

THIRTEENTH REPORT

COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME
IMPLEMENTATION



Presented to Lok Sabha on.....

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

November, 2006/Agrahayana 1928 (Saka)

COMPLADS No. 13

Price: Rs. 236.00

© 2006 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eleventh Edition) and printed by the Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110 002.

CONTENTS

REPORT	PAGE NO.
(I) Review of rehabilitation and reconstruction works from MPLADS Funds in the Tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.	1
(II) Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS).	9
(III) Revised Guidelines on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS)	16
(IV) Funding of proposed North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) at Guwahati from MPLADS Funds—Proposal from Hon'ble Speakers of Legislative Assemblies of North Eastern States.	22
(V) Construction of fish landing centre with RCC Jetty at Enayamputhenthurai in Kanyakumari District at an estimated cost of Rs. 150 lakh from the contributions made by Members of Parliament, Lok Sabha from MPLADS Funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the Tsunami affected areas.	24
(VI) MPs proposing contribution from MPLADS Funds or their family members cannot be in the management of the recipient society/trust—Proposal from Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP (Lok Sabha) for waiving of the Clause.	25
(VII) Building war memorial at Chandigarh—Proposal from Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal (MP).	26
(VIII) Utilization of MPLADS funds for providing Scholarships to poor children for higher education—proposal of Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Governor of Uttaranchal.	28
(IX) Utilization of MPLADS Funds for procurement of Sport Items & Sports Infrastructure in the country—Suggestion from Shri Vikram Verma, Hon'ble Minister of Youth Affairs and Sports and Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, MP.	29
(X) Payment of Salary to Primary School Teacher—Proposal of Sh. Charnjit Singh Atwal, Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha.	30

	PAGE NO.
(XI) Solar Energy Projects in Haryana—Proposal from Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan (MP).	31
(XII) Purchase of Land for School—Proposal of Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources.	32
(XIII) Construction of School Building outside the Parliamentary Constituency—Proposal of Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources.	33
(XIV) Proposal from Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh, former Governor and Union Minister for (i) enhancement in the allocation of MPLADS Funds; (ii) constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS; and (iii) submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee	34
(XV) Selection of subject(s) for examination by Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) . . .	36
(XVI) Sanction for construction of works in relaxation of cost ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakh in respect of registered Society/Trust	38
(XVII) Approval of works in relaxation to cost ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakhs.	40

APPENDICES

I. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 30th September, 2004	45
II. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 29th October, 2004	47
III. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 14th December, 2004	50
IV. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 4th February, 2005	52
V. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 18th March, 2005	55
VI. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 11th April, 2005	57
VII. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 20th May, 2005	59
VIII. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 4th July, 2005	61
IX. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 18th July, 2005	64

	PAGE NO.
X. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 6th September, 2005	69
XI. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 20th September, 2005	72
XII. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 3rd October, 2005	75
XIII. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 20th October, 2005	78
XIV. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 8th February, 2006	82
XV. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 20th April, 2006	85
XVI. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 16th June, 2006	87
XVII. Minutes of sitting of Committee on MPLADS held on 3rd August, 2006	91
XVIII. Minutes of sitting of the Committee on MPLADS held on 28th September, 2006	93
XIX. Memorandum related to Chapter-I	94
XX. Memorandum related to Chapter-II	104
XXI. Memorandum related to Chapter-III	116
XXII. Memorandum related to Chapter-IV	148
XXIII. Memorandum related to Chapter-V	153
XXIV. Memorandum related to Chapter-VI	158
XXV. Memorandum related to Chapter-VII	160
XXVI. Memorandum related to Chapter-VIII	162
XXVII. Memorandum related to Chapter-IX	164
XXVIII. Memorandum related to Chapter-X	168
XXIX. Memorandum related to Chapter-XI	170
XXX. Memorandum related to Chapter-XII	172
XXXI. Memorandum related to Chapter-XIII	174
XXXII. Memorandum related to Chapter-XIV	176
XXXIII. Memorandum related to Chapter-XV	180

	PAGE No.
XXXIV. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVI	183
XXXV. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(1)	187
XXXVI. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(2)	190
XXXVII. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(3)	193
XXXVIII. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(4)	195
XXXIX. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(5)	197
XL. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(6)	200
XLI. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(7)	204
XLII. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(8)	207
XLIII. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(9)	210
XLIV. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(10)	213
XLV. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(11)	215
XLVI. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(12)	218
XLVII. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(13)	221
XLVIII. Memorandum related to Chapter-XVII(14)	224

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT
LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (2006–2007)

