Municipal Council, for a smaller urban area; and (c) Municipal Corporation for a larger urban area.<sup>10</sup> However, Municipality may not be constituted in such area or part thereof, as the Governor may specify to be an industrial Township. In regards to the meaning of transitional area, smaller urban area or a larger urban area, the Governor may specify, through Public Notification, as he thinks is necessary. In other words, the Governor may notify whether the inhabited area or areas are transitioning from rural to urban, or whether it encompasses the criteria for smaller urban area or larger urban area.

Seats shall be reserved for the Scheduled Castes (SC) and the Scheduled Tribes (ST) in every Municipality and the number of seats so reserved shall bear, as nearly as may be, the same proportion to the total number of seats to be filled by direct election in that Municipality. As the population of the SC/ST in the Municipal area, bears to the total population of that area, and such seats may be allotted by rotation to different constituencies in a Municipality.<sup>11</sup> All the seats in a Municipality shall be filled by persons chosen by direct election from the territorial constituencies in the Municipal area, and the tenure shall be five years from the date appointed for its first meeting. The State Government can dissolve it before the expiry of five years provided that a Municipality shall be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard before its dissolution. Seat reservations should be given to SC and ST in every Municipality in the same proportion to the total number of seats to be filled by direct election.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Singh, Mahendra. P., *V.N. Shukla's Constitution of India* (2010) 11<sup>th</sup> Edition, Eastern Book Company, Lucknow, ISBN 81-7012-904-4, Article 243-Q, p-704.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p-706.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*,

The State Election Commission shall be constituted to superintendence, direct and control the preparation of electoral rolls and the conduct of election to the Municipalities. As far as taxation is concerned, Article 243-X authorises the Municipality to levy, collect, and appropriate taxes, duties, tolls and fees. Grants-in-aid may also be made from the Consolidated Fund of the State. The State Finance Commission shall also be constituted by the Government to review the financial position of the Municipalities. In this regard, the State Government may, by law, make a provision for the maintenance of Municipal Accounts and Auditing.

### **III. 74th Constitutional Amendment Act and the North-Eastern States**

The Constitution 74th Amendment Act, 1992 provide a basis for the State Legislatures to guide the State Governments in the assignment of various responsibilities to Municipalities and to strengthen Municipal Governance in the Urban Areas. Accordingly, several State Governments have amended their Municipal Laws to bring in conformity with the Constitutional Provisions.

Among the 8(eight) States of the North Eastern Region, Assam leads with 85(eighty-five) Urban Local Bodies. Of these, 55(fifty-five) are Nagar Panchayats, 29(twenty-nine) are Municipal Councils and a single Municipal Corporation. This State is followed in numbers by Manipur, which has 20(twenty) Nagar Panchayats and 7(seven) Municipal Councils. Nagaland follows Manipur with 16(sixteen) Nagar Panchayats and 3(three) Municipal Councils. Tripura has 13(thirteen) Nagar Panchayats and 1(one) Municipal Council while Sikkim, the latest newcomer of North Eastern Region, has 8(eight) Nagar Panchayats only. Until the year 2004, the State of Mizoram, Meghalaya, and Arunachal Pradesh were without any form of Urban Local Bodies to conform to the 74th Constitution Amendment Act of India.<sup>13</sup>

Among the Municipalised States of North Eastern Regions, Assam and Tripura are the only States where women councillors are present in the Urban Local Bodies. From amongst 57(fifty-seven) elected Corporation members, 20(twenty) women councillors were inducted in Assam but no women members are found either in the Municipal Councils and Nagar Panchayats of this State. Besides, Tripura has

---

<sup>13</sup> Mathur, M.P., *Impact of the Constitution (74th) Amendment Act on the Urban Local Bodies: A Review*, (Coordinator- National Institute of Urban Affairs), New Delhi 110,003, p-5.

6(six) women Councillors in the Municipal Council and 39(thirty-nine) members in the Nagar Panchayats.<sup>14</sup> The legislation for Urban Local Bodies of Nagaland and Manipur did not provide for women's reservation. The Governor, therefore, could not give assent to the Nagaland Municipal Council (First Amendment) Bill 2005.<sup>15</sup> Regular and timely election to Manipur Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) is an ever-present problem for this State.

Tripura is the only State in North East India to have women as Chairperson/President in the ULBs. This State has 2(two) SC and 1(one) ST Chairperson.<sup>16</sup> One important hindrance of ULBs in the North Eastern Region is that functional Ward/Wards Committees have not yet constituted so far.<sup>17</sup> However, with regards to the constitution of State Finance Commission, Sikkim, Tripura, Manipur and Assam have all formed this Commission and submitted their action taken reports to the appropriate authority of the Union Government.

**Table – 3.3**  
**State-Wise Information on Status of State Finance Commission**  
**(As on October 2004)<sup>18</sup>**

Sl. No	States/ UT's	First SFC		Second SFC		Status of Action Taken Reports	
		Date of constitution	Date of submission of report	Date of constitution	Date of submission of report	First	Second
1	Arunachal Pradesh	21.5.03	INA	Due in 2008	NA	INA	NA
2	Assam	23.6.95	29.2.96	Constituted	UC	Submitted	NA
3	Manipur	22.4.94	1996	Constituted	INA	Submitted	INA
4	Meghalaya	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
5	Mizoram	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
6	Nagaland	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL	NIL
7	Sikkim	22.7.98	16.8.99	Constituted	INA	Submitted	INA
8	Tripura	23.4.94	17.9.99	29.10.99	INA	Submitted	INA

As shown in Table (3.3) State Finance Commissions (SFC) has been constituted in 5(five) States of the North Eastern Region. Among the North-East

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p-6.

<sup>15</sup> *UNI-Nagaland*, Report on August 2005. From: [www.nagarealm.com](http://www.nagarealm.com)

<sup>16</sup> *Op.cit.*, Mathur, M.P., p-7.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p-9.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p-6.

States, Manipur became the first State to constitute the SFC, which occurred on 22.4.1994. Tripura constituted its first SFC on 23.4.1994, Assam on 23.6.1995, Sikkim on 22.7.1998 and Arunachal Pradesh on 21.5.2003. However, Arunachal Pradesh has not submitted action taken report.

Though complete information could not be tapped out from all the SFCs, most of them are found to be carrying out their responsibilities smoothly and without hindrance. Assam, Manipur, Sikkim and Tripura States have even constituted their Second SFC, while Arunachal Pradesh has not. Conversely, Meghalaya, Mizoram and Nagaland States have not constituted the SFC.<sup>19</sup>

### **Identification of new Urban Towns in the North-Eastern Areas by Census of India 2001**

The 2001 Census of India has identified many new Urban Towns in the North-Eastern areas. The 74th Constitution Amendment is not enough for putting in place a systematic urban mechanism until and unless the State Assembly legislates to that effect. The status of each of the Towns in all the eight States of the North-Eastern Region is as follows:

#### **1. ASSAM**

Local Self-Government has been introduced in the Urban Areas (UA's) of Assam by the imperial rulers during the second quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century; it was in 1836 that the first Town Improvement Committee (TIC) was established in Guwahati. Since then many new ULBs were established in other Towns like Nagaon, Magaldai, Dibrugarh, Golaghat, Goalpara, Barpeta, North Lakhimpur and Silchar. However, the first Assam Municipal Act was legislated only in 1923. After independence, this Act was subsequently replaced by the Assam Municipal Act, 1956, and was amended in 1994 to conform to the 74th Amendment Act of the Constitution of India.<sup>20</sup>

The 2001 Census identified the following settlements were as sheer Urban Centres and Urban Towns in Assam.

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p-11.

<sup>20</sup> Government of Assam, *Municipal Directorate*.

**Table – 3.5****List of Urban Centres/Notified Towns in Assam<sup>21</sup>**

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Name of Urban Centres (Census Town)</b>	<b>Districtss</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Type of Urban Administration</b>
1.	Guwahati	Kamrup	8,18,809	UA
2.	Silchar	Cachar	1,84,105	UA
3.	Jorhat	Jorhat	1,37,814	UA
4.	Dibrugarh	Dibrugarh	1,37,661	UA
5.	Nagaon	Nagaon	1,23,265	UA
6.	Tinsukia	Tinsukia	1,08,123	UA
7.	Tezpur	Sonitpur	1,05,377	UA
8.	Bongaigaon	Bongaigaon	75,928	UA
9.	Dhubri	Dhubri	64,168	MB
10.	North Lakhimpur	Lakhimpur	54,285	MB
11.	Sibsagar	Sibsagar	53,854	MB
12.	Karimganj	Karimganj	52,613	MB
13.	Diphu	Karbi Anglong	52,310	TC
14.	Lumding	Nagaon	50,570	UA
15.	Goalpara	Goalpara	49,037	MB
16.	Barpeta	Barpeta	41,038	MB
17.	Digboi	Tinsukia	37,143	UA
18.	Haflong	North Cachar Hills	36,302	TC
19.	Barpeta Road	Barpeta	35,725	MB
20.	Hojai	Nagaon	35,718	MB
21.	Lanka	Nagaon	34,423	TC
22.	Golaghat	Golaghat	33,064	MB
23.	Bilasipara	Dhubri	31,171	TC
24.	Kokrajhar	Kokrajhar	31,164	MB
25.	Hailakandi	Hailakandi	29,739	MB
26.	Mankachar	Dhubri	28,780	Census Town
27.	Dhekiajuli	Sonitpur	25,349	MB
28.	Rangia	Kamrup	25,151	MB
29.	Gauripur	Dhubri	25,002	TC
30.	Margherita	Tinsukia	24,049	Census Town
31.	Magaldoi	Darrang	23,920	MB
32.	Duliajan Oil Town	Dibrugarh	23,763	Census Town
33.	Nalbari	Nalbari	23,183	MB
34.	Silapathar	Dhemaji	22,516	TC
35.	Mariani	Jorhat	20,997	TC
36.	Marigaon	Marigaon	20,811	TC
37.	Doom Dooma	Tinsukia	19,806	TC
38.	Namrup	Dibrugarh	19,021	Census Town

<sup>21</sup> *Census of India 2001*. Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India. From: [www.censusindia.gov.in](http://www.censusindia.gov.in)

39.	Rangapara	Sonitpur	18,824	TC
40.	Numaligarh Refinery Township	Golaghat	18,705	Census Town
41.	Chapar	Dhubri	18,558	TC
42.	Tangla	Darrang	18,228	TC
43.	Dhing	Nagaon	17,844	TC
44.	Kharupatia	Darrang	17,783	TC
45.	Sonari	Sibsagar	17,502	MB
46.	Chabua	Dibrugarh	17,433	TC
47.	Jagiroad	Marigaon	17,177	Census Town
48.	Biswanath Chariali	Sonitpur	16,825	TC
49.	Howli	Barpeta	16,730	TC
50.	North Guwahati	Kamrup	16,286	TC
51.	Naharkatiya	Dibrugarh	15,523	TC
52.	Makum	Tinsukia	15,118	TC
53.	Udalguri	Darrang	14,897	TC
54.	Abhayapuri	Boangaigaon	14,673	TC
55.	Bokajan	Karbi Anglong	14,219	TC
56.	Sualkuchi	Kamrup	14,133	Census Town
57.	Gossaigaon	Kokrajhar	13,508	TC
58.	Dergaon	Golaghat	13,446	TC
59.	Nazira	Sibsagar	13,047	MB
60.	Bijni	Bongaigaon	12,568	TC
61.	Lakhipur	Goalpara	12,547	TC
62.	basugaon	Kokrajhar	12,440	TC
63.	Sapatgram	Dhubri	12,126	TC
64.	Dhemaji	Dhemaji	11,863	TC
65.	Badarpur	Karimganj	11,297	TC
66.	Doboka	Nagaon	11,058	TC
67.	Bihpuria	Lakhimpur	10,868	TC
68.	Lala	Hailakandi	10,270	TC
69.	Pathsala	Barpeta	9,974	TC
70.	Badarpur Railway Town	Karimganj	9,940	Census Town
71.	Lakhipur	Cachar	9,802	TC
72.	Gohpur	Sonitpur	9,419	TC
73.	Umrangso	North Cachar Hills	9,131	TC
74.	Bokakhat	Golaghat	8,844	TC
75.	Lido Town	Tinsukia	8,571	Census Town
76.	Hamren	Karbi Anglong	8,445	TC
77.	Donkamokam	Karbi Anglong	8,240	TC
78.	Bohari	Barpeta	8,086	Census Town
79.	Maibong	North Cachar Hills	7,738	TC
80.	Sarbhog	Barpeta	7,687	TC
81.	Dharapur	Kamrup	7,668	Census Town
82.	Sarthebari	Barpeta	7,628	TC
83.	Golokganj	Dhubri	7,612	Census Town

84.	Titabor Town	Jorhat	7,545	Census Town
85.	Durga Nagar Part-V	Cachar	7,480	Census Town
86.	Chadrapur Bagicha	Kamrup	7,373	Census Town
87.	Bamun Sualkuchi	Kamrup	7,162	Census Town
88.	Barpathar	Golaghat	7,079	TC
89.	Amguri	Sibsagar	6,997	TC
90.	Salakati	Kokrajhar	6,829	Census Town
91.	Moran Town	Dibrugarh	6,826	Census Town
92.	Lido Tikok	Tinsukia	6,764	Census Town
93.	Bongaigaon Refinery & Petro-Chemical Township	Bongaigaon	6,613	Census Town
94.	Sarupathar Bengali	Dibrugarh	6,609	Census Town
95.	Mahur	North Cachar	6,264	TC
96.	Kochpara	Kamrup	6,081	Census Town
97.	Moranhat	Sibsagar	5,779	TC
98.	Palasbari	Kamrup	5,554	MB
99.	Kampur Town	Nagaon	5,409	Census Town
100.	Kharijapikon	Goalpara	5,318	Census Town
101.	Anand Nagar	Dhubri	5,026	Census Town
102.	Naubaisa Gaon	Jorhat	4,964	Census Town
103.	Kokmoka	Karbi Anglong	4,664	TC
104.	Jonai Bazar	Dhemaji	4,453	Census Town
105.	Borgolai Grant No.11	Tinsukia	4,383	Census Town
106.	Tihu	Nalbari	4,303	TC
107.	HPC Ltd., Township Area Panchagram	Hailakandi	4,076	Census Town
108.	Howraghat	Karbi Anglong	4,052	TC
109.	Duliajan No. 1	Dibrugarh	1,602	Census Town
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,439,240</b>	

According to the above Table (3.5), there are 10(ten) Urban Agglomerations (UA), 18(eighteen) Municipal Boards (MB), 51(fifty-one) Town Committees (TCs) and 30(thirty) Census Towns (CTs) in Assam. The State Capital i.e., Guwahati, has Municipal Corporation. Even though 79(seventy-nine) ULBs have been constituted by the Government, 30(thirty) Towns remain without any form of Urban Local Self-Government.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Op.cit., Government of Assam.

## 2. ARUNACHAL PRADESH

Arunachal Pradesh, the erstwhile North East Frontier Agency (NEFA) was transformed to Centrally Administered Union Territory (UT) in 1972, and upgraded to the status of State in 1986.<sup>23</sup> There are 4(four) Towns in 1971, 6(six) Towns in 1981 and 10(ten) Towns in 1991 Census respectively. However, the 2001 Census has added 7(seven) more urban centres or Towns in the State. As a result, the number of Towns in the State now totals 17(seventeen). The following Table (3.4) shows the list of Towns in the State:

**Table- 3.4**  
**List of Towns in Arunachal Pradesh<sup>24</sup>**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Centres (Census Town)	Districts	Population	Type of Urban Administration
1.	Itanagar	Papumpare	35,022	Census Town
2.	Naharlagun	Papumpare	27,020	Census Town
3.	Pasighat	East Siang	21,965	Census Town
4.	Along	West Siang	17,033	Census Town
5.	Daporijo	Upper Subansiri	15,756	Census Town
6.	Tequ	Lohit	15,015	Census Town
7.	Seppa	East Kameng	15,002	Census Town
8.	Ziro	Lower Subansiri	12,384	Census Town
9.	Namsai	Lohit	11,747	Census Town
10.	Roing	Dibang Valley	10,107	Census Town
11.	Khonsa	Tirap	9,233	Census Town
12.	Tawang	Tawang	8,376	Census Town
13.	Bomdila	West Kameng	6,693	Census Town
14.	Changlang	Changlang	6,469	Census Town
15.	Deomali	Tirap	6,061	Census Town
16.	Jairampur	Changlang	5,919	Census Town
17.	Basar	West Siang	4,079	Census Town
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,27,881</b>	

The total population of Arunachal Pradesh was 10, 37,968 in 2001 Census.<sup>25</sup> While 2, 27,881 persons live in the Urban Areas, and 8, 10,087 in the rural areas. This shows that the State has 20.75% urban population. However, this State has neither Urban Local Self-Government nor Urban Local Bodies. Even the State Capital i.e., Itanagar, did not yet constituted urban administrative system.

<sup>23</sup> Sarin, V.I.K. *India's North-East in Flames*, (1982) Published by Vikas Publishing House, Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi. P- 57.

<sup>24</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Census of India 2001*

<sup>25</sup> Government of Manipur, *Directorate of Municipal Administration*.



### 3. MANIPUR

In pursuance of the Fifth Schedule to the Constitution of India, the Union Parliament enacted the Manipur Municipalities Act, 1994, to provide for Municipalities in the Urban Areas of the State. Excepting the Hill Areas, where the Manipur (Hill Areas) Districts Council Act, 1971 is functional, this Act of Parliament extends to the whole of the State. The Manipur Urban Development Agency (MUDA) was formed by the State Government and was registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1989. The Department of Municipal Administration, Housing and Urban Development administers the Agency. All the responsibilities of the Department of Municipal Administration for urban development are taken over and executed by the MUDA through its 5(five) Districts Urban Development Agencies (DUDA) and 28(twenty eight) Urban Local Bodies (ULBs).<sup>26</sup> These are:

- (i) Imphal West,
- (ii) Imphal East,
- (iii) Bishnupur,
- (iv) Thoubal and
- (v) Chandel.

In addition, all the Urban Areas of the 12 Districts, with and without DUDAs are administered by MUDA. While MUDA supervise and coordinate the activities of urban management, DUDA functions in five Districts as the agencies of MUDA.<sup>27</sup> According to the Census of India 2001, the following Table (3.6) lists the Towns and ULBs in Manipur.

Manipur has, altogether, 8(eight) Municipal Councils, 1(one) Urban Agglomeration, 22(twenty-two) Nagar Panchayats and 2(two) Census Towns. Table (3.6) demonstrated that two more Urban Centres/Notified Towns has been added by the latest Census. The following Table (3.6) portrayed the List of Urban Centres/Census Town in Manipur.

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*,

**Table – 3.6**  
**List of Urban Centres/Census Town in Manipur<sup>28</sup>**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Centres (Census Town)	Districts	Population	Type of Urban Administration
1	Imphal West	Imphal West	1,50,595	MC
2	Imphal East	Imphal East	86,081	UA
3	Thoubal	Thoubal	41,174	MC
4	Kakching	Thoubal	28,724	MC
5	Mayang Imphal	Imphal West	20,532	NP
6	Lilong(Thoubal)	Thoubal	18,699	NP
7	Moirang	Bishnupur	17,178	MC
8	Moreh	Chandel	14,962	ST
9	Nambol	Bishnupur	14,931	MC
10	Thongkhong Laxmi Bazar	Imphal West	12,680	NP
11	Ningthoukhong	Bishnupur	10,877	NP
12	Lilong (Imphal 'W' Part)	Imphal West	10,421	NP
13	Bishnupur	Bishnupur	10,264	MC
14	Samurou	Imphal West	9,382	NP
15	Kakching Khunou	Thoubal	9,318	NP
16	Lamjaotongba	Imphal West	9,067	Census Town
17	Kumbi	Bishnupur	8,725	NP
18	Andro	Imphal East	8,316	NP
19	Yairipok	Thoubal	8,261	NP
20	Wangol	Imphal West	7,868	NP
21	Wangjing	Thoubal	6,970	NP
22	Naoriya Pakhanglakpa	Imphal West	6,631	Census Town
23	Kwakta	Bishnupur	6,484	NP
24	Jiribam	Imphal East	6,423	MC
25	Oinam	Bishnupur	6,282	NP
26	Lamsang	Imphal West	6,260	NP
27	Sikhong Sekmai	Thoubal	6,120	NP
28	Samurou	Thoubal	5,048	NP
29	Sugnu	Thoubal	4,508	NP
30	Sekmai Bazar	Imphal West	4,314	NP
31	Lamlai	Imphal East	4,085	NP
32	Nambol	Imphal West	3,853	MC
33	Heirok	Thoubal	2,450	NP
34	Lilong(Part)	Imphal East	1,558	NP
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5, 75,968</b>	

As shown in Table (3.6), the system of functioning of Urban Local Self-Government in Manipur is a little bit different from those operating in other States of the Country. While both MUDA and DUDA are to function as Agency of ULBs, the

<sup>28</sup> *Op.cit., Census of India 2001*

former acts as the forerunner of the latter. Urban Local Self-Government in Manipur is arranged in the order of MUDA at the top, DUDA at the intermediate and ULBs were at the bottom of the structure. Of the two Agencies in the State, the MUDA plays the role of the executive and vigilance unit of the DUDA. In short, there is no proper demarcation of functions between MUDA and DUDA in Manipur. Different Councillors were elected to each of every Town in Manipur.

#### 4. MEGHALAYA

Meghalaya State has experienced Municipal Administration since the British period. The State capital, Shillong, has witnessed Municipal administration for the past 90 years or more. Initially, Shillong was a ‘Station’ which has been upgraded to ‘Municipality’ by the erstwhile British Government on 15<sup>th</sup> November 1910. Afterwards, the Bengal Municipal Act was extended to Shillong on 1<sup>st</sup> January 1911, and, in 1917, the Municipal Area was enlarged to cover not only the British portion but also the portion of *Mylliem* State. It is important to mention that the *Mylliem Syiemships* of *Malki*, *Laitumkhrach*, *Jhalupara* and *Mawprem* were included within the Municipality in 1913. The British transformed the erstwhile Shillong Municipality into the new Municipality by the instrument of the Assam Municipal Act, 1923.

**Table – 3.7**

**List of Urban Centres/Notified Towns in Meghalaya<sup>29</sup>**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Centres (Census Town)	Districts	Population	Type of Urban Administration
1.	Shillong	East Khasi Hills	2,67,662	UA
2.	Tura	West Garo Hills	58,978	Municipality
3.	Jowai	Jaintia Hills	25,057	Municipality
4.	Nongstoin	West Khasi Hills	23,106	TC
5.	Williamnagar	East Garo Hills	18,247	MB
6.	Resubelpara	East Garo Hills	17,660	MB
7.	Nongpoh	Ri Bhoi Districts	13,180	TC
8.	Mairang	West Khasi Hills	11,492	TC
9.	Cherrapunjee	East Khasi Hills	10,086	Census Town
10.	Baghmara	South Garo Hills	8,643	MB
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,54,111</b>	

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*,

Table (3.7) shows that urban population of Meghalaya is 19.58% to the total population of the State. According to 2001 Census, there is 1(one) Urban Agglomeration, 2(two) Municipalities, 3(three) Municipal Boards, and 3(three) other Town Committees in the Urban Areas of Meghalaya State.<sup>30</sup>

This Act divided Shillong Municipality into 10 (Ten) Wards, they are (1) Laitumkrah Ward, (2) European Quarters (Block A & B), (3) Jail Road, (4) Police Bazar Ward, (5) Mawkhar Proper, (6) Mission Compound and Jaiaw, (7) South East Mawkhar and Garikhana, (8) Mawprem and Jhalupara, (9) Laban and (10) Malki.<sup>31</sup> However, as on March 2008 there were 28(twenty-eight) Wards in Shillong Municipality covering an area of 10.36 Sq.kms (approx).<sup>32</sup> The Shillong Municipal Boards, under the Chief Executive Officer, administered this Municipality and the Boards have power over 27 Wards. The latest, Ward No. 28<sup>th</sup> i.e., Civil Station, lies beyond the power of the Boards.