1. Shri Prasanna Acharya — *Chairman*
2. Shri Ilyas Azmi
3. Shri Pankaj Choudhary
4. Dr. Ram Chandra Dome
5. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
6. Shri Raghuvir Singh Kaushal
7. Shri Chandrakant Bhaurao Khaire
8. Shri A. Krishnaswamy
9. Shri Sajjan Kumar
10. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Libra
11. Shri Punnu Lal Mohale
12. Dr. Chinta Mohan
13. Shri Shripad Yesso Naik
14. Shri A.F.G Osmani
15. Shri P. Rajendran
16. Shri M. Sreenivasulu Reddy
17. Shri Toofani Saroj
18. Prof. Mahadeorao Shiwankar
19. Kunwar Manvendra Singh
20. Shri Sita Ram Singh
21. Shri Narsingrao H. Suryawanshi
22. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
23. Shri Chandra Pal Singh Yadav
24. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Shri J.P. Sharma | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R.S. Kambo | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri P.D. Mahawar | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 4. Smt. Balwant Kaur Saimbhi | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |
| 5. Shri Arvind Sharma | — | <i>Committee Officer</i> |

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, of the Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS-2006-2007) having been authorized by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Report on the business transacted by the Committee during the period August 2004 to August 2006.

2. The Committee considered various representations and proposals pertaining to MPLADS received from Hon'ble Members of Parliament, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India and others. Sittings of the Committee were held on 30th September, 29th October and 14th December in 2004 and 4th February, 18th March, 11th April, 20th May, 4th & 18th July, 6th and 20th September, 3rd and 20th October, 16th November, 2005, 8th February, 20th April, 16th May, 16th June and 3rd August in 2006. The Report is based on the issues considered and decisions taken by the Committee at their aforesaid sittings and the Study Tour undertaken by it in October, 2005 and follow up action taken thereafter by the Government.

3. A few important issues taken up by the Committee are as follows :—

- (i) Devastation wreaked by the Tsunami in the States/Union Territory of Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Pondicherry and Andaman & Nicobar Islands and the massive relief and rehabilitation work that followed is well etched in the memory of everyone. While the entire Nation did its best to show solidarity with the victims and their family members, the Hon'ble Members of Parliament also rose to the occasion. In response to an appeal made by the Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha Members of Lok Sabha contributed generously from their MPLADS funds for rehabilitation work of the Tsunami affected victims. The Committee through the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation had closely monitored the rehabilitation work by holding discussion, calling for reports and undertaking visits in October, 2005 to the areas affected by the Tsunami.
- (ii) The CAG in their reports for the year 1998 & 2001 had made some adverse remarks regarding functioning/implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. Also Shri Era Sezhiyan Ex. MP, under the aegis of the Institute of Social Science, had conducted a study on the working of MPLAD Scheme and brought out a booklet titled 'MPLADS – Concept, Confusion and Contradictions'. According to Shri Sezhiyan MPLADS runs contrary to the Constitutional provisions which envisage separate roles for the Executive and Legislature and accordingly the Scheme should be scrapped. The Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha had referred the matter to the Committee to look into these reports and give views and comments thereon. The Committee had considered the matter and found that there was nothing wrong with the scheme *per se*. However, it felt that some bottlenecks and procedural infirmities had to be removed for its effective implementation.

(viii)

- (iii) The new Guidelines for MPLADS have been made effective from 16.11.2005. The Committee had to study and deliberate at length various clauses of the draft guidelines prepared by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The Committee had made several recommendations out of which few were accepted by the Government.
- (iv) In a major initiative the Committee have undertaken a detailed study on the subject namely 'Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme — A Review'. The study is primarily aimed at evaluating success of the Scheme, which is in operation for more than a decade now, *vis-à-vis* its aims and objective and suggesting various measures for bringing improvement in it by identifying shortcomings, bottlenecks, difficulties in implementing various projects and works and keeping pace with changing time and needs. Feedback from Members of Parliament, general public, societies, trusts, Central and State Governments have been invited for the purpose.
- (v) Besides, the above issues the Committee also considered several other proposals including 14 cases of approval of works in relaxation of cost ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakhs received from Hon'ble Members and other well known personalities. The wide range of issues raised by the Hon'ble Members and others goes to show how concerned they are about the MPLAD Scheme and developmental needs of villages, towns and cities and people they represent.

4. The Committee considered and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 28th September, 2006.

5. The Committee would like to express their thanks to the Hon'ble Members, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and others for placing before them their proposals/suggestions, written notes and desired information in connection with MPLADS and facilitating deliberation and making recommendations over various related issues.