As a Municipal election has not yet conducted, the Shillong Municipality has no Councillors. The Municipal Board functions under the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Engineers and other Administrative Staffs. The Boards executes only those subjects as were subordinated to them by the Meghalaya Urban Development Agency (MUDA). The following 5(five) subjects were subordinated to the Boards by the MUDA in 2010, they are (1) Collection of Property Tax; (2) Water Supply; (3) Waste Management; (4) Licensing of Business and Markets; and (5) Minor Infrastructure, like construction and maintenance of footpath and drains.<sup>33</sup>

## 5. TRIPURA

Tripura State is surrounded by Bangladesh on all sides except for a narrow sector in the Northeast where it is bounded by the States of Assam and Mizoram. Urbanisation in Tripura has taken place with Agartala as the nucleus. The State Legislative Assembly enacted the Tripura Municipal Act in 1994 to reorganise the

---

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>31</sup> Government of Meghalaya, Office of the Chief Executive Officer, Shillong Municipal Board, From: [www.smb.gov.in](http://www.smb.gov.in)

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, (*Documents, Numbers of Wards with names of Localities as on March 2008*)

<sup>33</sup> Banroi Chyne, Farguhar., *Executive Engineer*, Officer of the Chief Executive Officer, Shillong Municipal Board, Interview on 2nd February 2011.

administration of the Urban Areas. However, the Act of 1994 has not been extended to the tribal inhabited areas administered through the 6<sup>th</sup> Schedule of the Constitution.

According to the 2001 Census, there is 1(one) Municipal Council, 12(twelve) Nagar Panchayats and 10(ten) Census Towns in Tripura. There is no Municipal Corporation in the State.<sup>34</sup> The latest Census has declared the following as Urban Centres/Census Towns in Tripura:

**Table – 3.8**  
**List of Towns/Census Towns in Tripura**<sup>35</sup>

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Centres (Census Town)	Districts	Population	Type of Urban Administration
1	Agartala	West Tripura	189,998	MC
2	Badharghat	West Tripura	47,713	Census Town
3	Jogendranagar	West Tripura	34,850	Census Town
4	Dharmanagar	North Tripura	30,790	NP
5	Pratapgarh	West Tripura	26,837	Census Town
6	Udaipur	South Tripura	21,758	NP
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>351,946</b>	

With the exception of Assam, Tripura is the only State to have Urban Local Self-Government conforming to Part-IXA of the Constitution. This State can regularly conduct elections to the Local Bodies under the superintendence of the State Election Commission (SEC). However, Table (3.8) shows that 3(three) identified Census Towns have not yet constituted Urban Local Bodies.

## 6. SIKKIM

In 1975, when Sikkim merged with India, a Municipality was in operation in Gangtok by nominated members. But the body became defunct in the mid-80.<sup>36</sup> The Sikkim Municipal Corporation Act is passed in 1975, it was not, however, fully implemented. In 1985, the Municipal Act was repealed and the functions of Urban Local Bodies transferred to the State Government.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>34</sup> *Op.cit., Census of India 2001*

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.,*

<sup>36</sup> Chhetri, Vivek., Sikkim Times, From: [www.sikkimtimes.com](http://www.sikkimtimes.com)

<sup>37</sup> Government of Sikkim, *Urban Development and Housing Department*, From: [www.sikkimudhd.org](http://www.sikkimudhd.org)

The followings Table (3.9) is the list of Urban Centres and Notified Towns in Sikkim:

**Table - 3.9**  
**List of Notified Towns/Census Towns in Sikkim<sup>38</sup>**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Centres (Census Town)	Districtss	Population	Type of Urban Administration
1	Gangtok	East	29,354	Notified Town Area
2	Upper Tadong	East	14,357	Census Town
3	Singtam	East	5,432	Notified Town Area
4	Rangpo	East	3,709	Notified Town Area
5	Jorethang	South	2,967	Notified Town Area
6	Mangan	North	1,248	Notified Town Area
7	Nayabazar	West	996	Notified Town Area
8	Namchi	South	979	Notified Town Area
9	Gyalshing	West	828	Notified Town Area
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>59,870</b>	

As portrayed in Table (3.9), Sikkim has a single Census Town and 8(eight) Notified Town Areas. However, all these habitations are without Urban Local Bodies (ULBs). The then Sikkim Municipal Act 1995 (Act No 6 of 1995) was amended in 1997, but this amendment is not strictly consistent with the Provision of Part-IX A of the Constitution. In 2005, the State Government initiates a new legislation by calling Public Hearing, and that resulting in legislation of the Sikkim Municipalities Act, 2007.<sup>39</sup>

By exercising the powers conferred by the Municipalities Act, 2007, the Government of Sikkim declared 3(three) tier Urban Local Self-Government, viz., Municipal Corporation, Municipal Council, and Nagar Panchayat.<sup>40</sup> The State Capital i.e., Gangtok, is given Municipal Corporation, South Districts Headquarters i.e., Namchi, is given Municipal Council. Besides, the commercial Towns of Rangpo, Singtam and Jorethang were given Nagar Panchayats. Moreover, the North Sikkim administrative centre Mangan and West Sikkim administrative centre Gyalshing are included in the Nagar Panchayat bracket.<sup>41</sup> Gangtok Corporation have 15(fifteen) Wards, Namchi MC have 7(seven) Wards, while Rangpo, Singtam, Mangan,

<sup>38</sup> *Op.cit., Census of India 2001*

<sup>39</sup> Sikkim Express, Daily News Paper, Dated 26<sup>th</sup> August 2009.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.,

Gyalshing and Jorethang NP have 5 (five) Wards each.<sup>42</sup> Despite State wide boycott called by the opposition Party in the first Sikkim ULBs election in April 2010, civic polls was conducted by the State Government to the total 47(forty-seven) Wards. The opposition feared that if civic polls were conduct there could be dilution of Article 371 (F), and more particularly the 1917 Revenue Order 1.<sup>43</sup> These legislations bar outsiders from purchasing land in Sikkim. Despite strong opposed from opposition Party, the first Local Self-Government election in Sikkim is conducted on 27<sup>th</sup> April and counting of votes held on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2010.<sup>44</sup>

## 7. NAGALAND

In Nagaland, the State Government created the Town & Country Planning Department in 1967. Its main responsibility, at the beginning, was for the preparation of a 'Master Plan' for the newly declared Capital Town, i.e., Kohima, and other Districts Headquarters. Under the provision of the Nagaland Town & Country Planning Act, Development Authority of Nagaland (DAN) was constituted in 1976 for implementing the Master Plan prepared by the Department of Urban Development. DAN has the power to acquire and develop land and also to undertake any other remunerative projects. The jurisdiction of DAN covers all the Urban Areas of the State and functions as a self-financing institution and, at the same time, performs its functions with grants-in-aid received from the Urban Department of the State.

The State has a three-tier Urban Local Bodies; they are State Urban Development Agency (SUDA), Districts Urban Development Agency (DUDA) and Local Development Committee (LDC). While the Commissioner & Secretary of the Urban Development Department is the Chairman of SUDA, the Additional Deputy Commissioner is the Chairman of DUDA, and the Administrative Head of the Urban Department serves as the Chairman of LDC.

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>43</sup> Upreti, K.N., *Vice Presiden*, Congress Party, Sikkim. From: [www.sikkimtimes.com](http://www.sikkimtimes.com)

<sup>44</sup> PTI, 6th April 2010, From: [www.zeenews.com](http://www.zeenews.com)

According to the Census of India 2001,<sup>45</sup> the followings are the list of Towns in Nagaland:

**Table – 3.10**  
**List of Towns/Notified Towns in Nagaland<sup>46</sup>**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Centres (Census Town)	Districtss	Population	Type of Urban Administration
1.	Dimapur	Wokha	98,096	Town Committee
2.	Kohima	Kohima	77,030	Town Committee
3.	Wokha	Wokha	37,636	Town Committee
4.	Mokokchung	Mokokchung	31,214	Town Committee
5.	Tuensang	Tuensang	29,772	Town Committee
6.	Zunheboto	Zunheboto	23,081	Town Committee
7.	Mon Town	Mon	16,590	Town Committee
8.	Chumukedima	Wokha	16,504	Census Town
9.	Phek	Phek	12,864	Town Committee
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>342,787</b>	

Altogether, there are 9(nine) Towns in Nagaland. Though the Department of Urban Development was created on the plea of urban management for the 9(nine) Towns, this office exists only in paper. The reason behind this non-functional nature of the Urban Development is that the Department of Town & Country Planning has been create to act as the premier agency for all the Urban Areas of the State. As Urban Department has no subsidiary offices at the Districts level, all works connected with urban managements are carry out by Town & Country Planning Department, and the Office of the Town Planner. It is paradoxical that the Chief Town Planner heads the Department of Urban Development in Nagaland.<sup>47</sup>

The Nagaland Municipal Act was legislated by the State Assembly in 2001 and Amendment of the Act was also subsequently initiated in 2005.<sup>48</sup> But, the Governor of Nagaland, Shri Shyamal Datta, rejected the Amendment Bill for the following reasons:

(1) The Bill seeks to give right to vote to the nominated members and, at the same time, withdraw the right to vote from the ex-officio members which is against Article 243-R of the Constitution.

<sup>45</sup> *Op.cit.*, Census of India, 2001.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>47</sup> Government of Nagaland, Department of Urban Development,. From: *www. nlsic.gov.in*

<sup>48</sup> *Nagaland Post*, Dated 4th September 2010.



(2) The 2005 Amendment Bill does not incorporate the provision for reservation of not less than one-thirds of the total number of seats for women, and thereby, is not consistent with Article 243-T.<sup>49</sup>

The State Government cannot conduct regular election to the civic bodies. However, after amendment to the vintage Town Committee Act, elections to the MC, and TC are scheduled for December 8<sup>th</sup> 2010. The State Election Commission of Nagaland has already issued Notification in this regard fixing November 16 as the date for filing nominations. Simultaneous election is scheduled for 3 (three) MC and 16(sixteen) TC.<sup>50</sup>

## **8. MIZORAM**

In Mizoram, there are 8(eight) Districtss, which includes 3(three) Autonomous Districts Councils (ADC) constituted under the Sixth Schedule found in 2(two) Districtss, viz., Lunglei Districts, and Saiha Districts. Each Districts has one or more Urban Towns.<sup>51</sup> Though the Census of India 2001 has declared no new Town area so far, the Government of Mizoram declared Lawngtlai as a new Town and constituted a 'Town Planning Committee' in 1999.<sup>52</sup> This implies that while even the Districts Headquarters i.e., Lawngtlai, has not yet given the status of Town by the Census of India, the State Government has treated it at par with other Urban Areas/Towns. On the other hand, among the Headquarters of the Districts Council, Saiha, the Headquarters of Mara Autonomous Districts, has already been declared as an Urban Town by the 1981 Census.

As portrayed by Table (3.11) there are 4(four) Notified Towns(NTs) each in Aizawl Districts, Kolasib Districts, and Champhai Districts while Mamit, Serchhip, and Lunglei Districtss have 3(three) NTs each. There was no new NT addition in Mizoram between the decadal census of 1991 and 2001. Hence, the total number of CT or NT duly recognised by the Registrar of Census Operation, Government of India remains 22(twenty-two). Surprisingly, in Mizoram, all the Villages, and Towns have Village Councils for managing both Rural and Urban affairs since 1954.

---

<sup>49</sup> *Eastern Mirror*, Dated 3rd September 2010.

<sup>50</sup> PTI, 1st January 2011, From : [www.hindustantimes.com](http://www.hindustantimes.com).

<sup>51</sup> *Gazette, Mizoram*, No. 64, Dated 6.4.1998.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 373, Dated 17.12.1999.

The 2001 Census identified the following Notified Towns/Urban Towns in the State:

**Table – 3.11**  
**List of Notified Towns/Urban Centres in Mizoram<sup>53</sup>**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Centres (Notified Town)	Districts	Population	Type of Urban Administration
1.	Zawnuam	Mamit	3,120	Notified Town
2.	Mamit	Mamit	5,110	Notified Town
3.	Lengpui	Mamit	2,423	Notified Town
4.	Vairengte	Kolasib	7,715	Notified Town
5.	Bairabi	Kolasib	3,304	Notified Town
6.	Kolasib	Kolasib	19,008	Notified Town
7.	N.Kawnpui	Kolasib	6,472	Notified Town
8.	Darlawn	Aizawl	3,865	Notified Town
9.	Sairang	Aizawl	5,034	Notified Town
10.	Aizawl	Aizawl	2,28,280	Notified Town
11.	Saitual	Aizawl	10,966	Notified Town
12.	Khawzawl	Champhai	10,954	Notified Town
13.	Champhai	Champhai	26,465	Notified Town
14.	Khawhai	Champhai	2,403	Notified Town
15.	Biate	Champhai	2,227	Notified Town
16.	Serchhip	Serchhip	17,096	Notified Town
17.	Thenzawl	Serchhip	5,507	Notified Town
18.	N.Vanlaiphai	Serchhip	3,275	Notified Town
19.	Tlabung	Lunglei	3,681	Notified Town
20.	Lunglei	Lunglei	47,137	Notified Town
21.	Hnahthial	Lunglei	7,138	Notified Town
22.	Saiha	Saiha	19,826	Notified Town
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>441,006</b>	

In spite of the rapid increase in the number of notified Urban Centres, no discussion on the imperative need for Urban Administration or Urban Local Bodies for large human settlements in the State had taken place on the floor of the State Assembly before 2006. But, in 2007, the prevailing circumstances had compelled the State Government to do something for the establishment of Urban Local Bodies in its Notified Towns or Urban Towns. Ultimately, Mizoram State Legislative Assembly made a landmark decision in 2007 and passed the first Mizoram Municipality Act, 2007.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>53</sup> *Op.cit., Census of India, 2001*

<sup>54</sup> *Op.cit., Mizoram, No. 123 Dated 24.4.2007.*

From all the above discussions, it is clear that the 74th Amendment concerning Urban Local Self-Governance does not have much impact on the people and the politicians in the North East Region, but inconsistency was continuously resolve after 2000. Though the system was in place in a few cities like, Guwahati, Shillong, and Dibrugarh for the past many decades and have been functioning since the British Rule, Urban Local Bodies have not yet introduced in many States of the North Eastern Region as envision by the Constitution. It is right to be says that most of the States are not concerned much with the 74th CAA, which seeks to empower the people living in Urban Areas.

Unlike in the plains area of the Country, Urban Centres in North Eastern Region are small in terms of size. Hence, the Municipal limits are also naturally small and limited to a few square kilometres. Shillong, for example, has only 10.36 Sq. kms. It is relevant to point out that the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Schedules to the Constitution of India, empowered the Union and the State Governments to administer the Tribal Areas of the region on the basis of their own system of Local Governance, to comply with their traditions and customary laws. However, in view of the increasing urbanisation in many parts of the region, there is an increasing realisation of the need for modern system of Urban Governance, which appears, somehow, to be in conflict with the traditional system.

Despite the fact that Urban Areas have grown beyond the Municipal limit, and the growth rate is much higher in such areas, most of the cities in the Hill States of the region have not done much to rectify the situation in conformation to the 74th Constitutional Amendment. As in the case of Shillong, no further change in the status of the Municipal Board has noticed for the past few decades. In some States, the State Government cannot conduct Municipal elections at regular intervals and some have, thus, been kept pending since 1967.<sup>55</sup> Since no democratic election could take place in Shillong Municipal Board, it was simply administered by the State Government through the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), who belongs to the State Civil Services. The State Government is not in a position to make efforts for holding elections to the Shillong Municipal Board since the Local Durbars have an apprehension that their powers in the Civic Affairs would be transferred to the elected representatives if

---

<sup>55</sup> *The Telegraph*, Dated 14th June, 2010.

elections were conducted. They vehemently oppose to any move from the State Government either to extend the Municipal Limits or to hold elections.<sup>56</sup>

In addition to the fear in the minds of the traditional institutions, there is an apprehension in the people that they would be heavily taxed by the Municipal Board. All these anxieties have kept the people and their traditional institution away from accepting the municipalisation of the fast urbanised areas outside the old Municipal limits. So also is the case with Imphal Municipal Board which has limited jurisdiction in the context of large planning area covered by the master plan. It is, however, against this type of background that, till today, Shillong Municipal Board has to function without an elected board due to non-participation of the voters and the social pressure from the traditional institutions. Such type of problem is experienced in most of other North Eastern States.

In Nagaland, the people are of strong opinion that, from the constitutional point of view, the traditional rights of the Naga people cannot be overridden by an Act of Parliament unless it is ratified by the State Government. Hence, certain provisions of its legislation passed by their Legislative Assembly are not consistent with the 74th Amendment.

In Assam and Tripura, Urban Local Bodies have been established in conformity with the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act 1992. But the State Governments are very slow in transferring those powers to the Urban Local Bodies as enshrined in Twelfth Schedule of the Constitution. Needless to say, Tripura and Assam States find it difficult to easily transfer to Urban Local Bodies those functions of Municipality as enumerated in the 12th Schedule for obvious reasons.

---

<sup>56</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Eastern Mirror*, Dated 28th August, 2010.

**CHAPTER – IV**

**RURAL GOVERNMENT MACHINERIES IN THE URBAN  
AREAS AND THE NEED FOR THEIR TRANSFORMATION  
IN MIZORAM**

## CHAPTER – IV

### RURAL GOVERNMENT MACHINERIES IN THE URBAN AREAS AND THE NEED FOR THEIR TRANSFORMATION IN MIZORAM

Mizoram is entirely a 'Rural' Area before 1951. But, the 1951 Census declared Aizawl as Urban Centre/Town for the first time. In order to have unique definition of Rural Area and Urban Area in the Country, the 1991 Census prescribed the criteria of a Village as follows:

“The basic unit for Rural Areas is the revenue Village which has definite surveyed boundaries. The revenue Village may comprise several hamlets but the entire Village is treated as one unit for presentation of data. In unsurveyed areas, like Villages within forest areas, each habitation areas with locally recognised boundaries within each forest range officer's beat are treated as one Village.”<sup>1</sup>

Any human settlement to qualify as Village should have definite surveyed boundaries. Even in unsurveyed areas, there can be Villages, provided that such area of human settlements is locally recognised by the people in general and by the forest officers in particular. According to the above criteria, there can be inhabited Villages and uninhabited Villages in the method of village settlement in Mizoram.

Clause 1, Section 3 of the Lushai Hills District (Village Councils) Act, 1953 embodies that, “There shall be Village Council comprising one or more Villages, as the administrator may, by notification in the Mizoram Gazette,<sup>2</sup> decide to be composed in the manner here-in-after provided ...” Section 2 (20) of the same Act also States that “Village means an area declared as such by the Administrator.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Census of India, 1991*, Mizoram State District Profile 1991, Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India, p-vii.

<sup>2</sup> *The Lushai Hills District (Village Councils) Act, 1953* (As amended in 1986), Section 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p-3.

The first body of Village Council election was held on 23rd April 1954 at Lungpho Village and elections to other Villages were conducted till 7<sup>th</sup> July 1954.<sup>4</sup> Initially, there were 366 Village Council bodies in Mizoram, and the first sitting of the Village Councils was held on 16<sup>th</sup> August 1954. Since then, elections to the Village Councils were conducted after every 3 years. So far, 17 Village Council elections have been held in the state, viz., 1954, 1957, 1960, 1963, 1971, 1974, 1977, 1981, 1984, 1987, 1990, 1994, 1997, 1999, 2002, 2006 and 2009. Village Council elections have been conducted through a system of single transferable vote and the voting is by secret ballot.<sup>5</sup>

During the armed insurgency period (1966 – 1986) in the state, regular and timely elections could not be held during the years 1966 to 1970. During the years under reference, Villages are grouped together for security convenience, which was also called ‘Villages Grouping’ or in Mizo dialect ‘*Khawkhawm.*’ This Village Grouping demolished village Council boundaries and jurisdictions. However, the government could conduct regular elections again when normalcy returned and law and order became stabilised in the state from 1971.<sup>6</sup> The Executive functions of the Council rests with the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of the Village Council. The State Government with the recommendation of the Village Council President, however, appoints the Secretary. Law does not allow the President and Vice Presidents, to act as the Secretary. In contrast, the Secretary is not allowed to exercise vote in the decision-making.

## **1. Village Council System in the Urban Areas of Mizoram**

As portrayed in Table (4.1), the 1991 Census identified 785 Villages in Mizoram, of which 698 are inhabited Villages, and 87 are uninhabited. The same Census conveyed the ‘Rural’ covers an area of 20,588 Sq. km., while the Urban Area is 493 Sq. km, which is only 2.4 percent of the total area. There are 22 Towns unevenly distributed in 3(three) Districts – 18(eighteen) Towns in Aizawl District, 3(three) Towns in Lunglei District and 1(one) Town in Chhimtuipui District. Urban Areas in Aizawl District and Lunglei District cover 449 Sq. km. and 44 Sq. km.

---

<sup>4</sup> Lalrinzuala, K. MCS, District Local Administration Officer, Aizawl – *Mizoram a Village Council Tobul, Anih phung leh mawphurhna tlangpui te*, p-1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p-2.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*,

respectively. However, Urban Area data was not prepared for Chhimituipui District at this time; as such, there is no Urban Area in the District in the 1991 Census.<sup>7</sup>

**Table-4.1**

**Table showing No. of Rural and Urban Areas in Mizoram (1991 Census)<sup>8</sup>**

Sl. No	District	Area (in Sq.Km)	Area (in Sq.Km)		Number of Villages			Towns
			Rural	Urban	Inhabited	Uninhabited	Total	
1.	Aizawl	12,588	12,139	449	342	50	392	18
2.	Lunglei	4,536	4,492	44	158	21	179	3
3.	Chhimituipui	3,957	3,957	NA	198	16	214	1
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21,081</b>	<b>20,588</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>785</b>	<b>22</b>

To point out a bizarre administrative practice, there is no separate local administration for all the 698 inhabited Villages in the rural areas and 22 Towns. Except in Aizawl City, the traditional Village Council system of administration is found in both Urban and Non-Urban Villages and Towns.

As shown in the following Table (4.2), the number of Villages and Town increased to 707 inhabited Villages and 110 uninhabited Villages in the 2001 Census while the total number of Towns/Notified Towns remained at 22.

**Table-4.2**

**District Wise Area Break-up (2001 Census)<sup>9</sup>**

Sl. No	District	Area (in Sq.Km)	Area (in Sq.Km.)		Number of Villages		Towns
			Rural	Urban	Inhabited	Uninhabited	
1.	Aizawl	3,576	3,400	175.98	NA	NA	4
2.	Lunglei	4,536	4,470	65.94	NA	NA	3
3.	Saiha	1,399	1,346	53	NA	NA	1
4.	Mamit	3,025	2,984	41	NA	NA	3
5.	Kolasib	1,382	1,278	104	NA	NA	4
6.	Champhai	3,185	3,105	80	NA	NA	4
7.	Serchhip	1,421	1,354	67	NA	NA	3
8.	Lawngtlai	2,557	2,557	0	NA	NA	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21,081</b>	<b>20,494</b>	<b>586.92</b>	<b>707</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>22</b>

There was no decadal growth of Town in the State between 1991 and 2001; however, the locations of the Towns have shifted after the main District, i.e., Aizawl

<sup>7</sup> *Op.cit.*, p-2.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>9</sup> *Census of India, 2001*, (Series 16), Primary Census Abstract, p-8, 10, 11, 15, 18, 20 & 23.



District, was divided for better administration purposes. Now, there are four Towns each in Aizawl, Kolasib and Champhai Districts, three each in Lunglei, Mamit and Serchhip Districts, and one Town in Saiha District. However, one District, i.e., Lawngtlai District, has no Town due to the fact that Lawngtlai, the District capital, remains purely rural area from the purview of the Census of India 2001.<sup>10</sup> The following table shows the number of Village Councils in Mizoram.

**Table – 4.3**  
**Number of Village Councils & Members**  
**(As on 1.4.2008)<sup>11</sup>**

Sl.No	Districts	No of Village Councils	No. of Village Council Members
1	2	3	4
1.	Mamit	72	244
2.	Kolasib	44	168
3.	Aizawl	166	664
4.	Champhai	100	350
5.	Serchhip	42	153
6.	Lunglei	132	457
7.	Lawngtlai	163	872
8.	Saiha	72	340
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>791</b>	<b>3,248</b>

As portrayed by Table (4.3) above, there are 791 Village Council (VC) institutions with 3,248 Village Council Members in Mizoram.<sup>12</sup> While Aizawl District has 166 VC, Mamit District, and Saiha District have 72 each. On the other hand, Serchhip District has only 42 VCs, which is the lowest in number so far as VC institutions is concerned. Apart from these, Lawngtlai has 163, Lunglei 132, Champhai 100 and Kolasib has 44 VCs respectively.

As seen in Table (4.4), 7(seven) Districts have 22(twenty-two) Urban Centres in Mizoram. In each of the Urban Centres and Towns, VC institutions were constituted in lieu of appropriate Local Self-Government.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p-23.

<sup>11</sup> Government of Mizoram, *Statistical Handbook Mizoram 2008*.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*,

**Table-4.4**  
**Number of Village Councils in the Urban Areas<sup>13</sup>**  
**(In different Districts in Mizoram)**

Sl. No.	District	No. of Village Council	No. of Members
1.	Mamit	8	32
2.	Kolasib	16	74
3.	Aizawl	81	388
4.	Champhai	23	97
5.	Serchhip	20	47
6.	Lunglei	26	116
7.	Saiha	17	68
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>822</b>

The following numbers of Villages are located in the Town areas in Mizoram, they are 8(eight) VCs in Mamit District, 16(sixteen) in Kolasib District, 81(eighty-one) in Aizawl District, 23(twenty-three) in Champhai District, 20(twenty) in Serchhip District, 26(twenty-six) in Lunglei Districts and 17(seventeen) VCs in Saiha District respectively. This means that there are 191 Village Councils, constituted by 822 members, in all the Urban Areas/Urban Centres in the State of Mizoram. Table (4.4) clarifies that no Urban Administration has introduced in Mizoram under the provision of Part - IX A of the Constitution.

Different Urban Towns in different Districts are shown in Table (4.5). In Mamit District, Zawlnuam, Zawlnuam Vengpui and Lengpui have 1(one) VC each while the District Capital Town of Mamit has 5(five) VCs. In Kolasib District, there are two(two) VCs in Vairengte, and 1(one) each in Bairabi, and Kawnpui North. Kolasib have 12(twelve) VC. In Aizawl District, Darlawn and Saitual have 1(one) VC each, Sairang have 1(two) VC and the State Capital i.e., Aizawl, has a recorded high of 77(seventy-seven) VCs within its urban area.<sup>14</sup> In Champhai District, Champhai Town has 16(sixteen) VCs, Khawzawl 5(five) VCs, Khawhai and Biate have 1(one) VCs each. In Serchhip District, Thenzawl has 2(two) VCs, N. Vanlaiphai has 1(one), and Serchhip Town has 17 VCs.

<sup>13</sup> Government of Mizoram, *Village Council Census, 2009*, Directorate-Local Administration Department.

<sup>14</sup> Government of Mizoram, *Village Census, 2010*, Local Administration Department.

**Table-4.5****VCs details in the Urban Areas of Mizoram (As on September 2009)<sup>15</sup>**

Sl. No.	District	Urban Town / Notified Town	No. of Village council	No. of Village Council Members
1.	Mamit	Zawlnuam	1	3
		Zawlnuam Vengpui	1	4
		Mamit	5	20
		Lengpui	1	5
		<b>Sub Total</b>	8	32
2.	Kolasib	Vairengte	2	11
		Bairabi	1	6
		Kolasib	12	52
		Kawnpui North	1	5
		<b>Sub Total</b>	16	74
3.	Aizawl	Darlawn	1	6
		Sairang	2	9
		Aizawl	77	367
		Saitual	1	6
		<b>Sub Total</b>	81	388
4.	Champhai	Khawzawl	5	20
		Champhai	16	67
		Khawhai	1	5
		Biate	1	5
		<b>Sub Total</b>	23	97
5.	Serchhip	Thenzawl	2	9
		Serchhip	17	33
		N.Vanlaiphai	1	5
		<b>Sub Total</b>	20	47
6.	Lunglei	Tlabung	1	5
		Hnahthial	2	10
		Lunglei	23	101
		<b>Sub Total</b>	26	116
7.	Saiha	Saiha	17	68
		<b>Sub Total</b>	17	68
		<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>822</b>

At the southern District of the State, Lunglei Town has 23(twenty-three) VCs, Tlabung has 1(one), and Hnahthial has 2(two) VCs. The southern tip District of Saiha,

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*,

the District capital has 17(seventeen) VCs. As shown by Table (4.4) there are 191 Village Council Institutions and 822 VC Members in the Urban Areas of Mizoram. This Table unveiled the fact that the Village Council institution, meant for the village administration, was adopted in all the Urban Areas/Notified Towns of Mizoram.

Much change has not been found in the 2001 Census from the 1991 Census except that the total number of Inhabited Villages increased from 698 in 1991 to 707 in 2001. Apart from this, the number of uninhabited Villages also increased from 87 in 1991 to 110 in 2001. This may not be administrative development from the purview of development administration because separate local administration is not given to Villages and Towns in Mizoram.

Unlike the 1991 Census, the 2001 Census distributed Mizoram into eight Districts,<sup>16</sup> i.e., Aizawl District, Lunglei District, Saiha District, Mamit District, Kolasib District, Champhai District, Serchhip District and Lawngtlai District respectively.<sup>17</sup> This is because the State Government has divided Aizawl District into 5(five) separate Districts in 1998.<sup>18</sup> As such, all the District Areas have a different shape and size (as compared to 1991 census).

Aside from these, even the District Headquarters and the State Capital, i.e., Aizawl, is administered by Village Council, which is meant for the Villages. Therefore, there are no civic amenities in the District capitals of Mizoram, causing the drainage systems, water supply, sanitation, sewerage, roads and streetlights are almost without maintenance. Of course, these civic amenities are under the direct control of the Government Departments of the State. Though the State Government did its best through its departments, it was not able to solve public requirements since Government departments are too much busy with their routine works.

After the administration of Mizoram was elevated from a District Council status under the Sixth Schedule to that of State in accordance with the 53<sup>rd</sup> Constitution Amendment,<sup>19</sup> the Village Council election was conducted by the Local Administration Department. Except for the 2009 VC election, all other elections are

---

<sup>16</sup> *Gazette, Mizoram (Extra Ordinary)*, No. 64 of 1998, read with No. 137 of 1998.

<sup>17</sup> *Op.cit., Census of India, 2001.*

<sup>18</sup> *Op.cit., Gazette, Mizoram (Extra Ordinary).*

<sup>19</sup> Singh, Buta, Constitution 53rd Amendment, *Statement of objects and Reasons*, Dated 1st August 1986.

conducted under the provisions provided by the Village Council Act, 1953. It may be noted that the 2009 Village Council elections was for the first time conducted under the superintendence of the State Election Commission.

Though Village Councils are not given powers by Law, they exercise different functions consistent with the customary laws of the Mizo society. It should, however, be noted that they are not a Development Unit.<sup>20</sup> The only and most important responsibility of the Council is to administer the village community. Section 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the Village Councils Act, 1953 embodies few important functions of the Councils.<sup>21</sup> Section 8 (1) States that “The Village Council or any Officer of the District Council authorised by the Executive Committee shall allot a particular region within the boundaries of each Village for Jhum to a particular year, and the distribution of the Jhum plots shall be done in accordance with the laws framed by the State Government under paragraph 3 (1) (d) of the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution of India.” Clause (2) of Section 8 States, “The Village Council shall have powers to enforce ‘*Hnatlang*’ (community works) for the interest of the public for whatever occasion so required. Provided that no discrimination shall be made on grounds of religion, caste, class or any of them.” Clause (3) of the same Section says that “Any person who does not comply with the order of ‘*Hnatlang*’ shall be liable to ‘Fine’ either in kind or in cash, which may be fixed by the Government by Order, from time to time, not exceeding Rs. 50/- per *Hnatlang* Day.” Again, Clause (1) of Section 9 enshrines that “Each Council shall have power to exempt any person or persons from ‘*Hnatlang*’ at its own discretion.” The reason for exemption shall be recorded in writing, but no persons who is 60 years or above shall be forced to do any ‘*Hnatlang*.’ Besides, Clause (2) and (3) of Section 9 embodied certain restrictions and rate of ‘*Hnatlang*’ Day.<sup>22</sup>

On the other hand, functions regarding the collection of taxes and constitution of Sanitation Committee at the Village Levels are written in Section 10 and 11 of the Village Council Act. Though the Village Council lacks Constitutional powers while performing their functions, they execute their daily responsibilities by exercising minimal authorities enshrined in (1) The Lushai Hills District (Village Councils) Act,

---

<sup>20</sup> *Op.cit.*, Lalrinzuala, K. MCS, Aizawl, p-2.

<sup>21</sup> *Op.cit.*, *The Lushai Hills District (Village Councils) Act, 1953*, p-7 & 8.

<sup>22</sup> *Op.cit.*, Lalrinzuala, K. MCS, Aizawl, p-2 & 3.

1953; (2) Court Manual of the Mizo District Council Part-III Village Council; (3) The Lushai Hills District Jhumming Regulation 1954; (4) Administration of Justice Rules 1953; (5) The Lushai Hills District (House Site) Act 1953; (6) The Mizoram Land Holding and Village *Ram* Rules 2001; (7) The Mizoram Forest Act 1955 (Read with the Mizo District Forest Act 1955). Other sources of the VC powers are - The Mizoram Animal (Control and Taxation) Act 1980; The Mizoram Animal (Control and Taxation) Rules 1982; Guidelines and Manuals of Developing Agency e.g., DRDA etc.<sup>23</sup>

By exercising the powers mentions by the Laws above, the State Government delegates minimal functions to the Village Councils. However, they are under stringent control of the bureaucracy, particularly the District Local Administration Officer (DLAO) of the Local Administration Department. In fact, as stated by the Village Council Act, all the Councils are authorised to undertake only the responsibilities entrusted to them by the Government. The Village Councils are not empowered under any Act or rules, especially in Town areas, to exercise any powers. However, they can call '*Hnatlang*' (or Community works) in the interest of the community at the local levels. Though the Village Councils are authorised by the Acts and Rules to carry out the distribution of 'Jhum site' and 'House sites' in the rural areas, this power is not applicable in the Urban Areas.

Though Mizoram Government has notified 23 Towns,<sup>24</sup> the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, Government of India identified 22 Urban Towns/Notified Towns in Mizoram.<sup>25</sup> They are: (1) Aizawl; (2) Lunglei; (3) Saiha; (4) Champhai; (5) Kolasib; (6) Serchhip; (7) Saitual; (8) Khawzawl; (9) Vairengte; (10) Hnahtial; (11) N. Kawnpui; (12) Thenzawl; (13) Mamit; (14) Sairang; (15) N.Vanlaiphai; (16) Darlawn; (17) Tlabung; (18) Bairabi; (19) Zawlnuam; (20) Lengpui; (21) Khawhai; (22) Biate.<sup>26</sup> All these Urban Towns/Notified Towns existed without any Urban Administrative System. Instead, they have Village Councils, which are mean for the village administration. This Table (4.6) shows that all the Urban Areas/Notified Town

---

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p-3.

<sup>24</sup> Government of Mizoram, *Statistical Handbook Mizoram 2006*, p-7.

<sup>25</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Census of India 2001*, p-29.

<sup>26</sup> Government of India, Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India, p-1, From: [www.censusindia.gov.in](http://www.censusindia.gov.in).

of Mizoram have Village Council for the local administration of rural and Urban Areas, and that there is no Urban Local Bodies in the state.

It is pertinent to mention that the Government of Mizoram has cancelled 'Nominated seats' to all the VC institutions since 23rd November 1999.<sup>27</sup> Before this, the Village Council Act empowered the Government to appoint one-fourth nominated seats from the total number of seats to all the Councils.

The followings are Urban Town detailed and VCs in each of the District Headquarters:

**Table-4.6**  
**Urban Town detailed and VCs in the District Headquarters.<sup>28</sup>**  
**(Aizawl)**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Town / City	Name of Village Council	No. of Members		Total (Members)
			(Elected)	(Nominated)	
1.	AIZAWL	1. Selesih	3	NIL	3
		2. Durtlang 'N'	4	NIL	4
		3. Durtlang	5	NIL	5
		4. Durtlang Leitan	5	NIL	5
		5. Zuangtui	5	NIL	5
		6. Muanna Veng	3	NIL	3
		7. Chaltlang	6	NIL	6
		8. Bawngkawn	6	NIL	6
		9. Bawngkawn 'S'	4	NIL	4
		10. Ramhlun 'N'	6	NIL	6
		11. Ramhlun Venglai	5	NIL	5
		12. Ramhlun Vengthar	4	NIL	4
		13. Laipuitlang	4	NIL	4
		14. Ramhlun Sports Complex	4	NIL	4
		15. Ramhlun 'S'	6	NIL	6
		16. Ramhlun North	4	NIL	4
		17. Ramthar Veng	6	NIL	6
		18. Aizawl Venglai	4	NIL	4
		19. Electric Veng	6	NIL	6
		20. Chanmari	6	NIL	6
		21. Zarkawt	4	NIL	4
		22. Chanmari 'W'	6	NIL	6
		23. Edenthar	4	NIL	4
		24. Hunthar	4	NIL	4
		25. Zemabawk	6	NIL	6
		26. Zemabawk 'N'	5	NIL	5
		27. Falkland	3	NIL	3

<sup>27</sup> *Op.cit.*, The Mizoram Gazette (Extra Ordinary), No. 337 Dated 23.11.1999.

<sup>28</sup> Lalthlamuana, Directorate of Local Administration Department, Government of Mizoram. Dated 19th August 2010.

	28. Thuampui	5	NIL	5
	29. Armed Veng	4	NIL	4
	30. Chite	3	NIL	3
	31. Armed Veng 'S'	6	NIL	6
	32. Dawrpui	5	NIL	5
	33. Saron Veng	4	NIL	4
	34. Chhinga Veng	6	NIL	6
	35. Tuithiang Veng	4	NIL	4
	36. Chawnpui	5	NIL	5
	37. Zotlang	4	NIL	4
	38. Zonuam	4	NIL	4
	39. Government Complex	4	NIL	4
	40. Luangmual	5	NIL	5
	41. Chawlhmun	5	NIL	5
	42. Tanhril	5	NIL	5
	43. Sakawrtuichhun	4	NIL	4
	44. Rangvamual	4	NIL	4
	45. Tuivamit	3	NIL	3
	46. Tuikual 'N'	6	NIL	6
	47. Tuikual 'S'	6	NIL	6
	48. Dinthar	6	NIL	6
	49. Dawrpui Vengthar	5	NIL	5
	50. Vaivakawn	5	NIL	5
	51. Kanan	5	NIL	5
	52. Khatla	6	NIL	6
	53. Khatla 'S'	5	NIL	5
	54. Mission Vengthlang	6	NIL	6
	55. Bungkawn	6	NIL	6
	56. Maubawk	5	NIL	5
	57. Lawipu	3	NIL	3
	58. Nursery	4	NIL	4
	59. Bungkawn Vengthar	4	NIL	4
	60. Bethlehem	6	NIL	6
	61. College Veng	5	NIL	5
	62. Bethlehem Vengthlang	6	NIL	6
	63. Venghloi	5	NIL	5
	64. Republic	5	NIL	5
	65. Upper Republic	4	NIL	4
	66. Republic Vengthlang	4	NIL	4
	67. Mission Veng	6	NIL	6
	68. Salem Veng	5	NIL	5
	69. Dam Veng	4	NIL	4
	70. Venghnuai	4	NIL	4
	71. Thakthing	4	NIL	4
	72. ITI Veng	6	NIL	6
	73. Kulikawn	5	NIL	5
	74. Tlangnuam	5	NIL	5
	75. Saikhamakawn	4	NIL	4
	76. Melthum	4	NIL	4
	77. Hlimen	5	NIL	5
			<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>367</b>



**Table-4.7****Urban Town detailed and VCs in the District Headquarters.<sup>29</sup>  
(Lunglei)**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Town / City	Name of Village Council	No. of Members		Total (Members)
			(Elected)	(Non elected)	
2	LUNGLEI	1. Zobawk	5	NIL	5
		2. Lungpuizawl	3	NIL	3
		3. Hrangchalkawn	3	NIL	3
		4. Theiriat	4	NIL	4
		5. Lunglawn	5	NIL	5
		6. Salem Veng	4	NIL	4
		7. Farm Veng	4	NIL	4
		8. Electric	5	NIL	5
		9. Rahsi Veng	5	NIL	5
		10. Hauruang	4	NIL	4
		11. College Veng	4	NIL	4
		12. Zohnuai	4	NIL	4
		13. Zotlang	4	NIL	4
		14. Sethlun	3	NIL	3
		15. Luangmual	4	NIL	4
		16. Ramthar	5	NIL	5
		17. Chanmari	6	NIL	6
		18. Venglai	5	NIL	5
		19. Sazaikawn	3	NIL	3
		20. Venghlun	4	NIL	4
		21. Bazar Veng	5	NIL	5
		22. Serkawn	4	NIL	4
		23. Pukpui	4	NIL	4
		24. Salem Veng	4	NIL	4
			<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>101</b>

**Table-4.8****Urban Town detailed and VCs in the District Headquarters.<sup>30</sup>  
(Mamit)**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Town / City	Name of Village Council	No. of Members		Total (Members)
			(Elected)	(Non elected)	
3.	MAMIT	1. Mamit Hmar Veng	4	NIL	4
		2. Venghlun	4	NIL	4
		3. Mamit Bazar	4	NIL	4
		4. Mamit Chhim Veng	4	NIL	4
		5. New Mamit	4	NIL	4
			<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>20</b>

**Table-4.9**<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

**Urban Town detailed and VCs in the District Headquarters.<sup>31</sup>**  
**(Kolasib)**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Town / City	Name of Village Council	No. of Members		Total (Members)
			(Elected)	(Non elected)	
4.	KOLASIB	1. Kolasib - I	5	NIL	5
		2. Kolasib - II	6	NIL	6
		3. Kolasib - III	5	NIL	5
		4. Kolasib - IV	5	NIL	5
		5. Kolasib - V	4	NIL	4
		6. Kolasib - VI	4	NIL	4
		7. Kolasib - VII	4	NIL	4
		8. College Veng	4	NIL	4
		9. Rengtekawn	4	NIL	4
		10. Bawktlang (Builum)	3	NIL	3
		11. Thingdawl	5	NIL	5
		12. Project Veng	3	NIL	3
		<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>52</b>

**Table – 4.10**

**Urban Town detailed and VCs in the District Headquarters.<sup>32</sup>**  
**(Champhai)**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Town / City	Name of Village Council	No. of Members		Total (Members)
			(Elected)	(Non elected)	
5.	CHAMPH AI	1. Champhai Vengsang	5	NIL	5
		2. Champhai Kahrawt	4	NIL	4
		3. Hmunhmeltha	4	NIL	4
		4. Champhai Venglai	5	NIL	5
		5. Champhai Vengthar	4	NIL	4
		6. New Champhai	3	NIL	3
		7. Champhai Bethel	5	NIL	5
		8. Champhai Zote	4	NIL	4
		9. Tlangsam	4	NIL	4
		10. Ruantlang	4	NIL	4
		11. Champhai Kanan	5	NIL	5
		12. Champhai Electric	4	NIL	4
		13. Champhai Chhungte	3	NIL	3
		14. Zotlang East	4	NIL	4
		15. Champhai Vengthlang	6	NIL	6
		16. Champhai Dinthar	3	NIL	3
		<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>67</b>

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

**Table-4.11****Urban Town detailed and VCs in the District Headquarters.<sup>33</sup>  
(Serchhip)**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Town / City	Name of Village Council	No. of Members		Total (Members)
			(Elected)	(Non elected)	
6.	SERCHHIP	1. Serchhip - II	5	NIL	5
		2. Serchhip - II	4	NIL	4
		3. Serchhip - III	4	NIL	4
		4. Serchhip - IV	6	NIL	6
		5. Serchhip - V	4	NIL	4
		6. New Serchhip	5	NIL	5
		7. Chhiahtlang	5	NIL	5
			<b>TOTAL</b>		

**Table-4.12****Urban Town detailed and VCs in the District Headquarters.<sup>34</sup>  
(Saiha)**

Sl. No.	Name of Urban Town / City	Name of Village Council	No. of Members		Total (Members)
			(Elected)	(Non elected)	
7.	SAIHA	1. Siahavaihpi - I	4	NIL	4
		2. Siahavaihpi - II	4	NIL	4
		3. Siahavaihpi - III	4	NIL	4
		4. New Colony - I	4	NIL	4
		5. New Colony - II	4	NIL	4
		6. New Colony - III	4	NIL	4
		7. College Vaih	4	NIL	4
		8. College Vaih - II	4	NIL	4
		9. Meisavaih 'East'	4	NIL	4
		10. Meisavaih 'West'	4	NIL	4
		11. New Siaha 'East'	4	NIL	4
		12. New Siaha 'West'	4	NIL	4
		13. Meisatlah	4	NIL	4
		14. ECM Vaih	4	NIL	4
		15. Council Vaih	4	NIL	4
		16. Sihatlah - I	4	NIL	4
		17. Sihatlah - II	4	NIL	4
		<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>68</b>

As shown by the Tables (4.6 to 4.12), Aizawl is the biggest Urban Centre in Mizoram. There were 77 (seventy-seven) Village Council Institutions and 367 elected members in this Centres. Lunglei is the second biggest Town of the State, it has 24

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

VC and 101 elected members. The District Headquarters of Mara Autonomous District Council (MADC) is called Saiha, it has 17 VCs and 68 elected members. Among the 5 (five) newly created Districts, Champhai has the highest number of VCs, it has 16 VCs and 67 elected members, which is followed by Kolasib with 12 VCs and 52 elected members. While Serchhip has 7 VCs and 33 elected members, and Mamit has 5 VCs and 20 elected members respectively.

**Table–4.13**  
**Population Break-up (District-Wise)<sup>35</sup>**

Sl. No.	District	Males	Females	TOTAL	Percent
1.	Aizawl	1,66,877	1,58,799	3,25,676	36.65
2.	Lunglei	71,402	65,821	1,37,223	15.45
3.	Champhai	55,756	52,636	1,08,392	12.20
4.	Lawngtlai	38,776	34,844	73,620	8.28
5.	Kolasib	34,562	31,398	65,960	7.42
6.	Mamit	33,114	29,671	62,785	7.07
7.	Saiha	31,242	29,814	61,056	6.87
8.	Serchhip	27,380	26,481	53,861	6.06
	<b>G. TOTAL</b>	<b>459,109</b>	<b>429,464</b>	<b>888,573</b>	

Table (4.13) exhibited that 3, 25,676 persons lived in Aizawl District, while 1, 66,877 are males and 1, 58,799 are females. While Lunglei District has the total population of 1, 37,223, Saiha District has 61,056 populations. Percentage calculation of different Districts in the State is as follows: Aizawl has 36.65 percent; Lunglei 15.45 percent, Saiha 6.87 percent of populations from the total population of the State.<sup>36</sup> From the new Districts, Champhai has the highest percent of 12.20 populations, followed by Lawngtlai with 8.28 percent, Kolasib 7.42 percent, Mamit 7.07 percent and Serchhip has 6.06 percent of populations respectively.

As said before, Village Council elections have been held since 23rd April 1954 with 17 elections having been conducted in the State till date. In all these elections, women were sparsely represented. This is quite disproportionate to the female population of Mizoram. Detailed population, as shown in Table 4.13 clearly portrayed that the female population in Mizoram is 4,29,464 while male is 4,59,109. This implies that female population is 48.33 percent of the total population or sex

<sup>35</sup> Op.cit., *Statistical Handbook Mizoram 2006*.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*.

ratio of male to female is 1000: 935 in Mizoram. Among the 8(eight) Districts, Aizawl District has the highest female population of 1, 58,799 followed by Lunglei District with 65,821 females. Champhai District has 52,636, Lawngtlai District has 34,844 and Kolasib District has 31,398. The remaining Districts, Mamit, Saiha, and Serchhip Districts all have female population below 30,000 with 29,671, 29,814 and 26,481 being their female populations respectively.

Though the share of female population in the State of Mizoram is high, their participation in the elective body or VCs was quite low as was shown in Table (4.14). Accordingly, 38 females elected in the last Mizoram Village Councils Election held in 2009. The elected female percentage to male is only 4.85 while their population percentage is as high as 48.33 percent. Among the District, Aizawl has the highest female Village Council members at 21(twenty-one), followed by Lunglei with 7 (seven) and Saiha District 6 (six). Unhappily, Serchhip, Mamit, Champhai and Kolasib Districts have only 1(one) female elected member each.

**Table-4.14**  
**Number of Elected Women in Different Districts**  
**(2009 V.C. Election)<sup>37</sup>**

Sl. No.	District	No of Members		Percent of Female Members
		Female	Male	
1.	Aizawl	21	367	5.73
2.	Lunglei	7	109	6.43
3.	Serchhip	1	46	2.18
4.	Mamit	1	31	3.23
5.	Champhai	1	96	1.05
6.	Kolasib	1	73	1.37
7.	Saiha	6	62	9.68
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>784</b>	<b>4.85</b>

The overall number of elected members is 822 in the last VC election. In the largest and most populous District of the State i.e., Aizawl, 388 members elected in which only 21(twenty-one) females are present. This is 5.73 percent of the total elected VC members in the District.<sup>38</sup> Thus, female representation in the VC institution is very disproportionate to the male/female population ratio.

<sup>37</sup> Government of Mizoram, Office of the Directorate of the Local Administration Department.

<sup>38</sup> Sangtei, Smt., Directorate of the Local Administration Department, Government of Mizoram, Date 5th August 2010.