6. The observations/recommendations of the Committee and other important aspects have been printed in bold letters in the body of each chapter of the Report for reference. Each chapter of the Report deals with a different subject/issue. These are based on Memoranda which were considered by the Committee at their various sittings. For details on each chapter it is advised that the relevant Memorandum/Memoranda, given as annexure to the report, be referred to.

NEW DELHI;
27th November, 2006

6 Agrahayana, 1928 (Saka)

PRASANNA ACHARYA,
Chairman,
Committee on Members of Parliament
Local Area Development Scheme,
Lok Sabha.

I

REVIEW OF REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION WORKS FROM MPLADS FUNDS IN THE TSUNAMI AFFECTED AREAS OF COASTAL INDIA AND THE ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS

1.1 Hon'ble Speaker made an appeal on 11th January, 2005 urging Members of Parliament, Lok Sabha to contribute generously from MPLADS funds for the rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the Tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. In response to this humble request as many as 207 Members of Parliament of Lok Sabha came forward and contributed Rs. 2,273.51 Lakh (as on 22 May, 2006) towards this noble cause. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation was designated as a Central Nodal Agency for coordinating and monitoring the rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas.

A. Priority List of Works

1.2 The first and foremost task before the Committee was to identify and prioritize list of works which can be taken up from MPLADS funds. The matter was taken up with the Central Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The Ministry *vide* their communications dated 18 and 25 February, 2005 (Appendix-XIX, Memorandum No. 9 & 10) informed the Committee that they held discussions with the Chief Secretaries of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands in this regard. It was made clear to the State Governments that the utilization and accountability of MPLADS funds needs to be in accordance with the Guidelines on MPLADS. As the funds were flowing from various sources and to avoid duplication and omission, a priority list of works based on requirement of tsunami affected areas was prepared by the respective State Governments. The Central Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation suggested that the disbursement of funds be made proportional to the severity of damage in different States and Union Territories and thereafter implement the works on the basis of priority list submitted by these States/UTs.

1.3 The Committee at their sitting held on 18th March, 2005 considered the priority list of works forwarded by Government of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala to be undertaken in the tsunami affected areas for rehabilitation and reconstruction works and decided as follows:—

- (a) MPLADS funds contributed for tsunami affected areas be released and utilised in the ratio proposed by the Ministry i.e. 40% to Tamil Nadu, 40% to Andaman and Nicobar Islands and 20% to Pondicherry, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala.**
- (b) Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should monitor and coordinate the release and utilization of funds in consultation with the authorities of concerned State Governments.**

- (c) **Funds should be utilised only for works permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS.**
- (d) **The nodal District Collector of the affected area should ensure execution of work in a time frame.**
- (e) **Details of each MP's contribution i.e. release of amount from each MP's fund to District Collector, place of work, nature of the project etc., be furnished to each MP and the Committee.**
- (f) **Each Hon'ble Member who had contributed from MPLADS funds should be regularly informed about the progress of works undertaken from the amount contributed by him.**
- (g) **The details of the utilization of the funds of each MP should be regularly furnished to the MP and the Committee on monthly basis.**

1.4 The Committee also recommended at their sitting held on 11th April, 2005, that if an MP who had contributed from his MPLADS funds towards tsunami rehabilitation and reconstruction works and had given suggestion for the utilization of funds contributed for specific purpose/work, then the amount contributed be utilized only for the specific suggested work.

B. Suggestion for formation of Trust/Foundation for utilization of funds contributed from MPLADS Funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction works in Tsunami affected areas

1.5 Like Lok Sabha Members, Rajya Sabha Members had also contributed from their MPLADS funds for the cause. The Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha had visited the Tsunami affected areas in Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry and Andaman and Nicobar Islands from 1st to 7th February, 2005 and held discussions with State Governments and Union Territory Administration and recommended certain rehabilitation works at an estimated cost of Rs.14.89 crores to be undertaken from MPLADS funds contributed by Members of Rajya Sabha.

1.6 Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha in his meeting with Hon'ble Chairman, Rajya Sabha held on 3 May, 2005, decided that a joint meeting of the Chairmen of Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha be held to finalise a common plan of action for utilization of funds donated by Hon'ble Members of Parliament for undertaking relief and rehabilitation works in the Tsunami affected areas.