Saiha District contributed to the highest women elected members with 9.68 percent. Lunglei District has 6.43 percent. The other Districts contributed minimally with Serchhip having 2.18, Mamit 3.23, Champhai 1.05 and Kolasib 1.37 percent women representatives respectively. The status of women could be the best indicator of a nation's progress.<sup>39</sup> It is a most alarming situation, as far as the status of women elected is concerned, that no Districts in the state of Mizoram have attained a percentage above a single digit for female members in their Village Council Election. This Table (4.14) clearly signifies that women do not contribute much in the initiation of democracy in Mizoram.

**Table-4.15**

**Status of Women in the VC Institutions of Mizoram<sup>40</sup>**

Sl. No.	Name of District	Number of Women					
		VCP	VP	Tr.	Secy.	VCM	TOTAL
1.	Aizawl	4	3	4	0	10	21
2.	Saiha	0	0	0	0	6	6
3.	Lunglei	3	2	0	0	2	7
4.	Kolasib	0	0	1	0	0	1
5.	Champhai	0	0	0	0	1	1
6.	Mamit	0	0	0	0	1	1
7.	Serchhip	0	0	0	0	1	1
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>38</b>

The status of women in the present local bodies or Village Council is much below expectations as shown in Table (4.14). From amongst 38 (thirty-eight) elected representatives in the VCs, only 17 (seventeen) elected members are given Office Bearers' (OBs) posts in the institution. Sadly, Saiha, Champhai, Mamit, and Serchhip Districts do not have any female OBs. This clearly implies that, though women candidates are elected, they are not preferred to occupy executive position in the body. Of the 17(seventeen) female OBs, 7(seven) members are assigned President

<sup>39</sup> Singh,U.B., *Urban Government in North Eastern Region(Legal Issues & Practices) (1999)*. Gyan Publishing House-5, Ansari Road, New Delhi-110,002, p-1.

<sup>40</sup> *Op.cit., Village Census 2010.*

(VCP) posts and 5(five) each are appointed as Vice Presidents (VP) and Treasurers (Tr.) posts respectively.<sup>41</sup>

## **II. Need for Transformation of Rural Government Machineries in the Urban Areas to Cater to the Needs of the Urban Dwellers**

From the experiences of the system during the last 55 years, the Village Councils in the Urban Areas essentially need to be supplanted by the system embodied by the Constitution through the 74th CAA. This institution, especially in the Urban Areas, had faced complex problems, as they have no powers backed by the Constitution of India. Though they are constituted under the Village Council Act of 1954, they have become redundant and obsolete in the Urban Areas with the passing of time. In order to make the VC institutions look as legitimate as possible, the Government assigns many subjects to them through different Acts, Rules, Manuals etc., which in reality are not pertinent to the Village Council Act, 1954. Since the institution emerged under the erstwhile District Council for village administration, it functions without appropriate laws in the Urban Areas and Towns.

Thus, the urban management and people in the urban areas encounter innumerable problems. Vital public amenities like sanitation, public water supply and distribution, electricity supply and management, sewerage, waste/garbage collection, internal road links and transportation as well as many other public amenities are outside the ambit of the traditional Councils. They are not a development unit, and thereby, this institution cannot undertake construction and management of essential public assets.<sup>42</sup> Therefore, an urgent need of the day is an empowered Constitutional Body, which has adequate legal protections. It would be appropriate to opt for urban administration in Mizoram as Article 243-P to 243-ZG was added in the mother law of the Country through the 74th Amendment Act in 1992.<sup>43</sup>

In Mizoram, Urban Areas, Towns/Notified Towns have no responsible governing mechanism as a result of which urban assets and civic administrations are

---

<sup>41</sup> *Op.cit.*, Sangtei.

<sup>42</sup> *Op.cit.*, Lalrinzuala, K. MCS, p-3

<sup>43</sup> Singh, Mahendra, P., *V.N. Shukla's Constitution of India*,(2010), Eleventh Edition, Publishers-EBC Publishing House (P) Ltd., 34-A, Lalbagh, Lucknow – 226001. p-704.

placed at a disadvantage. The following Government Departments are directly involved in Urban and Town subjects:-

(1) Local Administration Department (LAD), (2) Revenue Department, (3) Public Works Department (PWD), (4) Public Health Engineering Department (PHED), (5) Food Civil Supplies and Consumers Affairs (FCS&CA), (6) Home Department, (7) Health Department, (8) General Administration Department (GAD), (9) Power and Electricity Department (P& E). The following few problems are more widespread in the Urban Centres/Notified Towns of the State:

*Firstly*, the LAD is responsible for the management of VCs in the rural and Urban Areas. Its roles include conducting VC election, management of VCs and subordinating different responsibilities from the Department to the institutions. Traditionally, the LAD is the premier agent for public sanitation and provision of many other civic amenities of the urban people. Besides conducting VC elections, sanitation maintenance is the most important function of the department. Due to rapid urbanisation, public wastes increased.<sup>44</sup> The department, however, cannot afford to provide adequate sanitation as before. Thus, it introduced Public Private Partnership (PPP) mode, and collecting household wastes by vehicles has been privatised since 5<sup>th</sup> October 2010 in 60 Villages/localities of the Capital city through a 90:10 ratio share expenditure between the Government and the Villages/localities.<sup>45</sup> This shows that the LAD could not afford to provide sanitation to Urban Centres/Towns.

*Secondly*, the Revenue Department constructs and manages some market buildings in the urban Towns of Mizoram.<sup>46</sup> However, they do not undertake the required steps for the management and maintenance of the buildings. What the Department does is collect monthly rentals and fees from tenants while neglecting their other responsibilities.

---

<sup>44</sup> *Op.cit.*, Lalrinzuala, K. MCS, p-3.

<sup>45</sup> Lalnunsanga, R., *Local Council Member*, Aizawl Municipal Council, Ward No IX. Dated 29 December 2010.

<sup>46</sup> Lalkhawngaiha, JHB., *Surveyor*, Directorate of Land Revenue & Settlements. Government of Mizoram, Dated 18th January 2008.



*Thirdly*, construction and maintenance of roads, culverts, side drains etc., are the sole responsibility of PWD in the urban Towns.<sup>47</sup> However, the department is always slow in maintenance works as is with every other department. Construction and maintenance of Government office buildings and other departmental buildings are also the responsibility of this department, the duty of which is rarely carried out satisfactorily.

*Fourthly*, distribution of water, construction, and management of public water points and collection of water fees and duties are the subjects of the PHE Department. Water harvesting through hand pumps from underground natural water reservoirs, water-testing laboratories and maintaining the hygiene of public waters are also the responsibilities of PHE Department.<sup>48</sup> The Greater Aizawl Supply of Water Scheme Phase-I designed to meet the requirement of 80,000 people of Aizawl at the rate of 135 litres of water per head per day. The scheme was completed in December 1988. By the time the scheme was commissioned in 1989 the scheme had to feed 1,54,343 population of Aizawl Town.<sup>49</sup> But now water supply is direly inadequate for the 2,28,280 persons living in the city. The Department was hard-put to solve the State Capital's drinking water supply problems.

**Table-4.15**  
**Number of Villages Provided with Safe Drinking Water Facilities**<sup>50</sup>

Sl. No.	District	Pipe Supply Upto 31.3.2006	Hand pump installed Upto 31.3.2006
1.	Mamit	110	168
2.	Kolasib	86	168
3.	Aizawl	71	377
4.	Champhai	21	224
5.	Serchhip	63	198
6.	Lunglei	132	210
7.	Lawngtlai	59	122
8.	Saiha	28	49
	<b>Total</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>1516</b>

<sup>47</sup> Tluanga, Lalnun., *Chief Engineer*. Public Works Department. Government of Mizoram, Dated 18th December 2009.

<sup>48</sup> Nipuii, Kawlni., *Sample Collector*, PHED. Government of Mizoram, Dated 5th March 2007.

<sup>49</sup> Prasad, R.N., *Urban Local Self-Government in India*. (2006). Mittal Publications, New Delhi (India). ISBN 81-8324-130-1, p-193.

<sup>50</sup> Op.cit., *Statistical Handbook Mizoram 2006*, p-58

As all the Towns in Mizoram are built on hills, people depend mostly on the Government water supply. In the District capitals, 34,471 households are provided house water connection as of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2006., i.e., 214 houses in Mamit, 1946 houses in Kolasib, 21,753 houses in Aizawl, 946 houses in Champhai, 1371 houses in Serchhip, 6040 houses in Lunglei, 991 houses in Lawngtlai and 1210 houses in Saiha.<sup>51</sup> While there are 1,76,134 household in different Districts,<sup>52</sup> only 34,471 houses or 19.57 percent are given house water connection. In spite of that, 20 percent of house water connected families face water scarcity. Water shortage has become a perpetual complaint in all the Urban Centres/Notified Towns.

*Fifthly*, Public distribution system concern is the responsibility of FCS & CA Department, popularly known as Supply Department. Besides the distribution of essential commodities like rice, kerosene etc., to the public, this department also takes up examinations and tests of many consumable and non-consumable goods, which include weights and measures, qualities of oil products such as petrol and diesel and sensitizing the public about the consumer's rights. Supply irregularities, cheating of weights and measures by retailers etc., have remained unsolved because of insufficient checking staff in the department.<sup>53</sup>

*Sixthly*, security of the urban people and facilities of the Urban Areas in this regard are under the care of the Home Department. Maintenance of law and order, vehicular traffic management and relief measures of the urban masses during natural calamities etc., is its subjects. Protecting residences and public utilities 24 hours a day is its duty. However, the crime registered by the Police during January to March 2010 has increased by 49.42 percent as compared to the corresponding period of the preceding year.<sup>54</sup> This was revealed in the crime conference held at Police Headquarters Aizawl on 22nd April 2010. Of the 774 cases registered during the period, 598 are IPC cases and the rest non-IPC cases. Aizawl District registered the highest number of crimes with 465 cases followed by Champhai District with 78 cases. Mamit District, which has the least number of crimes, registered 18 cases.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p-59

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p-7.

<sup>53</sup> Liana, Zosang., *Retailer-2*, Chhinga Veng. Dated 28th February 2008.

<sup>54</sup> *Crime Conference*, Dated 22nd April 2010, at Police Headquarters, Aizawl.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*,.

*Seventhly*, mass immunisation of the urban population, attending to and controlling epidemics all falls under the responsibility of the Health Department. Anti-malaria programme, eradication of goitre, malnutrition and health status of mother and children of the urban people are its essential responsibilities.<sup>56</sup>

*Eighthly*, the General Administrative Department (GAD) is the forerunner of all the other departments in the Urban Areas where administration is concerned. It is true that other Departments have no line offices, either at the District Level or at Block Level. But, GAD has Line Agencies from the State to Sub-Division Levels. Therefore, the GAD has many responsibilities ranging from the maintenance of Law and Orders, Licensing, Collection of Fees and Fines, Conduct of Election to the legislature and the execution of development programmes. Most important of all, Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS) for Urban citizens and Member of the Parliament's Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) are executed by this Department.<sup>57</sup> As there is no separation of administration for the rural and Urban Areas, its role is very vast and wide. Thereby, their works in many of the Urban Centres are superfluous because this Department's subjects are complex in numbers and roles.

*Ninthly*, the management of electricity and its distribution to the consumers in the urban Towns are directly undertaken by the Department of Power and Electricity (P & E). Their functions include construction and maintenance of streetlights in the Urban Areas/urban Towns and the electrification of rural areas. Collection of monthly revenues and fees from the consumers, electrification of streetlights and household connectivity and all other subjects connected with electricity supply are under the charge of the P & E Department.<sup>58</sup> But, electric supply irregularities and unmanaged streetlights is the characteristic shown by the Department in Aizawl City and other Towns.<sup>59</sup> The State Government is taking its best efforts to generate more powers

---

<sup>56</sup> Rozama. R.L., *Community Trainer*, Government of Mizoram, Directorate of Health and Family Welfare, 2nd March 2003.

<sup>57</sup> Sakhawliana, *Public Administration for Class XI & XII* (2010). JP Offset. p-262.

<sup>58</sup> Sangyunga, J., *Head Assistant*, Government of Mizoram, P & E Department, Dated 18th January 2007.

<sup>59</sup> Meeting of Tenth North Eastern Regions Power Committee (NERPC), State Guest House. Dated 9th February 2011.

through hydro-electricity, like Tuivai HEP Pilot Project -210 MW capacity, Kolodyne HEP-460 MW, Chhimpui HEP 635 MW, and Lungreng HEP 815 MW etc.<sup>60</sup>

Besides the department mentions above, there are still a few other departments implementing their subjects in the Urban Towns without any variation from the functions and roles they perform for the rural areas. For example, the Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Department (AH&Vety) has the responsibility of checking epidemics in domestic animals in the urban Towns by providing awareness to the urbanites and providing vaccines. The department attends to various communicable diseases, from animals to human beings. On the other hand, the Agriculture department distribute seeds and seedlings to the urban farmers. The State flagship programme, the New Land Use Policy (NLUP), a scheme for discontinuing shifting cultivation in rural areas is also implemented in the Urban Areas.<sup>61</sup>

Despite the lack of adequate qualifications and facilities, many Government Departments have started evolving into dispenser of civic amenities. Due to the lack of an urban administrator, the roles and functions of different departments in the urban Towns remain in chaos. Few examples are-*Firstly*, the building of the biggest market in the State i.e., the New Market was constructed by the Public Works Department way back in 1980's. However, the management of this building is the subject of Revenue Department including collection of fees and fines. However, disposal of garbage and wastes is the responsibility of LAD. *Secondly*, PWD construct and maintain roads and drains in urban Towns. However, there are many culverts, pavements, and drains constructed by the LAD too.<sup>62</sup> Absence of proper unified authority and coordination between the different departments has caused many problems to arise. Under the present urban situation, a Department is required to obtain an 'authorisation' from another Department. *Thirdly*, there are many buildings directly constructed and managed each by the Revenue Department, LAD and PWD. *Fourthly*, the activities of PWD, LAD and PHE clash on many occasions. While providing household water connectivity, PHE department need to cut across roads/steps diagonally or position water pipes above/on/below culverts and drains, thus making it necessary for the construction departments or PWD, to make repairs to

---

<sup>60</sup> The Zozam Times *Daily News paper*, Dated 10th February 2011

<sup>61</sup> Sakhawliana, Public Administration for Class XI & XII (2010). JP Offset. P-276.

<sup>62</sup> *Op.cit.*, Sakhawliana, P-276

their roads/steps, culverts and drainage systems. This lack of coordination between the different departments has given rise to chaos and misunderstanding between the departments on many occasions.

The management, powers, and functions of the Village Council in the Urban Centres and urban Towns have been defective and inadequate too. Drastic change needs be taken in the institution especially after the 74th Constitution Amendment. Though the institution is said to authorise to exercises powers and functions from different edicts, like the Lushai Hills District (Village Councils) Act 1953, Administration of Justice Rules 1953; Court Manual of the Mizo District Council Part-III; Jhumming Regulation 1954; Land Holding and Settlement Act 2000; Forest Act 1955; Animal Act, 1980 etc., the reality is quite the opposite. This is experienced especially in the urban centres and urban Towns where the very Government that had given them authority denies most of the Village Councils' powers and functions to them. As the institution is meant for the Villages or rural people, VCs' powers relating to the allocation of house-site for indigenous people and anything concerning animal laws are conditionally restrained for the Councils in the urban centres and Towns. Some of the glaring deficiencies and urgency for the transformation of the present urban system to conform to Article Part - IXA of the Constitution are:

(1) The powers and functions of the Village Councils are restrictive and undemocratic. Though endowed with minor powers exercisable by the institutions through Justice Rules 1953, the State Government is authorised by law to direct, control and monitor the functions of the councils. However, politically controlled Councils have no freedom to make important decisions. The State Government officials like the DCs, DLAOs, COs and Circle Assistants maintain a tight grip over the Village Councils so that there is hardly any scope for the latter to act according to the local needs. This implies that even powers and functions elaborated by the Act of the State are denied to the Councils, which show that there is a miscarriage of democracy where VCs are concerned.

(2) The most regrettable part is the financial restriction. There is very little room left for the Village Councils to raise resources that may enable them to undertake many developmental activities viz., street lightings, drainage systems, etc. Further, people have no say on developmental activities because the Government

gives them little scope to exercise their democratic rights. Even if Village Councils have some capacity to raise funds, they cannot do so without the permission of the State Government. The Village Council Act does not make any distinction between rural and urban councils so far as fund raising is concerned, and the nature of raising funds is quite diverse in the two areas. The Act provides VCs with power to collect local funds through fines, sale of firewood from safety reserves, keeping aside 50% of Animal Taxes etc.<sup>63</sup> There is absolutely no scope for collecting revenue through sales of firewood in the Urban Areas since burning firewood for cooking purposes is impractical for urban use. At the same, the power to collect revenue through firewood sales is in total contrast to the protection of forest and the environment. Animals are mostly reared in Villages but not in urban Towns and centres, and therefore, these sources for collection of revenues are impracticable and useless in the present situation found in urban Mizoram.

(3) The VCs are given judicial powers by the Act of 1953 by which they can try cases of petty nature through the customary laws. This power is no longer valid for the Urban Areas since most people opt to go directly to either District Courts or the High Court to seek justice. This power has become worthless especially after separation of powers between Executive and Judiciary took place in the State in 2002.<sup>64</sup>

(4) The State Government is very apathetic towards the development of Urban Centres in general and the urban people in particular. Section 24 of the Village Council Act, 1953, stated that the State Government “shall cause the formation of Town Committees, where such committees are considered desirable and convenient in accordance with law made by the State Government for the purpose.” The authorities, however, did not adopt this provision. While many Acts and Rules enacted by the District Council have been either repealed or adopted by the Government after Statehood, The Mizo District (Administration of Town Committees) Act, 1955 has been left in a limbo. The VCs are given almost no responsibilities over the implementation of DRDA activities too. This clearly reveals that VCs are not allowed to function as engines of development, though the need of today is for development.

---

<sup>63</sup> Vanlalauva, H., *Former Minister*, Government of Mizoram, Local Administration Department, Dated 2nd April 2006.

<sup>64</sup> *Op.cit.*, Lalrinzuala, K., MCS, p-3.

Their roles are kept under the strict vigilance of the bureaucrats and politicians. If they act contrary to officials directions, the institution can face dissolution, as have had occurred many times in the past.

(5) Although all the Village Councils are constituted under the same Act, the powers and functions of the Councils in rural and Urban Areas is different. Under Section 3 of the Lushai Hills District (House Sites) Act, 1953, each VC is empowered to allot sites for residential and non-agricultural purpose,<sup>65</sup> but the same provision was not valid for VCs Urban Towns. Section 8 of the Lushai Hills District Village Council Act, 1953 empowered the VC to allot Jhum areas for cultivation, but if they act contrary to bureaucrats notification they are liable to be fined up to Rs. 500/-.<sup>66</sup>

(6) Rapid population influx in Towns and urban centres caused lot of havoc in the Urban Areas. As there is no authority for the urban management, all Towns and urban outgrowth came face to face with many civic problems. As there was no Local Self Government either in the rural or Urban Areas, most families migrated to any place where they could find livelihood. The administrative lacuna was a source of failure for provision of economic development to the masses, especially to the rural people. As such, many families preferred to seek better occupations in lieu of shifting cultivation. At this juncture, families were compelled to migrate to Urban Towns and outgrowths where better income and occupations are likely to be found. This has causes rapid population explosion to the Towns. To add to the chaotic administrative problems, Urban Centres and Towns do not have Urban Administration. Therefore, a lot of civic problems like water supply and sanitation, drainage system, uncontrolled construction of houses and buildings etc., have accelerated in the Urban Centres and Towns.

As urban population growth became beyond control, even those sites declared unsuitable/dangerous for construction of houses are given to individuals through their political influence over the authorities. As a result of this, many houses have been constructed without considering the danger they can pose both to the public and their own inhabitants. This is unavoidable because population explosion causes rapid land pressure for shelter and livelihood. Instead of leaving space with neighbouring

---

<sup>65</sup> *Op.cit.*, *Gazette Mizoram*, Dated 22nd January 2002

<sup>66</sup> *Op.cit.*, Lalrinzuala, K., MCS, p-3.

buildings, RCC buildings are constructed wall to wall and this is more aggravated at the heart of the Towns. All these unmanaged urban system cause a myriad of many problems where thus calamities, like landslides due to poor drainage systems and many unprecedented residential calamities are an everyday occurrence especially during the monsoon.

(7) While monsoon plays havoc, the dry season that preceded it cause as much misery, forcing the people to walk miles either up and down to fetch clean water or pay out a lot of money for water tankers to bring them potable water. The increase of population aggravated water supply problem forcing the Government to campaign to the public towards arranging for rainwater harvesting throughout Mizoram. The water from various springs in and around the urban Towns could not be considered fit for human consumption because the natural process of purification has been contaminated by the urban population explosion through poorly maintained sanitation and drainage systems. Therefore, the necessity for proper management of urban water supply system is quite high in city and urban Towns.

(8) Urban centres, and most importantly urban Towns, lack proper drainage. Refuse and wastes flow down from higher to lower slopes without proper channelling of the flow. This causes contamination of water of the various springs usually found in the surrounding area of the Towns. This contamination is intensified during rainy seasons as Towns are without adequate water channels and drainage system causing waste and household garbage to flow on the roads. Unless and until community works are organised by either the NGOs or Village Council of the area, these waste deposits on the roads tend to remain uncleared. The lack of Government action in this regard, as given by officials, is due to meagre financial allocation to the Department of Local Administration for disposing such kind of garbage deposits.<sup>67</sup>

(9) The overcrowding urban population also gave rise to acute shortage of burial grounds or cemetery in urban Towns where it is more problematical in higher urbanised centres like Aizawl. Unlike most communities of the Indian Union, the Mizo society, as a whole, follow the Christian faith, which practices burial of the dead and not cremation. The cemetery, whose usual location is in the outskirts of Town,

---

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*,



has now been encircled by residential houses and buildings.<sup>68</sup> This came about through house sites given in and around the cemetery by the authorities. This resulted in non-availability of space for the extension of burial grounds in most of the urban Towns.

(10) The tremendous increase in population of Urban Centres and Towns in Mizoram became the main cause for road congestion and traffic problems. Particularly in the state capital of Aizawl, acute problems for parking, loading and unloading of commodities and traffic congestion became a regular feature even on Government holidays. Hence, the state government prohibited entry of heavy commercial vehicles during day time and medium commercial vehicles during specific hours, generally 8:00 am to 6:00 pm. Even public transport passengers' vehicles are not allowed to ply every working day and city buses are forced to halt for two days a week on a rotational basis. The same is also applied to local taxis to solve the problems of traffic congestion. Mention should also be made that the State Capital and the largest urban centre i.e., Aizawl, covers an area of 128.98 Sq.Km. with a density of 1204 persons per. Sq.Km. There are 23,698 vehicles (as per 2002 census) and thus, the vehicular density is approximately 1070 per Sq.Km. Besides the permanent city vehicles, a large number of vehicles - trucks, buses, maxi-cabs and taxis – enter Aizawl on an everyday basis.

(11) No provision was given for women's reservation by the Village Council Act, 1953. However, the 74th Amendment provision grants reservation rights to females which is essential in a patriarchal society like the Mizo society for women to participate actively in a political capacity. The Constitution Article-243-T enshrined one-third reservation not only for women, but also for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. This means that every class of the society is given adequate chances of growth and development through Local Self-Government. The Village Council administration, however, was lacking in this area. Therefore, it is pertinent that urban administration is instituted in all the urban centres and Towns of Mizoram, as this is not only necessary but has become the requirement of the day.

---

<sup>68</sup> Government of Mizoram, Local Administration Department, Office of the Senior Sanitation Officer (Sanitation Wing), Tuikhuahtlang

All the previous points and many others clearly prove that the traditional administrative system or Village Council needs to be supplanted by a more authoritative administrative mechanism like Local Self-Government in Urban Areas and Towns. In fact, the VC institutions, which were meant solely for the Villages, have nothing to do in the Urban Towns. In lieu of it, Municipal administration has to be introduced as stipulated by the Constitution of India in the 74th Amendment Act of 1992. If not, civic problems would become critical and increased epidemics and unhygienic habitations would cause many deaths in Urban Towns. Special emphasis needs to be taken for Aizawl as this Urban Notified Town and the Government on 30th December 1999 declared state capital a 'City'. However, neither a City Government nor even a single City Administration has been provided by the administration, its duty and responsibility sorely neglected by the authorities. At this point, there is no system other than the Urban Local Self-Government - embodied by the Constitution of India's Article 243-P to 243-ZG - available or better. This clause embodies all the necessary powers and authority - along with financial powers and many other requirements - to a unit of pure local self-government.