1.7 After exchanging several ideas and communications, a Joint meeting of the Hon'ble Chairmen Committee on MPLADS both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha was held on 16 June, 2005. The issue of formation of a Joint Committee and trust (mooted by Rajya Sabha Secretariat) consisting of MPs of both the Houses and distinguished ex-MPs, so as to keep the funds in a separate account managed by trust was discussed at the meeting. It was decided that in the first instance the comments of the Committee Branch-I (CB-I) be obtained on the issue. The matter was then placed before the

Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for their views (Appendix-IX, Memorandum No. 18). The issues raised and the comments of the CB-I thereon were as follows:—

I. Whether a Parliamentary Committee is juristic entity to undertake such kind of works?

Comments

By definition, a juristic or legal entity is an entity (as a corporation or labour union) having under the law rights and responsibilities and especially the capacity to sue and be sued. The Rules of Procedure in Lok Sabha do not define the Parliamentary Committees as such. It may be stated that under the provisions of the Constitution and Rules of Procedure, the proceedings of Parliament and its Committees are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Court. On the other hand Parliamentary Committees have been vested with certain privileges and powers to enable them to discharge their mandate effectively. The Parliamentary Committees, have also been empowered to punish through the House any one for any act of omission or commission amounting to contempt or breach of its privileges. Viewed in this context, **a Parliamentary Committee cannot be called a juristic or legal entity.**

II. Whether a Joint Committee consisting of representatives of MPLADS Committee of both the Houses (Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha) can be constituted and a separate fund out of MPLADS funds be created by the Joint Committee?

III. Whether a Trust/Foundation could be created consisting of MPs of the MPLADS Committee of both the Houses and some ex-MPs to deal with natural calamities in future and whether the Trust/Foundation can suggest/recommend/monitor/choose implementing agencies so as to undertake rehabilitation works in the affected areas out of the surplus money which may be left after execution of the approved projects?

Comments II & III

A Joint Parliamentary Committee is constituted either on a motion adopted by one House and concurred in by the other, or by communication between the Presiding Officers of the two Houses, or under the rules. However, the mandate of such a Joint Committee should be within the mandate of the Parliament. In other words, it should not infringe upon the jurisdiction of the Executive.

Creation of a trust/foundation with funds drawn out of MPLADS funds and its administration by the proposed JPC with powers to disburse funds for implementation of schemes/projects for the rehabilitation of the victims of natural calamities may involve the question of office of profit. It was also brought on record that the opinion of the nodal Ministry concerned be also sought in this regard.

So far no Committee of this kind has been set up with executive and financial powers.

1.8 **The Committee at their sitting held on 4th July, 2005, deliberated over the proposal for setting up of a trust/foundation for utilization of funds received under MPLADS for undertaking reconstruction and rehabilitation works in Tsunami affected areas of the country. The Committee also took note of the views of the Minister of State, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation who had also participated in the meeting where the issue pertaining to formation of trust was**

discussed. The Committee was of the view that creation of trust/foundation and its administration to disburse funds is an executive function and beyond the jurisdiction of a Parliamentary Committee and may entail question of office of profit. Further, the Ministry also did not find favour with the proposal to have a separate trust/foundation and parking of contributed funds by the MPs in a separate account for the execution of rehabilitation works of the natural calamities under MPLADS. Instead, the Ministry favoured the implementation of rehabilitation works in the natural calamities affected areas through the District Authorities and preferably through the local self-Governments under the direct supervision of the State Governments.

1.9 Accordingly, the Committee decided that the proposal to have separate Trust/Foundation with a separate account need not be approved. Further, as Hon'ble Members of Parliament had always stood for such a noble cause and contributed generously from MPLADS funds or otherwise for undertaking relief and rehabilitation works in the areas affected by natural calamities, there was no need for creation of a separate trust.

C. On the spot assessment of rehabilitation and reconstruction works undertaken in the tsunami affected areas

1.10 The Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha with a view to assess and monitor the rehabilitation & reconstruction works undertaken in the tsunami affected areas and to have an on the spot-evaluation of MPLADS works, undertook an on the spot study visit to Chennai, Nagapattinam, Cuddalore, Pondicherry, Port Blair in October, 2005.

1.11 The Committee visited Chennai on 24 October, 2005 and held a meeting with the Chief Secretary of Tamil Nadu who was accompanied by Senior officers of the Departments/Agencies implementing the Tsunami relief/rehabilitation works in the State. It was an interactive session with the officials making an effective and passionate presentation which showed their commitment towards the job and the Committee acknowledged their efforts which included speedy disposal of the dead bodies for preventing spread of epidemics, formation of multidisciplinary teams under Ministers, Chairmen of PSUs and senior IAS Officers, immediate disbursal of cash of Rs. 1 crore to each DC, effective participation of NGO's in building permanent Housing shelters, Post disaster psycho social care programme etc. This was also reinforced by the experience gathered by the Committee during their field visits on the next day i.e. 25 October, 2005 to two of the worst hit districts in Tamil Nadu, namely Nagapattinam and Cuddalore. Here the determination of the local administrations in going ahead with the massive rehabilitation work was very much palpable, especially at places like Keelajur and Akkraipettai in Nagapattinam district and Rajapettai and Sothikkuppam villages in Cuddalore district.

1.12 Thereafter, the Committee visited Pondicherry on 26 October, 2005. The Relief and Rehabilitation Commissioner gave a presentation to the Committee which included details of the devastation caused by the Tsunami and the relief work undertaken by the Administration. The death toll was around 600 which consisted mainly of women and children. The fishery industry was decimated and around 750 hectares of agricultural land was destroyed. The Committee, however, expressed their displeasure over high rate of insurance premium, thus inhibiting the fishermen from availing of the benefits

of this Scheme. A distinguishing feature of the efforts of the Administration was formation of an umbrella organization namely Project Implementation Agency (PIA) for Tsunami Relief function and rehabilitation. It was a society registered by Registrar of Companies and headed by the Chief Secretary. The Committee also considered in detail the scope of improving the model of the Community Halls which was to be constructed out of the MPLADS funds. Earlier, on 25 October, 2005, *i.e.* the previous day, en-route to Pondicherry, the Committee visited Karikal (under UT of Pondicherry). During the brief stopover at Karikal, the Committee got an update information of the rehabilitation work from the District Magistrate and visited Mandapathur village where a housing Project for the Tsunami affected people was underway. The local people narrated their problems and asked for help from the Committee.

1.13 The Committee reached Port Blair on 27 October, 2005. It visited Tsunami affected areas and rehabilitation camps at Andaman & Nicobar and Campbell Bay Islands. It took meetings with top officials, headed by the acting Chief Secretary of the Andaman and Nicobar Administration (at Port Blair on 27 October, 2005), met cross sections of the local people including the tribals affected and displaced by Tsunami and reviewed the progress of the rehabilitation works out of the MPLADS Tsunami Fund which was about Rs.835 lakh (40% of the total contribution received). Notwithstanding the explaining done by the officials, the Committee was not satisfied with the tardy progress of work. It noted that lack of proper planning, initiative and poor administrative decisions, and heavy dependence on Central Government for decision making had hampered the rehabilitation work resulting in all round dissatisfaction among the inmates of the camps who were yet to get permanent shelters as the design, layout and materials to be used was not finalized. They were lodged in ill maintained intermediate rehabilitation centres, far from their places of work and under unhygienic conditions, which had even resulted in few deaths as alleged. Free ration was to be made available to the victims upto 31st October, 2005 only.

1.14 The Committee recommended that the Andaman and Nicobar Administration should come up with innovative designs and concepts focusing on available strengths and assets, resources of the region and involving local people for rehabilitation and generating employment.

1.15 The Committee at their sitting held on 20th April, 2006 again reviewed the status of ongoing reconstruction and rehabilitation works in the Tsunami affected areas of Andaman and Nicobar Islands and desired that a report be obtained from the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation covering various aspects of the activities/works undertaken in Tsunami affected areas. Accordingly, reports were called from Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management), Andaman & Nicobar Administration and Planning Commission. The representatives of Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management), Andaman and Nicobar Administration, Planning Commission and Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation apprised the Committee at its sitting held on 16th June, 2006 that there had been some delay in undertaking rehabilitation works in Andaman and Nicobar Islands due to inaccessible location, scattered population, material and manpower shortage, non-availability of land, frequent earthquakes etc. Works were being executed by CPWD, NGOs and other Government Departments and construction

of 9,714 permanent houses likely to be completed by March, 2008. Village level committees had been constituted to assess the relief works and the nodal Ministry (Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation) had been regularly reviewing the progress of works and projects identified would be handled by individual task force so as to shorten the implementation time and to expedite the works before the onset of monsoon. The five projects identified for construction were likely to be completed by July/August, 2007. An amount of Rs.854.81 lakh had been allocated for undertaking reconstruction and rehabilitation works in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands in consonance with the recommendations of the Committee. Project-wise allocation of funds was as follows :—

Sl.No.	Project	Cost (Rs. in lakhs)
(a)	Model Senior Secondary School having classes from I to XII with Hostel facilities, Kamorta Islands	Rs. 592.62/-
(b)	Community Hall at Ferrargunj, Andaman District	Rs. 49.25/-
(c)	Community Hall at Govind Nagar, Campbell bay	Rs. 69.39/-
(d)	Community Hall at Joginder Nagar, Campbell bay	Rs. 68.34/-
(e)	Community Hall at Katchal Nicobar Islands	Rs. 67.82/-
Total :		Rs. 847.42/-