**Table-4.16**

**Number of Beneficiaries & Amount Sanctioned under SJSRY**

Sl. No.	Name of Programmes	No. of beneficiaries		Amount (Rs in lakh)	
		2004-2005	2005-2006	2004-2005	2005-2006
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	USEP (Trg & Infra)	1450 Nos.	2120 Nos.	108.63	
2.	DWCUA (Sub)	77 BPL Groups	Nil	97.42	Nil
3.	DWCUA (T & CS)	77 BPL Groups	Nil	18.65	Nil
4.	USEP (L & Sub)	Nil	77 BPL Groups	Nil	4
5.	UWEP (M.W.)	77 BPL Groups	77 BPL Groups	54.23	364
6.	Community Structure	77 BPL Groups	77 BPL Groups	73.95	57.74

As far as development is concerned, the Centrally Sponsored Scheme called Swarna Jayanti Sahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) is the only programme launched by the State Government's Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation Department for the development of Urban Poor in Mizoram since 1999. LAD is the Nodal Agency at the initial stage, but with the Urban Department (UD&PA) being created by the

Government in 2006,<sup>69</sup> the SJSRY was transferred to this new department by the Cabinet.<sup>70</sup> The SJSRY scheme was sub-divided into different categories; they are USEP, DWCUA, UWEP and Community Structures. Table(4.16) shows that 1,450 families have been benefited by the lone Urban Poor development scheme or SJSRY.

There are 37,152 BPL families in the State, which means Urban Development Scheme has not reached 35,702 families or 96.1 percent of the poor families. As there is no separate data for the Rural and Urban BPL Families, calculation of these two types of has been done in aggregate. According to Table (4.16), 3,570 beneficiaries and 77 BPL Groups are benefited by Rs. 112.63 lakhs under USEP, and Rs.116.07 lakhs under DWCUA, Rs. 418.23 lakhs for UWEP. For Community Structure, Rs. 131.69 has been spent for 77 BPL Group up to 2005-2006. Mention must be made in this connection that BPL aggregate in all the 8(eight) District Capitals is 26,571 families or 116,353 persons in the financial year 2008 - 2009. The following Table (Table 4.17) shows the details of BPL in each District.

**Table–4.17**

**Slum Population Survey Report 2008 - 2009 (BPL)<sup>71</sup>**

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Name of City / Town etc.</b>	<b>No. of Village</b>	<b>No. of Persons</b>	<b>No. of Family</b>
1.	Aizawl City	77	71,643	16,426
2.	Lunglei Town	22	12,377	2,813
3.	Saiha Town	15	4,845	1,030
4.	Champhai Town	7	4,955	1,138
5.	Kolasib Town	9	8,106	1,785
6.	Serchhip Town	6	7,778	1,708
7.	Mamit Town	7	3,689	772
8.	Lawngtlai Town	8	2,960	899
	<b>G. TOTAL</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>116,353</b>	<b>26,571</b>

According to Table (4.17), all the 8(eight) District Capitals are a conglomeration of 152 Villages, with each village having a separate Village Council. Even the State Capital i.e., Aizawl City, is made up of 77 Villages and possessing the highest number of BPL families in the State viz. 16,426 families. Lunglei Town has

<sup>69</sup> *Op.cit.*, Prasad, R.N., p-192,

<sup>70</sup> Government of Mizoram, Notification No. A.46013/2/2006 - GAD/31 Dated 24.8.2006.

<sup>71</sup> VANGLAINI, Daily News Paper, Dated 8th November 2006, p-5.

2,813 BPL families; Saiha 1,030; Champhai 1,138; Kolasib 1,785, Serchhip 1,708; Mamit 772; and Lawngtlai 899 BPL families respectively. All these BPLs formed Groups to their respective Villages, and the Nodal Department circulated that each village is required to constitute a BPL Group or Committee.<sup>72</sup>

The SJSRY is the most vibrant Urban Development Programme of the Government and is implemented by constituting BPL Groups, to be known as 'Neighbourhood Groups' or NHG, in Villages. Each village has a separate Group with each Group having a committee of 6(six) Office Bearers (OBs). This committee is constituted under the Residence Community Volunteer abbreviated as RCV. However, only the 8(eight) District Capital Towns have benefiting the scheme, which means that all the 22 NTs are not covered by the SJSRY till date. The programme was started in Aizawl in 1998; in the Towns of Lunglei and Saiha it was implemented since 2000; Kolasib and Champhai begins in 2007; Serchhip, Lawngtlai, and Mamit Towns were the late comers of the programme, they started only in 2008. Though the District Capital of Lawngtlai Town has eight BPL Groups, the SJSRY scheme has not become effective because the Government of India has not accepted this District Headquarters as a Town.<sup>73</sup>

The Government of India revised SJSRY scheme recently. Revised programme of SJSRY added the formation of sub-component mission to be known as, 'Thrift and Credit Society' under the composite scheme 'STEP-UP'. This new mission provides adequate opportunity to offer different training trades to BPL Groups. These trades are (1) Tailoring, (2) Beauty Parlour, (3) Computer, (4) Hair Cutting, (5) Flower arranging, (6) Carpentry, (7) Catering and Food Processing, (8) Handloom, (9) Mobile Repairing, (10) Driving, (11) Auto Repairing, and (12) Envelope/Paper plate making.<sup>74</sup> Though all the training trades are open to BPL Groups/Families; Envelope/Paper plate making was restricted for physically challenged persons from 2(two) NGOs/Homes, viz., Gilead Special School (GSS) and *Thutak Nunpuitu* Team (TNT). Sponsorship was given to these 2 (two) selected NGOs/Homes with the UD & PA Department acting as the Nodal Agency.

---

<sup>72</sup> *Op.cit.*, Government of Mizoram, No. A. 46011/1/2004 – GAD Dated 26.9.2006.

<sup>73</sup> Government of Mizoram, Directorate of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation (UD&PA), Dated 14th .September 2010.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, , SJSRY CELL, Dated 4th September 2010.

As shown by the following Table (4.18), there are 336 houseless persons in Mizoram, viz., 274 were in Aizawl District, 22 were in Mamit, Saiha has 18 houseless persons, Champhai has 15, and there were 7 houseless persons in Lawngtlai Districts respectively. Among the 336 houseless populations, 182 are males and 154 are females. This means that the female houseless population in Mizoram amounts to 45.83 percent or 0.04 percent from the total female population of the State. According to the above-mentioned data, houseless population is highest in Aizawl District, followed by Mamit, Saiha, Champhai, and Lawngtlai Districts respectively. However, the second biggest District in Mizoram i.e., Lunglei District, and other two newly created Districts viz., Kolasib and Serchhip, have no houseless population.<sup>75</sup>

**Table-4.18**  
**Houseless Population of Mizoram<sup>76</sup>**  
**(District-wise)**

Sl. No.	Districts	Persons	Males	Females
1.	Aizawl	274	142	132
2.	Mamit	22	17	5
3.	Saiha	18	9	9
4.	Champhai	15	10	5
5.	Lawngtlai	7	4	3
6.	Kolasib	0	0	0
7.	Serchhip	0	0	0
8.	Lunglei	0	0	0
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>154</b>

On 3rd December 2005, the Government of India launched a very significant urban development programme called Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM). This new programme was sub-divided into two missions, namely Urban Infrastructure and Governance (UIG) as Sub-Mission-I and Basic Service to the Urban Poor (BSUP) as Sub Mission-II. These two sub-missions, again, have another two sub-components-Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small & Medium Towns (UIDSSMT) and Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP). While the implementation of Sub-Mission-I and UIDSSMT

---

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.,*

was put under the Ministry of Urban Development, the Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation took charge of Sub Mission-II and IHSDP.<sup>77</sup>

Aizawl, the capital city of Mizoram, is the only selected city for JNNURM beneficiaries in the State. However, the satellite mission of JNNURM by the Government covers other District Headquarters. The Government implemented the scheme by constructing residences for the Urban Poor, particularly the BPL families. As such, the Department of UD & PA has many ongoing projects (ANNEXURE-III). In Aizawl city, thereby, constructions of 408 residential buildings are underway at the localities of Lawipu, Chite, Rangvamual, and Durtlang for the Economically Weaker Section (EWS) or Urban Poor. This kind of residential projects has been prepared for EWS for other District Headquarters Towns too. The project stated that 200 residential homes are to be built in Saiha Town, 500 in Lunglei Town, 450 in Champhai Town, 350 in Serchhip Town, 150 in Mamit Town, and 300 in Kolasib Towns respectively. Until December 2010, 738 constructions have started by utilising the first instalment of JNNURM. Another project, called renovation of Aizawl Greater Water Supply Scheme Phase - I, has been completed and 14 passenger buses has purchased by utilising the first instalment of JNNURM (ANNEXURE-IV). Though the project was taken over by the UD & PA Department in Aizawl District, it was implemented by the DLAO in the rest of the District Capitals, and the DLAOs were acts as the District Project Officer for this particular Project.

---

<sup>77</sup> *Op.cit., Census of India 2001, p-45 to 49*

**CHAPTER – V**

**PROBLEMS FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF URBAN  
LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE IN MIZORAM**

## CHAPTER – V

### PROBLEMS FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF URBAN LOCAL SELF- GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE IN MIZORAM

Urban Local Self-Government is not only necessary, but also an essential component of modern Urban Administration. One important intention of the 74th Constitution Amendment Act (CAA) is to induce the State Legislature to bring about such Laws as would lead to devolution of Powers and Responsibilities to the Municipalities in respect of preparation of Plans for Economic Development and Social Justice. This is what the Constitution expects the State legislatures to do and more specific and obligatory Provisions, in this regard, is embodied in Clause (1) of Article 243-ZD of the Constitution of India. It read thus, “There shall be constituted in every State at the District Level, a District Planning Committee to consolidate the Plans prepared by the Panchayats and the Municipalities in the District and to prepare a Draft Development Plan for the District as a whole.”<sup>1</sup>

Before discussing the problems relating to the introduction of Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram, it is appropriate to introduce the basic components of the 74th CAA, 1992. They are:

#### **I. Addition of Part - IX A to the Constitution of India**

The 74th CAA added a new part - Part-IX-A (Article 243-P to 243-ZG) to the Constitution of India. This Part deals with Urban Local Self Government. Hence, (i) Nagar Panchayat (by whatever name called) for a Transitional Area, that is to say, an Area in transition from a Rural Area to an Urban Area; (ii) Municipal Council for a smaller Urban Area; and (iii) Municipal Corporation for a larger Urban Area, can be established in accordance with the Provisions of Part-IX-A.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Singh, Mahendra. P., *V.N. Shukla's CONSTITUTION OF INDIA*, Eleventh Edition (2010), Publishers: EBC Publishing (P) Ltd., 34-A, Lalbagh, Lucknow-226001, p-704

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*



## **II. Composition**

All the seats in a Municipality shall be filled by persons chosen by direct election from the Territorial Constituencies in the Municipal Area. Municipal Area is to be divided into different Territorial Constituencies, known by the name 'Wards'. And one person shall be chosen through Adult Suffrage directly from such Ward and elected members shall be called Councillor or otherwise. Apart from the elected representative, the State Government may, by law, appoint to the ULBs, (i) Persons having special knowledge or experience in Municipal Administration; (ii) Member of the Parliament's (MP) (Lok Sabha) and Member of the State Legislative Assembly's (MLA) representing Constituencies which comprise wholly or partly of the Municipal Area; (iii) Member of the State Legislative Council's (MLC) and MP's (Rajya Sabha) registered as electors from the concerned Municipal Area; and (iv) the Chairpersons of the Committees constituted under Clause (5) of Article 243-S. However, all the appointed members have no right to vote in the meetings of the Municipality.<sup>3</sup>

## **III. Wards Committee**

There shall be constituted Wards Committees, consisting of one or more Wards, within the Territorial Area of a Municipality having a population of 3 lakhs or more. The State Legislature is empowered to make Provisions regarding the composition and Territorial limits of the Wards Committee. The Ward Committee consists of one Ward, the Ward Member, or Councillor who shall be the Chairperson. However, the Committee can be formed for a single Ward or more. The Chairperson shall be elected from amongst the Ward Members. In the Wards Committee, all the Ward Members within the Territorial Area of the Ward shall be its Members.<sup>4</sup>

## **IV. Reservation**

Two types of reservation of seats was given, they are, (i) Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (SC/ST); and (ii) Women. The total number of seats so reserved for SC/ST shall be determined based on their proportional strength to the total population in the Municipality. Within the reservation for SC/ST, one-third of the total seats shall be

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p-705

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*,

reserved for women belonging to SC/ST. Again, one-third of the total seats shall be reserved for women including the reservation of women belonging to SC/ST. This reservation of seat is, however, to be allotted on rotation to different Wards. The State Legislature is empowered, by law, to make Laws relating to either for reservation of seats to Other Backward Classes (OBC) or office of the Chairperson.<sup>5</sup>

## **V. Constitution of the State Finance Commission**

Article 243-Y (1) States that the Finance Commission constituted under Article 243-I shall also review the financial position of the Municipalities and make recommendations to the Governor as to the principles which should govern-(i) The distribution of the net proceeds of the Taxes, Duties, Tolls and Fees between the State and the Municipalities; (ii) The Taxes, Duties, Tolls and Fees that may be assigned to the State; (iii) The grants-in-aid to the Municipalities and the measures needed to improve the financial position of the Municipalities; and (iv) Any other matter referred to them by the Governor in the interest of sound finance of the Municipalities. The Governor shall cause every recommendation made by the Commission to the State legislature, along with explanatory memorandum as to the action taken thereon. The State Legislature is responsible to legislate a provisions with respect to the maintenance of Accounts by the Municipalities and the Auditing of their Accounts.<sup>6</sup>

## **VI. State Election Commission**

The Governor of the State appoints the State Election Commission.<sup>7</sup> The superintendence, direction, and control of the preparation of Electoral Rolls for, and the conduct of all elections to, the Municipalities shall be vested in the Commission. The Governor shall determine the service conditions and tenure of office of the Members. After appointment, the Commissioner shall not be removed from his office except in like manner and on the like grounds as a judge of High Court. The Constitution shall not allow calling in questions to Court, relating to delimitation of Constituencies and the allotment of seats. No election shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority and in such manner as is provided for by or under any law

---

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p-706.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p-708.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p-701.

made by the Legislature of a State. It was unanimously stated that the life of a Municipality has been fixed for 5 years and elections for the constitution of new Municipality must be conducted before the expiry of that period.<sup>8</sup> The Supreme Court held that both the conditions are mandatory and must be strictly observed.<sup>9</sup>

## **VII. Powers and Authority**

Article 243-W stated that the Legislature of a State may, by law, endow the Municipalities with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as institutions of Self-Government.<sup>10</sup> This includes preparation of Plans for economic development and social justice. The powers, functions, and responsibilities of the Municipalities are briefed as follows:<sup>11</sup>

1. Urban planning including Town planning;
2. Regulation of land-use and construction of buildings;
3. Planning for economic and social development;
4. Roads and bridges;
5. Water supply for domestic, industrial, and commercial purposes;
6. Public health, sanitation, conservancy, and solid waste management;
7. Fire services;
8. Urban forestry, protection of the environment, and promotion of ecological aspects;
9. Safeguarding the interests of weaker sections of society, including the handicapped, and mentally retarded;
10. Slum improvement, and upgradation;

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p-706

<sup>9</sup> The Morung Express, Daily News paper, Dated 25th April 2010.

<sup>10</sup> *Op.cit.*, Singh, Mahendra. P., p-707

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p-1098

11. Urban poverty alleviation;
12. Provision of Urban amenities, and facilities such as parks, gardens, playgrounds;
13. Promotion of cultural, educational, and aesthetic aspects;
14. Burials and burial grounds; cremations, cremation grounds, and electric crematoriums;
15. Cattle pounds; prevention of cruelty to animals;
16. Vital statistics including registration of births, and deaths;
17. Public amenities including street lighting, parking lots, bus stops, and public conveniences;
18. Regulation of slaughter houses, and tanneries.

### **VIII. Committee for Planning**

This is another essential feature of the Urban Local Self-Government. Provision was given in the Constitution's that there shall be constituted in every State (i) The District Planning Committee in the District; and (ii) Metropolitan Planning Committee in every Metropolitan Area, to prepare Draft Development Plan for their respective Centres. This committee shall be elected by, and from among, the elected members of the Municipalities, while the elective should be four-fifths in Municipalities and two-thirds in the Metropolitan Areas.

### **IX. Part not to apply to certain areas**

Part – IX(A) shall not be applied to Scheduled Areas referred to in Clause (1), and the Tribal Areas referred to in Clause (2) of Article 244. Moreover, nothing in this part shall be construed to affect the functions and powers of the Darjeeling Gorkha Hill Council.<sup>12</sup> As provided by Clause (1) of Article 244, the Fifth Schedule shall apply to the administration and control of the Scheduled Areas and Scheduled Tribes in any State

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p-712.

other than Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura, and Mizoram. These 4(four) States are incorporated in Clause (2) of the same Article.<sup>13</sup> As the whole State of Mizoram has not been under the Sixth Scheduled, other than the Areas under the Lai District Council, Mara District Council, and Chakma District Council, it shall not be outside the ambit of the Constitution Part – IX-A. Thus, the provision of the 74th CAA is valid for Mizoram, and it is mandatory to constitute Urban Local Bodies in all the Urban Centres and Urban Towns, except for Saiha, which falls under the provision of Sixth Schedule of the Constitution.

### **Various problems for the introduction of Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram**

All the above points clarifies that the 74th Constitution Amendment is an important instrument for the successful implementation of democracy through decentralisation. Particularly, it is a development oriented system to which National initiatives can be commenced from the local levels. This provision negates all the other traditional local administrative system and non-development administration of the imperialist legacy. In spite of that, there are many problems restrains the introduction of Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram. They are as follows:

#### **1. Lacks of political will**

Politicians are not conversant with the essence of Urban Local Self-Government. The Union Parliament has legislated, through an Amendment, for the constitution of Urban Local Bodies in 1992. However, the implementation of such amendments in the States remains the State subject. Entry 5 of List-II (State List) enshrined that “Local Government, that is to say, the constitution and powers of Municipal Corporations, Improvement Trusts, District Boards, Mining Settlement Authorities and other local authorities for the purpose of Local Self-Government or village Administration.”<sup>14</sup> As the Municipal Government or Urban Local Self-Government is under the State subject, the State Assembly can legislate for the constitution of Municipal Government. The Mizoram State Assembly, however, did not do this for quite many years.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p-712.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p-1079.

**2. Absence of proper understanding of Urban Local Self-Government by the people**

According to the Questionnaire Survey result of seven Urban Centres in 2007-2008, 70.38 percent of the people have not heard about Urban Local Self-Government. Not only this, 98.60 percent of the people in District Headquarters of seven Urban Centres are oblivious to the core meaning of Municipality, which included the sitting Village Council Members. It is alarming to note that the meaning of either Municipality, Municipal Corporation or Urban Local Bodies has not reached the Urban Towns of Saiha and Mamit as the Survey Result revealed that more than 92 percent of the Village Council Members do not know its meaning. They have not heard even the terminologies of Urban Local Bodies viz., Municipality and Municipal Corporation.

**Table-5.1a**  
**Questionnaire Result of Seven Urban District Capitals (2007-2008)**  
**(In Percentage)**

Sl. No	Urban Town/ Notified Town/ Urban Centres	No. of respondents	Have you heard about Urban Local Bodies?		Was either Municipality or Municipal Corporation been known to you?		Do you want to retain Village Council in your Town?		Do the V.C. require higher power for their functions?	
			Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1.	Aizawl	100	45	55	1	99	98	2	62	38
2.	Champhai	34	17.65	82.35	0	34	94.12	5.88	61.77	38.23
3.	Kolasib	26	42.31	57.69	3.85	96.15	96.15	3.85	76.92	23.08
4.	Lunglei	47	25.53	74.47	4.26	95.74	63.83	36.17	70.21	29.79
5.	Mamit	15	6.7	93.33	0	100	100	0	60	40
6.	Saiha	42	4.77	95.23	0	100	97.62	2.38	47.62	52.38
7.	Serchhip	23	34.78	65.22	0	100	95.65	4.35	82.61	17.39
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>29.62</b>	<b>70.38</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>98.60</b>	<b>91.64</b>	<b>8.36</b>	<b>64.11</b>	<b>35.89</b>

Table (5.1a) shows that though 91.64 percent still wanted to retain the Village Council in the Urban Areas, 64.11 percent disclosed that the Village Council needed higher powers for better functioning. Only 8.36 percent stated that the time had come to replace the Village Council Institutions in the Urban Towns.

All these Data shows that since only 29.62 percent have heard of Urban Local Bodies and only 1.40 percent knows their meaning, the people are indeed ignorant of the concept of Urban Local Bodies to a very great extent.

**Table-5.1(b)**

**Questionnaire Result of Seven Urban District Capitals (2007-2008)**

Sl. No.	Urban Town/ Notified Town/ Urban Centres	No. of respondents	Have you heard about Urban Local Bodies?		Was either Municipality or Municipal Corporation been known to you?		Do you want to retain Village Council in your Town?		Do the V.C. require higher power for their functions?	
			Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1.	Aizawl	100	45	55	1	99	98	2	62	38
2.	Champhai	34	6	28	0	34	32	2	21	13
3.	Kolasib	26	11	15	1	25	25	1	20	6
4.	Lunglei	47	12	35	2	45	30	17	33	14
5.	Mamit	15	1	14	0	15	15	0	9	6
6.	Saiha	42	2	40	0	42	41	1	20	22
7.	Serchhip	23	8	15	0	23	22	1	19	4
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>103</b>

The Questionnaire is answered by 287 persons, who belong to the Capitals of 7 Districts. While 85 persons have heard about Urban Local Bodies 202 respondents were not. It was also portrayed by the above Table (5.1b)'s that 103 respondents deny empowerment of the Village institution. Besides, 184 persons said that the Village Council require higher powers in the present situation.

### 3. Effects of the Imperialists

The British annexed Mizoram in 1890.<sup>15</sup> This imperial Government had imparted different changes over the administrations of the State for about half a Century. Mention should be made here that Mizoram is called 'Lushai Hills' by the British, and this was changed to 'Mizo District' after Independence in 1954,<sup>16</sup> and to 'Mizoram' since 1972. At the beginning of imperial administration, the whole Area was divided into two viz., (1) North Lushai Hills, and (2) South Lushai Hills. Both the hills are amalgamated into one

<sup>15</sup> Prasad, R.N., *Government and Politics in Mizoram, 1947 – 1986* (1987), Published by Northern Book Centre, 4221/1, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi 110002, ISBN 81-85119-23-6, p-27.

<sup>16</sup> Khuma, V.H., *Political History of Mizoram*, (1999) First Edition, Printed at the OMNIPRINT Offset, Aizawl, p-90.

Lushai Hills on 6th September 1895, and Captain Shakespeare was appointed as the first Superintendent. Indigenous Mizo people are administered under the local hereditary Chiefs at this time. Chiefs reigned within a certain portion of land, assigned by the British, and were responsible to the British Superintendent.<sup>17</sup>

Imperial rulers under the British came to realise that the traditional Chiefs should be retained for the Village Administration as it is efficient, effective and economical. In order to gain the support of the Chiefs, the British administration devolved different powers to them. These includes the right to- (i) collect Paddy taxes, (ii) summon Community works, (iii) Wild taxes *etc.* No one should act against the Chief even if he snatched the property of his Villagers, and he could possess Slaves too. As such, autocratic Chief institution was in place in all the Villages in Mizoram.

The institution of Village Council was officially inaugurated by Shri Hrangaiia, Executive Member of the District Council *i/c* Village Councils on 29th July 1954 at Baktawng Village,<sup>18</sup> about 80 km South-East of Aizawl.<sup>19</sup> As democratic representatives, VC members are elected in the Villages, thereby quashing the Chiefs' Rights and replacing them, through a legislation of Assam Assembly,<sup>20</sup> since Mizoram was under the Assam Government at that time. At the dawn of 1st April 1955, the power of 255 Chiefs ended from Aizawl Circle while on the other hand, 50 Chiefs' Rights from Regional Areas was made void on 15th April 1956.<sup>21</sup> Ever since, the traditional institutions of Chieftainship have been replaced by democratically elected institutions called the Village Council. This new institution, which replaced autocratic Chieftainship, led to the prohibition of forced labour, imposition of different kinds of taxes, and cancellation of even the wild taxes.

The Mizo society, which had, as long as can be remembered, been under autocratic Rule was strongly drawn to the Village Council institution as the institution was the first democratic element the Mizo people had ever seen or experienced and which had adequate powers to solve many of the problems of the people of that time. They were also satisfied with the system because of the fact that they could protect their Customs

---

<sup>17</sup> *Op.cit.*, Prasad, R.N., p-50.

<sup>18</sup> *Op.cit.*, Khuma, V.H., p-88.