1.16 According to the monthly progress Report received from the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, the general status of the ongoing rehabilitation and reconstruction works in all the Tsunami affected States/UTs for the period ending 31st May, 2006 were as follows :—

Sl.No.	Name of State/UT	No. of Works	Ongoing	Completed
1.	Andhra Pradesh	14	09	01
2.	Tamil Nadu	29	20	06
3.	Kerala	02	—	—
4.	Pondicherry	05	—	—
5.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	05	04	—
Total :		55	33	07

1.17 While reviewing the status of on-going works in Andaman & Nicobar Islands, when the Committee asked whether any proactive steps were taken by the Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management) to assess works/projects under MPLADS, the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management) during the evidence stated :—

“... We are in the Ministry of Home Affairs, I have to admit the fact, have not been

really aware of this particular scheme. The Ministry of Home Affairs has been looking at other works, but this particular scheme was as such not looked at specifically by the Ministry of Home Affairs. That is something which we are going to rectify now that the matter has come to our notice...”.

1.18 The Committee while reviewing the status of rehabilitation and reconstruction works in Tamil Nadu during their tour, appreciated the alacrity with which the District Authority in the State swung into action immediately after Tsunami hit the Coastal areas of the State. The determination and dedication with which the State Administration worked and managed the disaster both short-term and long-term action plans, is worthy of emulation. Not only the normalcy were restored in a shortest span but also all the facilities in the form of ‘Pacca Houses’ and other civic facilities extended on permanent basis. The District Administration also extended their helping hand in securing employment and other means of livelihood for the victims of the Tsunami. The Committee place on record, their profound appreciation for the way, in which the District Administration tackled the Tsunami and provided succour to the affected citizens.

1.19 The Committee also visited Port Blair in connection with the review of rehabilitation and reconstruction works. The Committee expressed their deep concern over the tardy progress of work. In order to hasten up the process of disbursement of MPLADS funds, the Committee recommended that funds need to be transferred directly from Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to the Andaman & Nicobar Islands Administration and Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation decided to take follow-up action in the matter. The Committee were concerned to note that this advice of the Committee had not been given a thought and still a lackadaisical attitude continues. The Committee, therefore, desire that Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration should expedite the reconstruction and rehabilitation works and furnish an utilization/completion report to the Committee within six months.

1.20 The Committee again reviewed the status of rehabilitation and reconstruction work in Andaman and Nicobar at their sitting held on 20th April, 2006 at Delhi and took note of the views of the representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management), Andaman & Nicobar Administration and Planning Commission. The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management) was candid enough to admit his ignorance about the utilization of funds under MPLAD Scheme for rehabilitation and reconstruction work of Tsunami for Andaman and Nicobar Island and stated “I have to admit the fact, have not been really aware of this particular Scheme. The Ministry of Home Affairs has been working at other works, but this particular scheme was as such not looked into specifically by the Ministry of Home Affairs.” The Committee are concerned to note that when the Ministry of Home Affairs is not aware of the MPLAD Scheme then how would the Department related to Disaster Management of the Ministry be able to mitigate the sufferings of victims of Tsunami. Such an attitude would impede the rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the Islands. The Committee also found that there were no system of coordination among the various Departments/Ministries, which resulted in delay in execution of

rehabilitation and reconstruction works. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration had been rather insensitive towards the suffering of the local population.

1.21 The Committee were critical of the variation of figures related to loss of lives as reported by the Planning Commission and Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration. In the absence of exact figures the Committee wondered as to how relief measures could be planned or estimated. The reasons given for the delay like shortage of manpower & material could not be accepted after one and half years of the tragedy. The Committee was surprised to note that even the tenders had not been opened/floated yet after one and half years of the disaster, though the magnitude of the disaster required immediate relief. Estimates had been frequently revised resulting in delay and further cost escalation of the project. The sites selected for construction of community hall at Joginder Nagar, Campbell Bay, Nicobar District were not yet accessible. The Committee also desired that the funds should not have been blocked for such a project and should have been utilised for some other project. Nodal Districts had failed to transfer the funds to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration.

1.22 The Committee, therefore, desire that Government should ensure that for want of coordination amongst various Ministries/Department of Government, the Relief and Rehabilitation works at Andaman & Nicobar Islands do not suffer. The Committee also recommend that Government should reconcile the various figures related to loss of life & property and act with alacrity in providing relief to the victims of Tsunami. The Committee also desire that procedural infirmities like failure in opening tenders, lack of firm estimates, inaccessible sites, shortage of man and material should be overcome, at the earliest.

II

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (MPLADS)

2.1 Shri Somnath Chatterjee, Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha had addressed a letter dated 23 July, 2005 to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS (Appendix XX, Memorandum No. 9) on the observations of audit Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (1998 and 2001), and adverse criticisms of MPLAD Scheme by Shri Era Sezhiyan, ex-MP and ex-Chairman, PAC, in a study undertaken by Institute of Social Science, New Delhi.

2.2 The Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha, in his letter, *inter alia*, stated as follows:—

“Your attention may have been drawn to two reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, mainly, Report for the year ended March 1997 (Union Government (Civil) Performance Appraisals No.3 of 1998) on the functioning of MPLADS (Chapter 5, Pages 85 to 109) and also to another Report for the year ended March, 2000 on the MPLADS. The later report deals entirely with MPLADS.

Recently, Shri Era Sezhiyan, former Member of Lok Sabha and former Chairman of P.A.C. has prepared a Report about the functioning of the MPLADS.

I shall be happy if the MPLADS Committee under your Chairmanship looks into these reports and give their views and comments thereon.

You may be aware that divergent views are being expressed on the proper implementation of the Scheme and in fact, many Hon'ble Members are even questioning the propriety of the continuance of the Scheme. In view of the aforesaid, I would be happy to receive the Committee's opinion in the matter before any further step is taken.”

CAG Reports

2.3 The Audit Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General (1998 and 2001) on MPLAD Scheme had pointed out various discrepancies, irregularities and deficiencies in the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. Audit findings had suggested that a sufficient part of the released money had not been utilised and the works executed in large number of cases did not qualify for the definition of durable assets. A large number of them remained incomplete thereby defeating the objective of the MPLAD Scheme. Several other works were either inadmissible or were not recommended by Members of Parliament themselves. The main findings of the Audit Report (1998 and 2001) on MPLADS were :—

- (i) Funds under MPLADS had not been utilised fully and were lying unspent with the District Collectors;

- (ii) Implementing agencies had failed to refund unspent balances and submit utilization certificates after the completion of the work;
- (iii) Irregular sharing/clubbing of MPLADS funds with funds of other scheme;
- (iv) Works had been left abandoned or incomplete midway;
- (v) Works had been entrusted to contractors in total violation of the Guidelines on MPLADS;
- (vi) Funds were sanctioned on the recommendation of the representatives of the MPs;
- (vii) Funds had been spent on inadmissible works;
- (viii) Nodal authorities had failed to maintain Asset Register;
- (ix) Implementing agencies had collected administrative and centage charges etc. for their services of preparing works implementing, supervision etc;
- (x) No proper evaluation of the Scheme.

2.4 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation responsible for monitoring and evaluation of Scheme had admitted that they were not in a position to effectively monitor the Scheme at the operational level. In fact the Ministry did not have any picture of works under implementation and quoted the Committee of Secretaries decision that central monitoring of large number of works was neither practicable nor desirable. The Ministry's view ran counter to the stated role of the Ministry in the area of monitoring as provided in the Guidelines. The Ministry's role, was mainly confined to providing resources only without any responsibility for its use. The Audit had found that Ministry had not done any book-keeping and it was unable to provide even the particulars of year-wise release of funds to district heads and the expenditure incurred. The Ministry had also failed to use the information technology facilities to monitor constituency wise progress and their role was limited to having an overall picture of the amount released. The Audit Report had, therefore, desired that the Central Government should thoroughly review the existing arrangements for the implementation of the Scheme. Such a review should cover the existing manner of resource transfer as also the technical and administrative arrangements.

2.5 The Reports of the C&AG on MPLAD Scheme were to be examined by the Public Accounts Committee of Lok Sabha. Accordingly, the PAC Branch were requested to furnish their action taken report on the Audit Reports relating to MPLADS. However, the PAC in their comments dated 19 March, 2005 had stated that paragraph 5 of Audit Report No.3 of 1998 and the entire Audit Report No.3A of 2001 — both relating to MPLADS — were selected for detailed examination by the PAC (1998-1999) and the PAC (2001-2002) during the respective period. However, due to paucity of time, the Committee could not pursue these subjects and subsequent Committees did not re-select these subjects for detailed examination.