<sup>19</sup> Lalrinzuala, K., MCS, District Local Administration Officer, Aizawl - *Mizoram a village council tobul, Anih phung leh mawhphurhna tlangpui te.*

<sup>20</sup> *Op.cit.*, Khuma, V.H., p-89.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p-90.



and Traditions through this institution. Therefore, how good it may be, a majority of the people did not welcome any other type of local administration system, including the Local Self-Government enshrined by the 74th CAA.

#### **4. Negative sentiment of the bureaucrats**

Many of the bureaucrats are always inclined towards a system that is Non-Democratic. Instead of decentralisation, they tend to promote centralisation so that they could exercise optimum powers under their hand. Bureaucrats want to hold on to their financial powers as long as they can, so also is the case with the administrative officers in Mizoram. As the Ministers come and go, the bureaucrats are more responsible for the introduction of Municipality in the Urban Areas of Mizoram. It will be almost impossible to change the system if bureaucrats are not supportive of the introduction of new development mechanisms like Municipality. At the same time, it is the fact that the State Legislators are not too concerned towards decentralisation. Even the Constitutional mandate does not help in the encouragement towards better change.<sup>22</sup> This negative sentiment towards decentralisation by the bureaucrats and non-support of decentralisation by Politicians has created many hurdles in Mizoram.

#### **5. Isolation and discrimination**

These problems are the common features of all North Eastern States. Everybody accepts that the North East States of India are isolated geographically from the rest of the Country. Mizoram, being located in the Southern-most part of the North East India, could be the worst sufferer since all transportation connectivity with other States is especially poor. Notwithstanding that the State has road connectivity from its neighbours *viz.*, (i) NH 54 (Dabaka-Lumding-Silchar-Aizawl-Tuipang), (ii) NH 44A (Aizawl - Manu), (iii) NH 150 (Aizawl-Churachandpur-Imphal-Ukhrul-Jessami-Kohima) and (iv) NH 154 (Khaleswar-Bairabi-Kawnpui).<sup>23</sup> The arterial road networks of Mizoram are classified as National Highway, State Highway, Major District Roads, Other District Roads, Village Roads, Town Roads and Satellite Town & Village Roads,<sup>24</sup> but unfortunately, all the roads are poorly maintained. The State is also connected through air from Kolkata to

---

<sup>22</sup> Ramdina, C., *President*, Mizoram Municipal Steering Committee, Dated 21st April 2007.

<sup>23</sup> Government of India, Ministry of Road Transport and Highway, (*National Highway Authority of India*), From: [www.nhai.org](http://www.nhai.org).

<sup>24</sup> Government of Mizoram, Socio - Economic Review Mizoram 2000-'0, p-71.

Aizawl via Imphal and from Guwahati to Aizawl. At present, railway connectivity is available at Bairabi, Kolasib District (about 124 km. North of Aizawl). Extension for railway connectivity is underway from Bairabi to Sairang, the latter an important river port situated only 26 km West of Aizawl. However, these developments that seek to bring the people of Mizoram closer to so-called 'Mainstream India' has not succeeded in erasing dreams relating to regionalism and parochialism that is still retained by the people of this State.

An isolated State like Mizoram has many other administrative problems from the mainstream, which is further aggravated by difficulties faced in dissemination of information to the Area. Many economic goods, political initiatives, administrative ideas, and new development programmes could reach the area only belatedly as compared to the rest of the Country. All these and many other composite sentiments and political history of the past adversely affects development programmes. To make matters worse, the people are too conservative, finding it difficult to adapt to new administrative systems. It is also true that, as per the content of Mizo Peace Accord, many of the Acts passed by the Parliament is not to be readily accepted by the Mizo Society. Mizo Nationalism, so to say, also causes some barrier. It may be recalled that the State had fought for independence for more than 20 years.<sup>25</sup> All the problems of isolation, assimilation and conviction of being discriminated on have been cemented by regionalism and parochialism. These have been the cause for the delay pertaining to the introduction of Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram.

## **6. Peace Accord between the Government of India and MNF**

Peace Accord or Memorandum of Settlement (MoU) signed between the erstwhile underground outfit Mizo National Front (MNF) and the Government of India was another significant hindrance for the introduction of Urban Local Self-Government in the Urban Areas of Mizoram. This is because Paragraph 4.3 of this Accord stated that, "Acts of Parliament shall not apply to the new State of Mizoram unless so decided by the Mizoram Legislature with regard to-

- (i) Religious or social practices of Mizos;

---

<sup>25</sup> Lalnithanga, P.(IAS Rtd), *Emergence of Mizoram (2005)*, Published by him at Lengchhawn Press, Bethel House, Aizawl-796001. p-31.

- (ii) Mizo customary law and procedure;
- (iii) Administration of civil and criminal justice involving decisions according to Mizo Customary law...’’<sup>26</sup>

This Memorandum of Settlement is legitimised by the entry of Article 371G to the Constitution through the 53rd Amendment Act, 1986. Through this Amendment, special provisions were inserted in Article 37-G that no Act of the Parliament shall apply to the State of Mizoram unless the Legislative Assembly of the State of Mizoram, by a resolution, so decides. Though Urban Local Self-Government provisions neither contradicts nor clashes with the Accord, political leaders misinterpreted this Clause by quoting the provisions of the Accord.

## **7. Absence of sensitisation**

Sensitisation of Urban Local Self-Government is very weak since the meaning of either Municipality or Municipal Corporation has not been properly known by 98.61 percent of the urban population as seen at Table (5.1). This Table clearly portrays that the people of Mizoram are acquainted with neither the meanings nor the institution of Urban Local Self-Government. There is no reason why people would like to have Urban Local Bodies introduced and bring pressure for decentralisation in the urban centres under these circumstances.

The anti-municipalisation groups stated that, though Central Grants could be availed during the pre-maturing period, such financial grants would be terminated after a certain period. Thereby, the Urban Local Body would be compelled to collect more taxes unavoidably, like Income Taxes etc., which is not taxes subject for tribal people including the Mizos.<sup>27</sup> The supporters of traditional system also exclaim that the Bengal Eastern Frontier Regulation 1873, commonly known as Inner Line Regulation (ILR) would become annulled or ineffective under Municipality.<sup>28</sup> Presently, non-indigenous persons are allowed to enter Mizoram with Inner Line Pass (ILP) issued by the State Government and other the authorities authorised by the former. Thereafter, the Pass holders are allowed to apply for an extension of their stay permit before the expiry of original Inner

<sup>26</sup> Memorandum of Settlement, 1986, during ‘*Archive Week*’ Dated 22nd – 26th November 2004.

<sup>27</sup> The Zozam Times, Daily News paper, Dated 13th September 2010.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

Line Pass. As both the general people and the Government want to preserve the ILR 1873 with at all costs, any exogenous model of urban administration, which includes Municipality, could not make much impact in Mizoram.

Assimilation is always another important administrative and political precaution of the people that affects the Government. Since the assimilation of the Cachari Society in Cachar District of Assam by the immigrant Bengalese, taking precautionary measures against facing the same situation in Mizoram has been a several decade exhortation of concerned NGOs. It is a popular belief among the Mizos that, by receiving financial advantages of urban administration, chances would be there for non-indigenous peoples to permanently reside in different Towns of Mizoram, which was thought highly unhealthy for a conservative society like the Mizo society. Pro-status quo groups also preached that hydro-electricity projects, oil and gas exploration, rail connectivity and exploration of forest wealth would also mean an intrusion of Mizoram by non-Mizos in general and of the Mizo society in particular.

As mentioned before, even politicians do not welcome the process of decentralisation. Unlike many other States in India, it is the routine practice of journalists, both print and media in Mizoram, to call upon Ministers for public interview at their residence. People could directly promulgate their cause to the Government through these interviews and if the politicians choose to take advantage of the situation such as promoting anti-decentralisation, it is very convenient for them to do so during the interview. Even the most influential NGO's in Mizoram, i.e., YMA, had held a discussion at their annual General Conference at Kawnpui village in 1999 regarding the introduction of Local Government Bodies in Mizoram but failed. This Agenda came from the Southern Sub-Headquarters Lunglei and it was for introduction of the 73rd and the 74th Amendment Acts. Unfortunately, no concrete resolution was passed. The time for the introduction of Urban Local Self-Government in the Urban Centres and Urban Towns of Mizoram cannot be foretold as the move for it faces so many hurdles and obstacles.

### **Trend of Urban Administration in Mizoram**

Though the Census of India, 1991 had identified 22 Notified Towns in Mizoram, the Government of Mizoram has not given different treatment to the Urban Towns. Before 1997, the State Government had especially faced many 'Audit Objections' from

the Government of India,<sup>29</sup> regarding its implementation of Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS) and other Development Programmes in the State. On 4th August 1997, the state Government declared Aizawl, Lunglei, Saiha and all other centres having 30,000 and above population as Urban Areas, adopting 1991 Census as base year.<sup>30</sup> Simultaneously, after the inauguration of four new Districts in 1998, the Government of Mizoram, which was issued by the Rural Development Department on 24th September 2000, notified all the new District Headquarters viz., Champhai, Kolasib, Serchhip, Mamit, and Lawngtlai as Urban Areas/centres.<sup>31</sup> This notification prohibits the implementation of rural development programmes in the urban centres since 1st April 2004.<sup>32</sup> Since then, Rural Development programmes are not allowed to be implemented in these Urban Areas.

It is important to be mentions that beside the District Headquarters, there are 14 other Notified Towns in Mizoram. One unhappy fact is that though the Headquarters of Lai Autonomous District and Lawngtlai District i.e., Lawngtlai had been declared as 'Urban Area' by the State Government in 2000,<sup>33</sup> the Census of India 2001 still recognised this Town as a village and status for this District Headquarters is still to be decided by the administration. Hitherto, as identified by the Government of India, the total urban centre in Mizoram remains at 22 (Table - 3.1). Although, Rural Development Programmes are not allowed to be implemented in each of the District Headquarters, this is not so in 14(fourteen) urban centres. In these Towns, the State Government consistently implements development programmes for the rural areas.

Since 2005, as encouraged by the Government of India (GOI), the Government of Mizoram undertook a number of initiatives for the implementation of many urban reforms, by and large, as a mandatory step to access funding from the Central Government through Centrally Sponsored Schemes and urban reform programmes, like JNNURM etc. Among the 63 selected Urban Cities/Towns in India, Aizawl is the only urban Town selected by the Mission in Mizoram. The State Government lost no time towards taking the implementation of JNNURM. Some immediate steps taken by the State Government are as follows:

---

<sup>29</sup> HNEHTU, Daily News Paper, Date 31st July 2006.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> *Op.cit.*, Mizoram Notification No. B.11016/4/2000-RD, Dt.24.9.2000.

<sup>32</sup> *Op.cit.*, HNEHTU.

<sup>33</sup> Government of Mizoram, Notification No. B.11016/4/2000-RD, Dated 24.9.2000 (read with Mizoram Gazette, Dated 17.12.1999).

*Firstly*, a new Department of Urban Development & Poverty Alleviation (UD & PA) was created by the Government on 24th August 2006.<sup>34</sup> And the legitimate functions of this new department were issued, through Notification, by the Government on 26th September 2006. Some of them are related to JNNURM and allied matters, Urban Infrastructure Development Schemes (UIDS), Urban Local Bodies, Solid Waste Management and Sanitation, and Aizawl Development Authority (ADA) etc.<sup>35</sup>

*Secondly*, as required by the Mission statement, the Government of Mizoram and the Ministry of Urban Development, GOI signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) on 12th June 2007.<sup>36</sup> This Agreement was followed by the preparation of City Development Plan (CDP) by WAPCOS, a Government of India undertaking. Perspective frameworks Plan for a period of 25 years indicating policies, programmes and strategies was submitted to the Central Ministry which did not withhold its approval.

*Thirdly*, the first ever Urban Administration Bill called The Mizoram Municipality Bill, 2007 was passed by the State Assembly<sup>37</sup> on 29th March 2007 and assented by the Governor on 16th April 2007, and Gazetted on 24.4.2007.<sup>38</sup> The Bill became an 'Act' and has been amended twice, in 2009 and 2010 respectively, by the State Assembly. This new Act was followed by the Mizoram Municipalities (Election of Councillors) Rules, 2007; The Mizoram Municipalities (Procedures & Conduct of Business) Rules, 2007; the Mizoram Municipalities (Delimitation of Wards) Rules, 2007; and The Mizoram Municipalities (Ward Committees & Local Committee) Rules, 2008 etc.

*Fourthly*, Aizawl Municipal Council Office was inaugurated by the then Minister Shri H. Vanlalauva on 1st July 2008 at Central YMA Building, Tuikhuahtlang, Aizawl.<sup>39</sup> This new office has a single member namely the Chief Executive Officer, one Secretary and other office staff.

*Fifth*, as authorised by the Rules dated 26th August 2008, Mizoram State Election Commission (SEC) was constituted on 3rd October 2008.<sup>40</sup> This Commission was

---

<sup>34</sup> *Op.cit.*, Mizoram, Notification No. A.46013/2/2006-GAD/31 Dated 24.8.2006.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, No. A.46011/1/2004-GAD/31 Dated 26.9.2006.

<sup>36</sup> Draft Final Report-Aizawl City Report. By LEA Associates South Asia Pvt. Ltd, India in association with CEPT, India, p-1-4.

<sup>37</sup> *Op.cit.*, HNEHTU.

<sup>38</sup> *Gazette*, Mizoram, Dated 24.4.2007.

<sup>39</sup> *Op.cit.*, HNEHTU.

<sup>40</sup> Constitution of Mizoram State Election Commission, From: [www.secmizoram.in](http://www.secmizoram.in)

constituted for superintendence, direction, and control of the preparation of electoral rolls and for the conduct of election of various local bodies in Mizoram. For the first time after its formation, the State Election Commission conducted the Village Council election in 2009 in Aizawl, Lunglei, Champhai, Mamit, Serchhip and Kolasib Districts respectively. The Commission also conducted mid-term elections/by-elections for seven newly created and two dissolved Village Councils in early 2010.<sup>41</sup>

*Sixth*, the only Municipal Council in the State is to be set up in Aizawl, the State Capital. As for the first step, Aizawl Town/City has been divided into 19(nineteen) Wards and the details of the wards are shown in **ANNEXURE-I**.

From among the 19(nineteen) Municipal Wards, the State Election Commission selected Ward No. II, IV, VI, XI, XII, and XVII as reserved wards for women and this reservation of Wards would be rotated in every election. On the other hand, Ward No. IX was declared 'General Ward', which means that the ward is open for contest for everybody, even those persons classified General categories. In other words, 18 out of 19 Municipal Wards are reserved for the SC/ST from which 6(six) are again reserved for women.

*Seventh*, the SEC through a Notification issued by the Commissioner Shri C. Ropianga IAS held the first Municipal Election in the history of Mizoram on 3rd November 2010. Accordingly, Election Notification and Schedule was issued on 4th October 2010. Following the elections, counting of votes was conducted and completed on 4th November and all the process for the first Municipal election was completed before 16th November 2010.<sup>42</sup> The SEC appointed 3 Returning Officers (RO) for 174 Polling Stations in the first Municipal election. There were 174 Presiding Officers, the same number of First Polling, Second Polling and Station Officers and a few reserved officers. Besides them, the Commission appointed 24 Counting Supervisors and 44 Assistant Counting Supervisors. 237 Electronic Voting Machines (EVM) were utilised in the election and 348 Security personnel were deployed.<sup>43</sup>

There were 45 candidates contesting the first AMC election with a majority of the candidates coming from political parties. 13 candidates belonged to Indian National

---

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> Vanglaini, Daily News paper, 21st September 2010.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, Dated 4th November 2010.

Congress (INC), 12 to Mizo National Front (MNF), six to Zoram Nationalist Party (ZNP), seven to Mizoram People's Conference (MPC) and four to Bharatya Janata Party (BJP). There were 2(two) independent candidates. Though there were independent and other party candidates, this election was fought from two corners comprising of the major political parties and their allies. While INC allied with ZNP were at the one hand, and the biggest State party MNF signed up with MPC on the other, were to contest the election.

In AMC election, there were 1, 68,649 registered voters of which 80,390 are males and 88,259 females(ANNEXURE-II). The total of male voters is 8.92 percent or 7,869 less than female voters. From amongst 1, 68,649 voters, 1, 07,261 persons or 63.60 percent cast their votes at the first AMC Election. While Ward No. 1 recorded the highest percentage of 71.82 voter turnout record, Ward No. II has the lowest turnout record at 49.43 percent only. <sup>44</sup>

List of elected Councillors in the first AMC election is shown in (ANNEXURE-III). INC, MNF and ZNP won 5 (five) Wards each while MPC was victorious in 4(four) Wards. Thus, the alliance of INC and ZNP formed the first AMC Government by taking 10 seats. The average age of the first councillors is 46.69 years.<sup>45</sup> While CT Zakhuma of Ward No XV at 61 was the oldest, Lalchhuanmawii of Ward No XI was the youngest at 30 years of age. Among the Councillors, there are 5(five) Post Graduates, 12(twelve) Graduates, 6(six) Matriculates and 1(one) Under-matriculate.

To conduct the election, the SEC required Rs. 109 lakhs; however, the Nodal Department sanctioned only Rs. 74.71 lakhs, which was Rs. 34.29 lakhs short of the demand. All the election expenditure was exclusively borne by the State exchequer.<sup>46</sup> One week before the commencement of election, the SEC issued a Notification for the candidates where more than 3 vehicles are not allowed to be utilised by a candidate at a time for campaign purposes. It was stipulated that one vehicle is for the candidate while the other two were for the candidate's agent and party workers each. The Municipal Returning Officer should certify all deployed vehicles; otherwise, owners of non-certified vehicles are liable to be punished under either the Representation of the People Act, 1951 or Chapter IX of IPC. 200(two hundred) local taxis, 33(thirty-three) buses, 1(one) Pik-Up,

---

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, Dated 6th November 2010.

<sup>46</sup> Zozam Times, Daily News paper, Dated 20th October 2010.



1(one) Tata 407 mini-truck and 4(four) Gypsy vehicles were deployed in the first AMC election through requisition.<sup>47</sup>

Oath taking ceremonies were conducted by Shri C. Thanchhuma, IAS, Deputy Commissioner, Aizawl District on 16th November 2010 at AMC Session Hall, Thuampui, Aizawl.<sup>48</sup> This Ceremony was chaired by Shri R. Sangliankhuma, CEO, Aizawl Municipal Council. All the newly elected Councillors formed the first Executive Council on the same day where Shri C.T. Zakhuma was elected as the first Chairman of AMC and Shri Zarzoliana for the Vice Chairman. Besides them, 3(three) Executive Members (EMs) were also constituted on the recommendation of the newly elected Chairman. They are, Shri Lalzirliana, Smt. F. Lalhuthangi and Smt. Hmingthanzami. State Legislators, Members of the Parliament and a number of top Government officials attend the ceremony.<sup>49</sup>

Despite Mizoram State facing so many problems for the introduction of Urban Local Bodies in the State, the political and non-political opposition to it had to finally succumb. Of course, most of the people have realised that unplanned and traditional type of administration like the Village Council institution has no place in the civilised urban society. It is embodied in the policy documents of the JNNURM that implementation of Urban administration, in consistent with the 74th Constitution Amendment or 'Part - IX-A' of the Constitution, is compulsory or otherwise, no financial assistance could be sanctioned to States. As the state faced so many urban problems caused by rapid population growth and ill-managed urban settlements, the State Government had to seek all available financial resources from the Central Government. It lost no time towards Municipalisation process consistent with the 74th CAA by signing a Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) on 12th June 2007, committing itself to implement a number of reforms.

Despite composite hurdles and difficulties, the State Government has smoothly undertaken the process of introduction of Urban Local Bodies and as embodied by Municipal Act, all the other District Headquarters are to have Municipal Boards, the responsibility for which now rests with the Government.

---

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*,.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, Dated 16th November 2010.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*,.

**CHAPTER – VI**  
**ROLE OF LOCAL VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS FOR**  
**THE INTRODUCTION OF URBAN LOCAL BODIES IN**  
**MIZORAM**

## CHAPTER – VI

### ROLE OF LOCAL VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF URBAN LOCAL BODIES IN MIZORAM

Voluntary or Volunteering is an important expression of citizenship and is fundamental to democracy. It is the commitment of time and energy for the benefit of society and the community, and can take many forms. It is freely undertaken and not for financial gain. The principle of non-payment of volunteer is, therefore, central to this code and to the wider sector and society understands of volunteering. The compact Code of Good Practice on Volunteering States that, Voluntary or Volunteering is “... an activity that involves spending time, unpaid, doing something that aims to benefit the environment or individuals or groups other than (or in addition to) close relatives.”<sup>1</sup> According to the United Nations (UN), Voluntary has three key characteristics.<sup>2</sup> In the *first* place, the activity should not be undertaken primarily for financial reward. *Secondly*, the activity should be undertaken voluntarily, according to an individual’s own free will. *Thirdly*, the activity should be of benefit to someone other than the volunteer, or to society at large.<sup>3</sup> With the passing of time, the terminology, Voluntary Organisation is known by different nomenclature, *viz.*, Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO), Private Voluntary Organisation (PVO), Non-Profit Organisation and Civil Society *etc.* In brief, it is Voluntary and Non-Profit Organisations, which are not part of the Government. The term is generally restricted to social and cultural groups whose primary goal is not commercial.

In Mizoram, there are as many as 2,704 registered Non-Government Organisations (NGOs)/Voluntary Organisations (VOs)/Non-Profit Institutions (NPI) in 2008.<sup>4</sup> According to the findings of Survey conducted by the Directorate of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Volunteering England Information Sheet*, Volunteering England 2008, From: [www.thecompact.org.uk](http://www.thecompact.org.uk), p-1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p-2.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>4</sup> Government of Mizoram, Mizoram, Directorate of Economics & Statistics, *State Presentation of Non Profit Institutions Survey First Phase of the Project*, 2008, Aizawl, p-4.

Economic and Statistics, Government of Mizoram, in 2008, there are only 250 registered Non-Profit Institutions or NGOs before 1990. This was 9.24 percent of the latest Surveyed Data made in 2008.

**Table– 6.1**

**Main Activity-Wise Number and Percentage Distribution of Institution by Year of Registration in Mizoram.<sup>5</sup>**

Sl. No.	Main Activity	Year of Registration			
		Before 1990	1990 - 2000	After 2000	TOTAL
1.	Culture & Recreation	54 (19.56)	183 (66.30)	39 (14.14)	276
2.	Education & Research	22 (11.76)	72 (38.50)	93 (49.74)	187
3.	Health	1 (1.47)	20 (29.41)	47 (69.12)	68
4.	Social Services	42 (8.97)	248 (52.99)	178 (38.04)	468
5.	Environment	1 (3.22)	3 (9.68)	27 (87.10)	31
6.	Development & Housing	8 (4.79)	84 (50.30)	75 (44.91)	167
7.	Law, Advocacy & Politics	1 (50.00)	1 (50.00)	-	2
8.	Philanthropic intermediaries & Voluntarism activities	-	4 (80.00)	1 (20.00)	5
9.	International activities	1 (100.00)	-	-	1
10.	Religion	23 (14.74)	95 (60.90)	38 (24.36)	156
11.	Business & Professional associations, Unions	58 (8.08)	556 (77.44)	104 (14.48)	718
12.	Not classified elsewhere	39 (6.24)	241 (38.56)	345 (55.20)	625
	<b>ALL</b>	<b>250 (9.24)</b>	<b>1,507 (55.73)</b>	<b>947 (35.03)</b>	<b>2,704</b>

Table (6.1) shows that there are 1,507 registered NGOs in the year 1990-2000 and 947 newly registered after 2000. Increase in NGO registration was optimum at 1,507 between the years 1990 to 2000 which was 55.73 percent. This Survey Report also shows that among the registered NGOs, 276 Institutions belong to Culture & Recreation, 187 to Education & Research, 68 to Health, 468 to Social Services, 31 to Environment, 167 to Development & Housing, 2 to Law Advocacy & Politics, 5 to

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

Philanthropic intermediaries & Voluntarism activities. Though there were only 1 NGO involves in International activities, Religious has 156 registered, and there were 718 to Business & Professional Associations. However, 625 registered NGOs were not classified into any category. This implies that 625 Institutions do not fall under the categories of classification prepared by the department.

**Table-6.2**  
**Percentage by Year of Registration & Main Activity.<sup>6</sup>**

Sl. No.	Main Activities	Year of Registration	
		Before 1990	After 1990
1.	Culture & Recreation	19.56	80.44
2.	Educational Research	11.76	88.24
3.	Social Services	8.97	91.03
4.	Others	7.44	92.56
	<b>ALL</b>	9.24	90.76

Above Table (6.3) portrays that the number of registered NGOs is much higher after 1990s rather than the years before 1990. While there were 9.56 percent of registered organisations before 1990, the percentage has risen sharply to 80.44 after 1990. In the category of Educational Research and Social Services sectors, it has increased from the percentage of 11.76 and 8.97 to 88.24 and 91.03 respectively. The range of increase during the fag end of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century was very wide and this type of unprecedented increase of percentage is very rare in any economic sector. All these positive changes, in terms of registered NGOs, have resulted in almost ten-fold percent change i.e., from 9.24 before 1990 to 90.76 after 1990.

As shown in Table (6.3), from among the 8(eight) Districts of Mizoram, Aizawl District leads the table in terms of registered NGOs. While Mamit District, Saiha District, and Serchhip District have below 3 percent from the total 2,704 of registered NGOs, Aizawl District alone accounted for a record high of 72.60 percent. it has 1,963 registered NGOs.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Table-4, p-5.

**Table-6.3**  
**District-Wise Number and Percentage of Institution and Year of Registration.**<sup>7</sup>

Sl. No.	District Name	Year of Registration			
		Before 1990	1990-2000	After 2000	TOTAL
1.	Mamit	8 (10.96)	22 (30.14)	43 (58.90)	73 (2.70)
2.	Kolasib	3 (2.42)	59 (47.58)	62 (50.00)	124 (4.58)
3.	Aizawl	192 (9.78)	1206(61.44)	565(28.78)	1963(72.60)
4.	Serchhip	4 (5.48)	26 (35.62)	43 (58.90)	73 (2.70)
5.	Champhai	11 (7.86)	52 (37.14)	77 (55.00)	140 (5.18)
6.	Lunglei	17 (9.83)	77 (44.51)	79 (45.66)	173 (6.40)
7.	Lawngtlai	9 (10.34)	34 (39.08)	44 (50.58)	87 (3.22)
8.	Saiha	6 (8.45)	31 (43.66)	34 (47.89)	71 (2.62)
	<b>ALL</b>	<b>250 (9.25)</b>	<b>1,507(55.73)</b>	<b>947 (35.02)</b>	<b>2,704 (100)</b>

The aggregate of all the other Districts, excluding Aizawl, is in the tune of 741 only; this is 37.74 percent to the total of Aizawl District alone. Mamit, and Serchhip Districts have 73 each, Kolasib District has 124, Champhai District 140, Lunglei District 173, Lawngtlai District 87 and Saiha District 71 respectively. Saiha District, which is the Southern tip of Mizoram has the lowest number of registered NGOs which stands at 71.

Distribution of NGOs or Non-Profit Institutions can also be categorised according to Rural and Urban Areas. As shown in Table (6.5), from the total 2,704 Non-Profit Institutions or NGOs in the State, 413 were in the Rural Areas while 2,291 are found in the Urban Areas. This means that only 15.17 percent belongs to Rural while 84.73 percent are in the Urban Areas. It is strange though that while it has been established that the majority of the population live in the Rural Areas, the pattern of NGOs formation is much higher in the Urban than in the Rural Areas. The Rural – Urban NGO registration is, remarkably, different in Mamit District and Lawngtlai District as the number of registered NGOs is higher in Rural than in Urban Areas. Of course, in the rest of the Districts in Mizoram, Urban Areas have a recorded high of NGOs rather than Rural.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

At the Rural Areas, Mamit District has the highest registered NGOs of 76.71 percent, while only 4.94 percent in Aizawl District. In spite of that, the exact number is still higher in the Rural Areas of Aizawl District it is 97, but Mamit District have only 56. At the Urban Areas, again Aizawl District account for 95.06 percent or 1,866, this is about 89 percent from the total 2,704 registered NGOs in Mizoram. Next to Aizawl, Lunglei District have 118, 81 in Kolasib District, 73 in Champhai, 52 in Serchhip, 50 in Saiha, 34 in Lawngtlai and only 17 in Mamit District respectively.

**Table-6.5**  
**District-Wise Number and Percentage Distribution of Institution by Location.**<sup>8</sup>

Sl. No.	District Name	Location		
		Rural	Urban	TOTAL
1	2	3	4	5
1.	<b>Mamit</b>	<b>56 (76.71)</b>	<b>17 (23.29)</b>	<b>73</b>
2.	Kolasib	43 (34.68)	81 (65.32)	124
3.	Aizawl	97 (4.94)	1,866 (95.06)	1963
4.	Serchhip	21 (28.77)	52 (71.23)	73
5.	Champhai	67 (47.86)	73 (52.14)	140
6.	Lunglei	55 (31.79)	118 (68.21)	173
7.	<b>Lawngtlai</b>	<b>53 (60.92)</b>	<b>34 (39.08)</b>	<b>87</b>
8.	Saiha	21 (29.58)	50 (70.52)	71
	<b>ALL</b>	<b>413 (15.17)</b>	<b>2,291 (84.73)</b>	<b>2,704</b>

Table (6.5) shows that though the number of NGOs is on the increase at a soaring rate, there is only a comparatively marginal rise in the numbers in the Rural Areas. Though a larger number of the population lives in the Rural, its share is only 15.17 percent. So, as development and Civil Society have a certain relationship, the incidental increase of NGOs in Rural Areas portray that all round development is also relatively slow in these parts.

### **Local Voluntary Organisations and the Issue of Introduction of Urban Local Bodies**

In spite of the increase in the number of NGOs, it is to be noted that all the 2,704 registered Local Voluntary Organisations are not involved in the activities of NGOs for the introduction of Urban Administration or Municipalisation. Among the

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, Table-2, p-3.

registered NGOs, the following 9 (nine) NGOs/Voluntary Organisations are found as adding Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation in their working sectors.<sup>9</sup> They are:

- (1) Centre for Environment Protection, (*Registration No. SR/MZ-56 of 1999*), Aizawl.
- (2) CP Multipurpose Society, (*Rgn. No. SR. 27/96/MZ-RFS of 1996*), Aizawl.
- (3) Goodwill Foundation, (*Rgn.SR. 27/98/MZ-RFS of 1998*), Aizawl.
- (4) Holy Heart Association, (*Registration SR. MZ-17 of 1999*), Aizawl.
- (5) New Horizon, (*Registration No. MSR - 21 of 4.12.2006*), Champhai.
- (6) Paite Students Federation, (*Registration No. SR- 182/95/MZ/ RFS of 1995*), Aizawl.
- (7) PRISM, (*Registration No. MSR-96 of 19.11.2007*), Aizawl.
- (8) Study Forum, (*Registration No. SR-MZ/ 247 Dated 26.2.2003*), Aizawl.
- (9) Torch Bearer Ministries, (*Registration No. SR. 165 of 1994, Dated 9.3.2006*), Aizawl.

While these nine organisations are legally registered NGOs with a motive of Urban Development, none of them had been specifically constituted for the cause of Urban problem solution or Urban Administration. Apart from this, their Working Sectors have included many other subjects like (i) Agriculture; (ii) Environment & Forests; (iii) Renewable Energy; (iv) Right to Information and Advocacy; (v) Rural Development & Poverty Alleviation; (vi) Science & Technology; (vii) Tribal Affairs; (viii) Water Resources; (ix) Animal Husbandry; (x) Dairying & Fisheries; (xi) Children; (xii) Health and Family Welfare; (xiii) HIV/AIDS; (xiv) Women

---

<sup>9</sup> Planning Commission of India, *NGO Partnership System*, From : [www.ngo.india.gov.in](http://www.ngo.india.gov.in).



Development & Empowerment; (xv) Education and Literacy; and (xvi) Vocational Training etc.<sup>10</sup>

Though they are less active in the area of introduction and sensitisation of Urban Local Self-Government, their composite working sectors are reasonable grounds for retaining their registration. In other words, they have so many working sectors that they are unable to confine themselves to Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation.

Surprisingly, the most vibrant NGOs like Young Mizo Association (YMA), Mizoram Hmeichhe Insuihkhawm Pawl (MHIP), Mizo Zirlai Pawl (MZP), Mizo Students' Union (MSU) and Mizoram Upa Pawl (MUP) have remained silent on the subject of formation of Urban Administration in Mizoram. Of course, the problems and activities of Urban Administration are not included in their objectives and Area of operations.

On the other hand, there are a few organisations involved for the promotion and sensitisation of adequate Urban Administration in Mizoram although they have not been formally registered with the Government. They are:

- (1) Mizoram Municipal Steering Committee (MMSC), Aizawl.
- (2) Zoram Reformation Forum (ZRF), Lunglei.
- (3) Mizoram Public Administration Association (MIPAA), Aizawl.
- (4) Forum for the Implementation of Constitutional Rights in Mizoram (FICORM), Aizawl.

The Mizoram Municipal Steering Committee (MMSC) was constituted on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 1999.<sup>11</sup> Since 1985, Local Educationist, Businessman, and Retired Government servants had aspired to constitute Local Administration for Aizawl City. They were called '*Aizawl Khawpui Hualhim Chaktu*', meaning Protector of Aizawl City. This

---

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*,

<sup>11</sup> Personal Interview with Mr. Ramdina, C., *President*, Mizoram Municipal Steering Committee. Dated 21st March 2010

Group also considered to adopt the title ‘Municipal Demanding Committee’ as their legal entity. But the Group had utterly failed to have any formal name before 1999. However, in early 1999, prominent citizens held a discussion in Aizawl, under the Chairmanship of Shri H. Raltawna, a former Civil Service Officer, and formed the Mizoram Municipal Steering Committee (MMSC). The credit for the formation of this Steering Committee also goes to other prominent citizens/retired Government Officers such as Shri H.Vanthuama, Shri S.R. Vala, Shri Bawlliana and Dr. Zokhuma.

The MMSC had submitted a Memorandum to Smt. Sonia Gandhi and met her 4(four) times for the Municipalisation of Aizawl City. They also had meetings 6(six) times with Honourable Jaipal Reddy, Minister, Ministry of Urban Development, Government of India. This Steering Committee also met the Tenth Finance Commission of India, the Eleventh Finance Commission, and the Twelfth Finance Commission of India for the introduction of proper Urban Administration in Mizoram. Along with the submission of their Memorandum pleading for proper Urban Administration, the MMSC had met the erstwhile Chief Minister of Mizoram Shri Zoramthanga 45(forty-five) times.<sup>12</sup> Besides, the MMSC had conducted an Advocacy Programme on Urban Local Self-Government through Seminars and Workshops. Press Release and formal meetings with politicians were among their activities for the constitution of Urban Administration in Mizoram.

Persons who were administratively motivated for Local Governance had also formed another NGO called the “Zoram Reformation Forum (ZRF)” in the late 1980s. This forum was constituted in Lunglei, about 235 kms South of Aizawl and its activities are confined to the Southern part of Mizoram only. The forerunners for the constitution of ZRF are retired Government Servants, Teachers, Educationists, and young aspirants. The main concern of ZRF is for the introduction of the Panchayati Raj System, incorporated by the 73rd CAA of 1992. Right from the beginning, the organisation has been using different means to exert pressure on the State Government for the birth of Rural Local Self-Government in Mizoram. They also conducted Seminars, Workshops and other informal discussions.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, Dated 12th August 2007.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, Dated 21st March 2010.

Ultimately, the ZRF had come out with Press Releases and also submitted Memorandums to the State Government. The Forum also published a 'Draft Panchayat Law in 1998' and prepared pamphlets for free distribution towards this cause. Since March 2004, it joined hands with the FICORM;<sup>14</sup> however, as their main objective is for Panchayati Raj Institution (PRI) for Rural Mizoram, they did not have much support from Aizawl District. In fact, most of the influential people involved in making an appeal to the State Government for introduction of Urban Administration were not overly concerned with the PRI system. Therefore, their activities could not pick up pace in Aizawl.<sup>15</sup>

Forum for the Implementation of Constitutional Rights in Mizoram (FICORM) came into being as a result of a Seminar conducted by the Mizoram Public Administration Association (MIPAA) on 30th July 2004, at PIB Conference Hall, Tuikhuahtlang, Aizawl.<sup>16</sup> However, this Forum was officially inaugurated on 15th September 2004 as an engine for the implementation of different Decentralisation Principles incorporated by the Constitution of India.<sup>17</sup> FICORM conducted various Seminars and Workshops to sensitise the public on Constitutional Provisions relating to Municipality and Panchayats, including Human Rights. It had prepared Press Releases on the subject of Urban Administration and met the former Chief Minister of Mizoram, Shri Zoramthanga, in the early 2005. Ministers and Department Officials were also invited to attend their Seminars. After passing Resolutions to that effect, they had submitted Memorandum to the State Government towards Municipalisation of all the Urban Centres in Mizoram.<sup>18</sup> The urgency for having proper Local Administration under the 73rd and 74th CAA was publicised through Pamphlets and Media. The FICORM had also published Books in order to sensitise the Provisions of the Constitution, including Urban Administration.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> *Personal Interview* with Mr.Zothuama, F., Lunglei Lunglawn, *Ex- Chairman* ZRF, Dated on 19th March 2005.

<sup>15</sup> *Personal Interview* with Mr.Zosangliana, *Ex-President*. Forum for the Implementation of Constitutional Rights in Mizoram (FICORM), Dated 9th on December 2005 at PIB Media Centre.

<sup>16</sup> Mizoram Reformation Forum, *Khawtlang inawpna Dan* (Local Self-Government Institutions or New Panchayati Raj Institutions), (1998), Lunglei, Mizoram, p-2.

<sup>17</sup> Mizoram Public Administration Association (MIPAA), Seminar paper Dated on 30th July 2004.

<sup>18</sup> *Meeting Minutes*, Forum for the Implementation of Constitutional Rights in Mizoram, , Dated 15th September 2004.

<sup>19</sup> *Op.cit.*, Zosangliana, H., Dated 11th November 2005.

Although registered Local Voluntary Organisations/NGOs did not come forwards to get themselves deeply involved in the activities for the introduction of Urban Local Bodies in Mizoram, unregistered NGOs like MMSC, ZRF and FICORM have taken active part and made a huge contribution for the introduction and sensitisation of Urban Administration in general and the 74th CAA in particular to the public.

**CHAPTER – VII**  
**CONCLUSION**

## CHAPTER – VII

### CONCLUSION

Local Self-Government has occupied the bottom-rung of the ladder of modern democratic Government structure. It is an integral part of the Government, through which the general people can have an opportunity to involve themselves through participation in the art of administration. This is the most essential administrative mechanism for the transformation of Traditional Village Administration in Mizoram.

Urban Administrative system in India emphasizes Plan-Based Development and distribution of decision-making process to different individuals, while decentralisation of powers is its essence. Modern Government is systematically distributed into three; the Central Government at the top, the State Government at the intermediate and the Local Self-Government at the bottom of the Structure. All the 3(three) types exhibit different functions under the roof of a Sovereign State.

In India, Local Self-Government has existed since the ‘*Vedic Age*’ dating around 2500 B.C. However, the *Cholas* Dynasty (919 AD - 921 AD) was credited for the setting of a very systematic Local Self-Government in the Sub-Continent. This Dynasty had effected Town Planning Administration in various Towns of Northern and Central India during the 1<sup>st</sup> Century BC. At the Eastern India, the *Paura* were the Administrative Body of the Towns. During the Muslim Rule (from 1175 AD to 1290 AD), a centralised form of Local Self-Government was also constituted when the ‘*Kotwal*’ was appointed as the Chief of the Town. Hence, the *Kotwal* was compatible with the modern ‘Mayor’ in Urban Administration. It is clear that modernised Urban Administration had been available during the pre-British period in India.

Modern Urban administration, as found today, is the creation of the British. It was in 1687 that the first Urban Local Body was formed in Madras (now Chennai) through the Charter Act. It rose round Fort Saint George on a site granted to the East Indian Company. Though this Urban Local Body was established without any measure of elective options, it marked the beginning of an administrative set up to keep the Town clean and to control Market Places and Entertainments etc. Due to the success story of

Madras Municipal Administration, Urban Administrative mechanism rapidly flourished all over India which at the beginning included Bombay (now Mumbai) and Calcutta (now Kolkata). The first Century of Urban Administration, however, was confined to British interests rather than the welfare of Indians.

The erstwhile Governor General and the Viceroy of India, Lord Ripon (1880 - 1884) was undeniably considered the pioneer of Urban Local Self-Government as it is in India today. Because, he was responsible in increasing Non-Official elements in the Local Bodies through his introduction of compulsory 'Elective Representatives' in the Local Self-Government. Ripon's Resolution turned the Local Self-Government into a School of Political Education and Participative in the form of representative democracy. Consequently, it opened a gateway for the native Indians to feel the pulse of participative democracy in the decision making process of the Administration.

The British introduced the first Urban Local Self-Government in India in Madras (now Chennai) in 1687. Though flourishing to all parts of India, Urban Local Self-Governments received Constitutional Legacy only after 1992 when the 74th Constitutional Amendment was passed by the Parliament of India. This Amendment incorporated Article 243-P to 243-ZG in Part-IX-A to the Constitution of India. Unlike the 73rd Constitution Amendment meant for Rural Local Governance, the 74th Amendment is a Mandatory Subject to be exercised throughout India except for the Scheduled Areas and the Tribal Areas enshrined in Article 243 and Clause (1) & (2) of Article 244 of the Constitution. Parliament, however, can extend this Provision to any Area. Before the aforesaid Amendment, there was no mention of Urban Administration in the Constitution or any other Law or Statutes in India. Though some small hints were given in Entry 5 of List-II (State List), the most detailed Provision was embodied in the Constitution only by the 74th Amendment of 1992.

Despite many of the Urban Local Self-Governments of the Pre-Independence period being continued in Post-Independence India, urgent effort was not given for the speedy institutionalisation of Urban Local Self-Government after Independence. Though the Directive Principle of the State Policy incorporated the Provision for Local-Governance, it is, of course, not for the Urban Local Bodies but for Rural Local Governance. The First and the Second Five Year Plans were silent on Urban Local Self-Government; however, it was the Third Five Year Plan which paved the way for Plan-

Based Development for Urban Administration to be introduced. Rapid population swell unavoidably added more uncontrolled Urban Centres in the Country causing a lot of Civic Problems in Cities and Towns. The Government and the Administrative Bureaucrats were finally compelled by necessity to make proper arrangements for Civic Administration.

The first initiative towards legalising Urban Local Bodies, however, was taken by the Parliament only in 1992 through the Legislation of the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act (CAA). The Amendment Legislated a Provision for the Urban Local Self-Government for the Urban Centre and added a new part, 'Part-IX-A', to the Constitution of India. This Provision enshrined different systems of Urban Local Self-Government in different Urban Centres. They are called Nagar Panchayat for Transitional Areas from Rural to Urban Centre, Municipal Council for small Urban Areas and Municipal Corporation for larger Urban Areas. Specifically, this new Amendment granted Legal entity to Urban Local Self-Governments and the system was made Mandatory to all the Provincial (State) Governments except for few Areas Notified under Article 244 (i) & (ii). Thus, the State Government was compelled by Law to constitute Urban Local Self-Governments for the Urban Areas of their respective States.

Conforming to the Constitution of India, many State Assemblies took steps to introduce Urban Local Self-Government simultaneously. As of October 2004, there are 2,850 Urban Local Self-Governments in India (Table 2.2) viz., 117 Municipal Corporations, 1,513 Municipal Councils, and 1,220 Nagar Panchayats. The Western State of Maharastra had the highest number of both Municipal Corporations and Municipal Councils. This State has 22 Municipal Corporations and 225 Municipal Councils. Uttar Pradesh State comes after Maharashtra with 12 Corporations, 194 Councils and 422 Nagar Panchayats. Uttar Pradesh, however, has the highest number of Urban Local Bodies with 628 in its stable. Maharashtra, in terms of total number of Local Urban Bodies, comes next with 247 followed by Karnataka with 222. With 183, Rajasthan is next followed by Tamil Nadu, where Local Urban Bodies originated, with 157. Gujarat has 149, Punjab 133 and West Bengal 126 Urban Local Bodies.

The North Eastern Region has 8(eight) States and they are Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim and Tripura. This region has an aggregate Area of 2,62,179 Sq. Km. Out of 220 Urban Centres/Towns, 153 Urban Centres/Towns have Urban Local Bodies (ULBs). Despite the many Local Urban Bodies



to be found in the North East Region, many ULBs do not conform to the Constitution of India 74th Amendment Act. For example, in Meghalaya, they have Urban Local Bodies without elective members while Manipur and Nagaland cannot conduct elections to their Urban Local Bodies. Contrary to the 74th Amendment, Arunachal Pradesh has no Urban Local Bodies.

Urban dwellers in the North Eastern Region have benefited by the introduction of proper Urban Administration. In Tripura, the tribal communities are given Reservations in their Municipality. This State also gives Reservation to SC/ST women for the posts of Chairman in their Urban Local Bodies. In Assam, Urban Local Bodies are indispensable instruments for maintaining Community Structure, Building Parks, Managing Solid Wastes, etc.

Mizoram State situated at the Southern most location in North Eastern India was formed by the 53rd Constitution Amendment of 1986 to become the 23rd State of the Indian Union. This State has 45.65 percent of Urban population, which is the highest Urban population percentage among the North Eastern States. The other States are Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Tripura and Sikkim. The State of Mizoram is made up of 8(eight) Districts, 23(twenty-three) Sub-Divisions and 26(twenty-six) Rural Development Blocks.

Mizoram was once under British Rule for about half a Century. At the beginning of the British intervention in the Political Administration of the State, the whole Geographical Area was divided into the South Lushai Hills and the North Lushai Hills. While the former was administered by the Bengal Governor, the latter was governed by the Assam Governor. However, such an administrative setup was not found convenient by the Imperialist Government and, therefore, the two Districts were amalgamated into one Lushai Hills in 1898.

After India received its freedom from the British, the nomenclature of 'Lushai Hills' for this District remained without any alteration. It was in 1952 that the whole Area of the then Lushai Hills was given Autonomous District Council Status by the Assam Government by exercising Provisions enshrined in the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution of India. District Council Government was constituted and the name 'Lushai Hills' was replaced by 'Mizo Hills'. The District Council Government remained for about two

decades, and it was on 21st January 1972 that a Centrally Administered 'Union Territory' Government was given to the Area. With this new Status, the Area was again renamed, this time to 'Mizoram' which means 'Land of the Mizos'. This Union Territory (UT) Government was upgraded to a 'State' Status under the Union of India through the 53rd Constitution Amendment Act of 1986. Hence, a full-fledged Mizoram State was inaugurated on 20th February 1987.

There was neither a single Urban Centre nor Urban Town at the time of Indian Independence. The first Urban Centre was identified only in 1951 which is Aizawl. The Census of India 1951 declared the biggest Village as a 'Notified Town,' hence Aizawl attained the Status of 'Town'. This Town is the only Notified Town or Urban Town for two decades in Mizoram. But in 1971, Census of India added one more Notified Town *i.e.*, Lunglei. By the 2001 Census, the total number of Notified Towns or Urban Towns increased to a high of 22. However, all these Notified Towns or Urban Towns have no Urban Administration, and instead are administered through the Village Council Institution which was meant for the Villages. The District Council Government constituted this kind of Village Administration in 1954 as provided by the Lushai Hills District (Village Council) Act, 1953. So far as Urban Administration is concerned, the Government had not taken the necessary steps for Urban Management. Even after identification of new Urban Centres or Notified Towns in 1951, no separate legislation for the Urban Administration had been made. Therefore, the same Administrative Machinery, the Village Council, was instituted in each of all the legitimate Villages and Towns in the State.

According to the Village Council Act, any recognised Village is entitled to have a Village Council but the number of elected member restricted by the size of the Village calculated on the basis of the number Households in the Village. The number of Village Council Members ranged from 4 to 15. While 4 Village Council Members can be elected in Village Centre having 100 Households or fewer, Villages having 2,100 Households and above were eligible to have 15 Elected VC Members. The Mode of Elections, Preparation of Electoral Roll and Administration of the Council comes under the purview of the Local Administration Department of the State Government. But as mentioned before, similar Administration was provided for both the Rural and Urban Areas. As such, all Towns or Notified Towns are a conglomeration of different Villages or Cluster of

Villages in terms of Self-Governed Administrative Bodies. It is possible for a single Village or Town to have more than Village Council within its Legitimate Area.

By the 1981 Census, the number of Notified Towns in Mizoram grew noticeably. Apart from Aizawl (recognition given in 1951) and Lunglei (recognised in 1971), Saiha, Champhai, Serchhip, and Kolasib were recognised as Notified Towns by this Census, thus bringing the total number of Urban Centres in Mizoram to Six. The 1991 Census of India again increased the number of Urban Centres when it recognised 16 habitations as Notified Towns bringing the total to 22 Notified Towns or Urban Centre in Mizoram. There was no change in the number of Urban Centres or Notified Towns from the Census of India 2001. Some Towns are the District Headquarters while many are not. Lawngtlai District has no Urban Centre from the purview of the Government of India, Directorate of Census Operations. However, the Headquarters *i.e.*, Lawngtlai, has been declared as a Town by the Government of Mizoram, through a Gazette notification on 24th September 2000. In spite of this, Lawngtlai was still not given the Status of Town or Notified Town by the 2001 Census.

Except in Aizawl, the State Capital, no other system of Urban Local Self-Government has been introduced in the State and the 74th Constitution Amendment Act of 1992 has not been implemented in any other Urban Centres of the State. The Villages and Towns are given identical Administrative System, called the 'Village Council'. This type of Village Administration has been in existence since 1954. To conform to the Village Council Law, all the Towns/Notified Towns were categorised into different Villages based on the boundaries of Local Areas within the habitation and given separate Village Council Administration. In other words, Towns are categorised into different Villages in order to make it possible for Village Council Institutions to be constituted. Hence, all the Notified Towns in Mizoram are in reality a collection of Villages or Cluster of Villages within a certain delineated Urban Centres.

Since 2004, the Union Government prohibited sanctioning Development Funds for Urban Centres and Towns which have not yet introduced appropriate Urban Local Self-Governments. In the meantime, expenditure of Rural Development Funds was prohibited in Towns recognised by the Union Government. As a result, the State Government is devoid of Development Funds for those Village Councils constituted in Urban Centres. This is mainly due to the fact that the Central Government was adamant

that States implement the 74th CAA of 1992. For example, even after 8 months from the date of receipt of the First Instalment, the concerned Department of the Government of India has not yet released the Second Instalment of Swarna Jayanti Sahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) and Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) to the State Government.

Consequent upon the absence of proper Urban Administration, Urban People faced diversified problems connected with Urban living such as Garbage Disposals, Street Lights, Drainages etc. Truly speaking, except for some Minor Works executed by the Government in the name of Urban Governance, all Local development Projects have been stopped in the Urban Towns. There is no proper Waste Management and all the Markets are without any proper Administration. It is important to mention that different Departments of the State Governments' are directly involved in the Civic Administration of the Urban Centres which eventually leads to clashes of function among them.

In Mizoram, the Politicians and Bureaucrats always manage to place hurdles to any move for the introduction of proper Urban Local Self-Government as enshrined in the Constitution of India. Using subtle propaganda against Decentralisation, they try to maintain the Status-Quo at all cost. As most of the State powers are in their hands, it is quite difficult to introduce Urban Local Self-Government in conformity with the context of the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act. Until and unless the Politicians and Administrators change their Self-Centred perception, the Urban People would always be deprived of true Decentralisation of Powers.

In the meantime, the plight of the Urban Poor is becoming a grave concern day by day. As portrayed by the Survey Report of 2008-2009, 26,571 families or 1, 16,353 persons in Mizoram are Slum dwellers. Though there are 37,152 BPL families, merely 1,450 families are benefited by the Central Government Programme for Below Poverty Line families. Composite Anti-Poor Programme like SJSRY is being carried out in Aizawl City alone. If appropriate Urban Local Bodies are constituted in all the Urban Centres, it is likely that Anti-Poor Programmes would be promptly implemented in all other Towns or at least in the 5(five) senior Urban Towns and District Headquarters like Lunglei, Saiha, Serchhip, Kolasib, Champhai and Mamit.

The Mizoram Municipalities Bill 2002 had been legislated in 2007 and important Amendments were also been made in 2009 and 2010. However, the Government has taken steps to address the problems faced only by the Urban dwellers in Aizawl City *i.e.*, the State Capital. Urgent steps are needed to be taken to supplant the Village Councils by introducing appropriate Urban Local Self-Governments in the different recognised Towns and this would be possible by extending the Mizoram Municipalities Act, 2007 to these Urban Centres. Willingness of the State Government is essential for introducing appropriate Urban Administration. If the State Government does not take a positive step to avoid ‘Audit Objection’ of the Union Government by introducing Urban Local Self-Governments, the Village Councils in the Urban Centres are certain to face ‘Fund Crunch’ for the development of their respective Localities. If this problem is not tackled immediately, inequity of development to various Towns would cause Public unrest.

As authorised by Article 371-G of the Constitution of India, the people can protect, through Legislation, their Religious or Social Practices, Customary Law and Procedure, Ownership and Transfer of Land, as well as Administration of Civil and Criminal Justice involving decisions according to Mizo Customary Law. Thus, the conservative Mizo Society need not suspect Decentralisation of Powers to the grassroots as designed by Part IX-A of the Constitution as some kind of hidden Agenda for assimilation. Instead, the present Village Council Institutions in all the Urban Centres and Towns should be transformed into Urban Local Self-Governments. This could be accomplished with ease by amending the Mizoram Municipalities Act, 2007 to suit all the Urban Centres and Towns.

The State of Mizoram cannot accelerate towards Municipalisation of its Urban Centres because the traditional Village Administrative system is still given preference by the majority of the people. This is due to the poor sensitisation of the public to Municipal Administration. The challenges of appropriate Urban Local Self-Government have not reached many of the average Mizo as well as Politicians, Businessmen, and Social Leaders. Even recognised and popular Voluntary Organisations have not taken steps for the transformation of Urban Administration.

Apart from what has been mentioned many other problems and hurdles exists for Municipalisation of Notified Towns.

*Firstly*, Political Will for the introduction of Municipal Administration is sadly lacking amongst the Politicians. Though Municipal Council has been introduced in the Aizawl in late 2010, it is only because of Administrative pressure put on by the Central Government through JNNURM.

*Secondly*, the General Public is still ignorant about much of Municipal Administration. On the other hand, overwhelming effects of the Imperialist Legacy and negative sentiments of the Government servants have also contributed to the hindrances for Municipalisation.

*Thirdly*, isolation sentiments and conservatism is another important obstacle for Municipality.

*Fourthly*, absence of sensitisation is other important issue.

*Fifthly*, the Peace Accord, which was signed between the then underground outfit MNF and the Government of India, which was responsible in adding a new Clause namely Article 371-G in the Constitution of India was responsible for ineffectiveness of the Parliamentary law in Mizoram. One of the Clause in the Accord stated that no Act of the Parliament shall apply to the State of Mizoram unless the Legislative Assembly of the State of Mizoram, by a Resolution, so decides.

Due to the absence of appropriate Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram, many problems are faced by the Urbanites in general, and by the Urban Poor in particular. The 37,152 BPL families that are identified in the State is 21.09 percent of the total 1,76,134 Households in Mizoram. Though the Government launched many Development Programmes like Indira Awas Yojana, National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme etc., for the Development of Rural Poor, the comparative the status of Urban Poor is not satisfactory at all. The Government of India has been launching Development Schemes for both the Rural Areas and Urban Areas through separate Guidelines and Manuals. Therefore, Urban Poor, especially BPL families, are quite helpless where special development is concerned since they still have to await the mechanism to put into motion

these Special Development Schemes in Urban Areas. The Government needs to take urgent steps for the economic upliftment of the Urban Poor.

In a stark contrast to the Rural Poor, the Urban Poor lack specially driven Development Programme for them. So far, Swaran Jayanti Sahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY) is the only Composite Scheme launched by the State since 1998. Though the Government of Mizoram has initiated State Sponsored Development Programmes like *Mizoram Intodelhna* Project and New Land Use Policy, the Scheme does not specifically target the Urban Poor. Therefore, this Centrally Sponsored Scheme SJSRY is the only Programme which has a Development Mission for the Urban Poor. However, the Programme has not covered the whole Urban Centres. Even though there are 152 Groups of Below Poverty Line (BPL) families, only 77 Groups of BPL in Aizawl City have benefited the SJSRY.

The implementation of SJSRY in Aizawl Town has provided Skill Training for Job Employments to all the BPL families placed under 77 Groups in the State Capital. The Lump Sum Grant Scheme under JNNURM for Financial Assistance has also been implemented resulting in the procurement of 14 Public Transport Buses and the construction of Residential Buildings for the Economically Weaker Section or BPL families. Though UIDSSMT and IHSDP are meant to serve as Development Projects for the Urban Areas and Urban Poor, these have not been implemented. Therefore, inhabitants of other Towns are without any Development Projects. The lack of Development Projects in Urban Centres has been the source of many problems for the Urbanites particularly in the Areas of Drainage and Sewerage, Garbage disposals, Power Supply and Maintenance of Roads.

For the development of Urban Areas in the North Eastern Region, Additional Central Assistance (ACA), the Central Government has allocated 10 % Lump Sum Grant and Asian Development Bank (ADB) funded North Eastern Region Urban Development Programme (NERUDP). In the case of NERUDP, only Aizawl, Kohima, Shillong, Agartala and Gangtok are covered in the *First* Phase. Except for ACA and 10% Lump Sum Grant, Urban Centres are not allowed to take financial benefits until and unless Urban Local Self-Governments are constituted within their Area.

A few Urban Local Self-Governments in the North Eastern States have received the benefits of many Urban Development Programmes. In Assam, Permanent Capital Complex has been constructed with a total project cost of Rs 124 crores. Such projects as a Park (Shradhanjali Kanan) at R.G. Baruah Road, a Two-Lane Railway Overbridge at Panbazar, South Guwahati West Zone Water Supply Scheme etc., are also at the final phase for completion. There are many other Projects sanctioned under JNNURM in Assam which includes Urban Transport, Heritage Development, Water Supply, Roads/ Flyover, Solid Waste Management, Drainage and Sewerage etc.

### **Suggestions**

By assessing all the problems and findings, the following points may be suggested for establishing Urban Administration in North East in general and Mizoram in particular.

(1) Except in Assam and Tripura, Municipal elections cannot be conducted, as required by the Constitution. Even though Mizoram was able to conduct a problem-free Aizawl Municipal Council (AMC) election for the first time in 2010, Meghalaya and Sikkim always faces election problems. Kohima Municipal Council (KMC) could not provide Reservation for women as stipulated by the Constitution of India. Thus, the State Governments need to take adequate steps to conduct Municipal Elections in all their Urban Areas and Towns' consistent to the Provisions enshrined in the Constitution of India. The Governments should not waste time to make a clear mandate for the conduct of Municipal elections.

(2) Sensitisation of Development Administration, like Urban Local Self-Government, needs to be launched by the State Governments as most people are quite ignorant of it. This is especially very important for a remote State like Mizoram. If Urban Local Self-Governments are not put in place, the Region might not have Socio-economic development proportionate to the National mainstream. A team of Experts, Professional organisations or Consultancy Firms are immensely required for this task. The Government should also employ experienced personnel for the success of Moral Transformation from Non-Development Classical Administration to Contemporary Development Administration.



(3) In Mizoram, reliable Data relating to Socio-economic development of the Urban Area needs to be prepared. Neither the number of Urban Infrastructure nor beneficiaries affected by them has been prepared so far. There is also no separate Data of the Urban Poor in Mizoram. As a result of this, it has become a problematic task for the Administration to provide Development Projects for the Downtrodden and Economically Weaker Section of the Society.

(4) Well marked Data, which shall be adopted for all the Programmes of both Central and State Government sponsored Projects, should be prepared. And the classification of both the Central Government and the State Government should be in conformity. For *example*, Lawngtlai, the District Capital of the same name which is also the Capital of Lai Autonomous District Council, has not been recognised as an Urban Town by the Central Government till date while the State Government has declared this Town as a purely Urban Town as far back as 1999. Therefore, the Department of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation (UD & PA) might not be able to implement such Urban Development Schemes as SJSRY, Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT) and Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP).

(5) A clear specification of Urban and Non-Urban Areas needs to be made in Mizoram. As for the first initiative, tentative Areas are required to be prepared at least for Urban Outgrowth (UO). As most Development Schemes are prepared based on Urban and Non-Urban Classification, Geographical distribution should also be prepared.

(6) Political stands of the Masses and the Politicians should be adapted towards Decentralisation as the basic of democracy and engine of Development. It is more essential in a conservative society like the Mizo society where the fear of assimilation has taken deep roots in the Political perception of the people.

(7) The Village Council Institution has become obsolete in the Urban Towns. This kind of classical Village Administration, meant for the traditional Agrarian Society, is no longer viable in modern Urban Administration. For instance, the Questionnaire report (Table - 5.1) clearly shows that it is not the Structure but the members of this traditional Administration who are not aware of Decentralisation which can happen through appropriate Urban Administration since 70.39 percent do not know the meaning

of Urban Local Self-Government and 98.61 percent are completely ignorant of its core meanings. Subsequently, adequate steps need to be taken to sensitise Urban Local Self-Government in Mizoram.

(8) As all the urban Towns are a collection of Villages or cluster of Villages, the constitutional mandate for urban administrative system and the privileges of the elected councillors therein should be well publicised to have a positive impact of the Constitution 74th Amendment Act. As for the novice, newly elected councillors of Aizawl Municipal Council, they should be given training on Municipal administration so as to make them channels of social transformation in the Urban Centres.

(10) Urban Local Bodies should be constituted in all the Urban Towns duly recognised by the Government of Mizoram. There are 22 Urban Towns or Notified Towns duly recognised by the Government of Mizoram. However, the State capital *i.e.*, Aizawl, is the only Town, which has received urban development, funds from the Central Government. This has led to injustice over the development of population in the other Urban Centres. Though Municipal Council has been constituted in Aizawl, the other 21 urban Towns are without any urban administration machinery. It was portrayed in Table-4.4 that there are 191 Village Councils in Urban Centres with 77 of them located in Aizawl alone. Even with the abolishment of these 77 VCs with the advent of a Municipal Council being instituted in Aizawl, 115 Village Councils exist in the various Urban Centres within the State. As provided in Section 7 of the Mizoram Municipalities Act, 2007, Municipal Boards should be constituted without wasting time in all Urban Centres or Towns.

(11) Various data of the Government of India and the State Government of Mizoram are not similar. With BPL and other Economically Weaker Section (EWS) of the society were requiring special treatment - economically and administratively - it is impossible to do this without proper data. The State Government should take urgent steps to match all the data of both the Union and State and the data of all the departments of both the Centre and the State.

(12) The legislators should amend the Municipal Acts and Rules to suit the local needs and conditions. Amendment can also be considered in a time bound manner. In the North Eastern communities by and large, however excellent they may be, the

Parliament Acts and Rules are not readily accepted by the people. The State Legislators should take not too small steps to overcome this problem.

(13) Urban leaders and influential group of the people should have a clear view of Municipal functions. Urban planning and adequate Town planning system should be aimed to accomplish Municipal responsibilities. For this, political parties should select those who have adequate knowledge and concern over public needs for public posts.

(14) Financial implication is another problem for Municipal administration in India. Though the Constitution authorise the State Finance Commission (SFC) to look into the financial problems of the Local Bodies and distribution of taxes between the State and Local Bodies, the SFC in every State can act only in an advisory capacity. Their suggestions and recommendations have not implemented by many States. Of course, the SFC has no power to ensure that its recommendations are implemented. It is an unhealthy state of affairs where a Commission may suggest many recommendations but cannot enforce their implementation. The State Government must try to accomplish all the recommendations of the SFC and give deep concern over its Constitutional obligations to Local Self-Governments.

(15) Planning machinery is being constituted in many of the Urban Centres, as provided by the 74th Amendment Act. In Mizoram, City Development Plan has been prepared while Town Planning Committee has also been constituted in all the District Headquarters. The Government should pay due attention to the plans drawn up by the concerned committee while implementing development projects and schemes. The economic and social development of the urban society should be done through adequate and clearly thought-out plan.

(16) Technical personnel and Consultant Firms should be employed when drawing up economic and administrative planning. If technical persons are not available in the Government departments, the State Government should try to employ Consultant Firms or Technical personnel from outside to prepare development plans.

(17) Village Council system of administration has been in existence in Mizoram for more than half a Century, *i.e.*, since 1954. Therefore, the mindset of the people is partial to this system and each locality which before had been administered by

its own Village Council may find it difficult to work cohesively with other localities it had become combined with under the new Municipal Ward as a single entity. However, these localities should prepare to work with other localities within their Ward without prejudice self-serving interests.

(18) There is a wide gap between the Municipal Council and the people at the local/community level which may cause non-participation by the voters for the execution of Municipal subjects. This should be solved by generating certain mechanisms, either a local representative or something to this effect that the voters can trust.

(19) Composite Building by-Laws and Urban Master Plan should be prepared for all the Urban Centres. Though Building by-Law has been implemented in Aizawl and City Development Plan prepared, all other Urban Centres or Notified Towns have not been provided with the same Development Plan. On the other hand, Municipal authorities must be given a free hand to consider for themselves what is best for the Urban/Town administration. In turn, they should have systematic urban planning through composite Laws and Plans.

(20) All Town/city areas may not be included in the Municipal Area while many may be within Urban Outgrowth (UO) area. As such, the public should be educated over Municipalisation of UO and agglomeration. Thought should also be given towards educating the masses about constitutional mandate of urban mechanism and the responsibilities of urbanites.

(21) Due to migration problems and rapid urbanisation, proper urban administration has become a difficult task in most of the Towns and cities in India, the same for which is true for Mizoram. A migration policy should be legislated and residential areas or non-residential areas delineated. This is more essential in Mizoram because there is no urban management. Neither commercial nor non-commercial areas, industrial areas nor residential areas have been classified.

All the above problems and suggestions may not be adequate for proper urban administration. But different problems relating to election, finances, systematic urban planning and legislations to suit the local needs require to be paid urgent attention. In particular, Mizoram state is at the nascent stage of urban administration. Many people

define municipal administrators as identical to state legislators. If both the state legislators and councillors are not competent to meet the challenges of educating urbanites in the area of municipalisation and alerting their sense towards decentralisation, the objective of the proper Urban Administration system might not be achieved. At the same time, the councillors should not think only of party concerns because voters from outside political parties had also voted for them in cause of urbanisation. Too many changes may not be good; however, both the Nodal Department and councillors must welcome changes if needed. To achieve proper urban management, everyone has a duty and responsibilities cannot be confined to a single person or an organisation. While one may need to peruse, the other may require support. All the politicians, administrators and urbanites have the same responsibilities for transforming urban administration to a synergy of development.

## ANNEXURE – I

### **DIFFERENT WARDS OF AIZAWL MUNICIPAL COUNCIL**

<b>Sl.No</b>	<b>Ward No.</b>	<b>Status</b>
1.	Ward No. I	ST
2.	Ward No. II	ST (Women)
3.	Ward No. III	ST
4.	Ward No. IV	ST (Women)
5.	Ward No. V	ST
6.	Ward No. VI	ST (Women)
7.	Ward No. VII	ST
8.	Ward No. VIII	ST
9.	Ward No. IX	General
10.	Ward No. X	ST
11.	Ward No. XI	ST (Women)
12.	Ward No. XII	ST (Women)
13.	Ward No. XIII	ST
14.	Ward No. XIV	ST
15.	Ward No. XV	ST
16.	Ward No. XVI	ST
17.	Ward No. XVII	ST (Women)
18.	Ward No. XVIII	ST
19.	Ward No. XIX	ST

## ANNEXURE – II

### FIRST AMC ELECTION, 2010 VOTERS TURNOUT REPORT

Ward No.	Male	Female	Total Voters	Voters Turnout	Percentage
I.	4,266	4,633	8,899	6,391	71.82
II.	5,718	6,239	11,957	5,910	49.43
III.	4,489	5,017	9,506	6,443	67.78
IV	4,726	5,127	9,853	6,353	64.48
V	3,770	4,446	8,216	4,934	60.05
VI	2,912	3,188	6,100	4,137	67.82
VII	4,766	4,800	9,566	5,964	62.35
VIII	2,962	3,161	6,123	3,951	64.53
IX	4,059	4,555	8,614	5,546	64.38
X	3,171	3,395	6,566	4,656	70.91
XI	4,235	4,405	8,640	6,112	70.74
XII	4,893	5,443	10,336	5,885	56.94
XIII	3,111	3,393	6,504	4,079	62.72
XIV	4,339	4,809	9,148	5,029	54.97
XV	4,180	4,611	8,791	5,582	63.50
XVI	4,367	4,979	9,346	6,309	67.50
XVII	4,088	4,611	8,699	5,574	64.08
XVIII	6,255	7,036	13,291	8,440	63.50
XIX	4,083	4,411	8,494	5,966	70.24
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>80,390</b>	<b>88,259</b>	<b>1,68,649</b>	<b>1,07,261</b>	<b>63.60</b>

ANNEXURE – III

**LIST OF ELECTED COUNCILLORS IN THE FIRST AIZAWL MUNICIPAL  
ELECTION, 2010 (3rd November 2010)**

<b>Ward No.</b>	<b>Name of Candidates</b>	<b>Party</b>
I	Lalrinenga Sailo	MNF
II	Hmingthanzami	ZNP
III	Lalthanliana	MPC
IV	Lalmalsawmi	MNF
V	Rosiamngheta	MPC
VI	Zamanthangi	MNF
VII	Zarzoliana	ZNP
VIII	PC Lalhmingthanga	MNF
IX	PC Lalruatsanga	MPC
X	Lalzirliana	INC
XI	Lalchhuanmawii	ZNP
XII	Laldinsangi	INC
XIII	W. Chhuanawma	ZNP
XIV	Lalrimawia	ZNP
XV	C.T. Zakhuma	INC
XVI	C. Lalsawivunga	MPC
XVII	F. Lalhuthangi	INC
XVIII	Biak Thansanga	MNF
XIX	Ramhlunsanga	INC



**ANNEXURE - IV**

Sl. No.	Name of Project	Implementing Agency	Name of Ministry	Dwelling units	Total Project Cost	Central Share	State Share	Central Share Released	State Share Released	Remarks
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>
<b>A. Urban Infrastructure &amp; Governance (UIG) (Rs. In lakh)</b>										
1	GAWSS Phase – I	PHED	Ministry of Urban Development		1681.80	1513.62	168.00	378.41	168.00	Budgetary transfer to PHED
2	Urban Transport, Purchase of Buses	Transport			325.00	293.00	32.00	146.30	0.00	14 nos. of buses purchased
<b>TOTAL of UIG</b>					<b>2006.80</b>	<b>1806.62</b>	<b>200.00</b>	<b>524.71</b>	<b>168.00</b>	
<b>B. Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small and Medium Towns (UIDSSMT) (Rs. In lakh)</b>										
1	Greater Lunglei Water Supply	PHED	Ministry of Urban Development		867.27	780.70	86.74	390.35	86.74	Budgetary transfer to PHED
2	Greater Serchhip Water Supply	PHED			687.60	618.84	68.76	309.42	68.76	Budgetary transfer to PHED
<b>Total of UIDSSMT</b>					<b>1554.87</b>	<b>1399.54</b>	<b>155.50</b>	<b>699.77</b>	<b>155.50</b>	
<b>C. Basic Service to Urban Poor (BSUP) (Rs. In lakh)</b>										
1	EWS Housing, Chite	HPL	Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation	200	1376.35	1040.15	336.20	260.04	84.05	Hindustan Prefab Limited
2	EWS Housing, Lawipu	HPL		208	2056.75	1851.08	205.68	462.77	51.42	
3	EWS Housing, Rangvamaul	NPCC		368	3075.14	2763.13	312.02	690.78	78.01	National Project Construction Corporation
4	EWS Housing, Durtlang	NPCC		320	2623.73	2356.85	266.87	589.21	66.72	
<b>Total of BSUP</b>				<b>1096</b>	<b>9131.97</b>	<b>8011.21</b>	<b>1120.8</b>	<b>2002.8</b>	<b>280.20</b>	
<b>D. Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme (IHSDP) (Rs. In lakh)</b>										
1	EWS Housing, Lunglei	Deptt.	Ministry of Housing & Urban Poverty Alleviation	500	827.27	621.41	205.86	205.86	103.00	Departmental work
2	EWS Housing, Champhai – I	Deptt.		74	153.65	132.97	20.68	20.68	10.34	
3	EWS Housing, Kolasib – I	Deptt.		50	129.02	96.58	32.44	32.44	16.22	
4	EWS Housing, Saiha	Deptt.		200	555.00	389.82	165.67	165.67	82.84	
5	EWS Housing, Serchhip	Deptt.		350	710.40	515.56	194.84	194.84	97.42	
6	EWS Housing, Mamit	Deptt.		150	352.50	259.81	92.67	92.67	46.34	
7	EWS Housing, Kolasib – II	Deptt.		250	576.00	423.09	152.91	152.91	76.46	
8	EWS Housing, Champhai – II	Deptt.		376	623.00	539.14	83.86	83.86	41.93	
<b>Total of IHSDP</b>				<b>1950</b>	<b>3926.84</b>	<b>2978.38</b>	<b>948.93</b>	<b>948.93</b>	<b>474.55</b>	
<b>TOTAL OF A + B + C + D :</b>				<b>3046.00</b>	<b>16620.48</b>	<b>14195.75</b>	<b>2425.20</b>	<b>4176.21</b>	<b>1078.25</b>	