2.6 Simultaneously, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation were also requested to furnish their factual comments on the action taken on the Audit Reports of C&AG of 1998 and 2001. The Ministry in their O.M. dated 20 May, 2005, had

stated that there were 34 audit paras in the first report and 45 audit paras in the second report of the C& AG on MPLADS. The audit paras were mainly on the following:—

- i. Continued poor administration of utilization of the MPLADS funds.
- ii. The Ministry released the MPLADS funds without any correlation with their end use.
- iii. Non-receipt of utilization certificates from implementing agencies.
- iv. Non-refund of unspent balance by implementing agencies.
- v. Mis-reporting of financial progress of works by the DCs.
- vi. Irregular clubbing of MPLADS funds with funds of other schemes.
- vii. Irregular diversion of funds to inadmissible purposes.
- viii. Execution of inadmissible works.
- ix. Sanction of works for commercial and private organizations.
- x. Irregular sanction of repair and maintenance works.
- xi. Purchase of stores out of MPLADS funds.
- xii. Irregular expenditure on places of religious worships.
- xiii. Irregular expenditure on memorials.
- xiv. Irregular sanction for works on private land etc.

2.7 Replies to the 9 audit paras of the first report and 14 audit paras of the second report had already been forwarded to the Director General of Audit for vetting. The remaining 25 audit paras of the first report and 31 audit paras of the second report pertain to the State Governments/UT Administrations and District Administrations with whom the matter had been pursued vigorously through letters, reminders, personal discussions. Information from some States/UTs/District Administrations had been received and from some others was still awaited. Replies to these audit paras would be forwarded to the Director General of Audit for vetting as soon as information from all the States/UTs was received and thereafter, replies to all the paras of the two reports would have been submitted to the Public Accounts Committee.

2.8 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation commissioned a study by Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission, to evaluate the design, implementation and impact of the scheme and to identify the areas of weakness and strength for the improved performance of the Scheme. The study was based on the data and information gathered for the period 1994-95 to 1998-1999. The Evaluation Report was submitted in November, 2001. Some of the findings of Evaluation Report were as under:—

- (i) Although the cost-estimates of a work recommended by the MPs was required to be worked out at time of sanctioning of the work, in reality it was

found that the cost estimates were prepared afterwards, perhaps made to conform to the amount allocated by the MP. Consequently many of the works were either completed by supplementing the fund allocated by the MP by fund procured from other sources or compromising the quality of the asset created.

- (ii) There was financial mismanagement of the Scheme and consequent inflated reporting of amount spent.
- (iii) Non-maintenance of a satisfactory accounting system for the Scheme and absence of monitoring for the expenses actually incurred.
- (iv) The evaluation team during their field visits failed to locate a few of the assets claimed to have been created. Such cases, largely the outcome of weak monitoring, perhaps encouraged various types of irregularities to thrive.
- (v) A disproportionately large amount of money was flowing in some of the districts out of MPLADS funds. Apart from an uneven distribution of works this led to increase in the workload for the officials leading to weak monitoring and supervision.
- (vi) Many of the MPs did not have full information even about the works they had recommended.
- (vii) A small group having easy access to the MP at times might impress upon him to recommend works according to *their* felt needs. Consequently the felt needs of many others got overlooked.
- (viii) Non-refund of unspent amount.
 - (ix) Quality of assets created: Allocation of inadequate funds often failed to ensure durability and usefulness of assets.
 - (x) A large number of works were executed by contractors inspite of prohibiting the engagement of contractors.
 - (xi) Inadequate infrastructure available to the Collectors vested with the responsibility of MPLAD Scheme, lead to weak monitoring and supervision.
 - (xii) Failure to maintain assets register. The inconsistency in the information received from sources pointed to weaknesses in maintenance of records and in monitoring of the on going work. Once a District Collector sanctioned a work and released the fund, there was generally a tendency to treat the work as executed.

The following suggestions were made out of Evaluation Report to improve the MPLAD Scheme:—

- (i) Adequate arrangements needed to be made for making a relevant information available to MP. Upper limit of number of projects and completion of the same as per specifications with appropriate fund needed to be ensured in the guidelines.

- (ii) The State nodal Department needed to be strengthened in terms of staff and other infrastructure. Relevant information about other development activities in the district might also be made available to the MP. Equipped with these detailed information MPs were likely to be in a more comfortable position to recommend specific works.
- (iii) PRIs be asked to provide a list of works to be recommended to the MPs annually. It would be appropriate to think in terms of coordination of works recommended under Legislature Area Development Scheme (MLALAD) together with those recommended for the respective Member of Parliament constituencies and utilize in a more fruitful way without interfering with the MPs and MLAs to recommend works for their choice within their budgetary limits.
- (iv) MP might consider allocation of funds only after the cost estimate was prepared and detailed work plan and coordination mechanism made available to him.
- (v) Making the MPLADS funds lapsable.
- (vi) Displaying the details of works at site to be made mandatory.

The Era-Sezhiyan Report

2.9 The Institute of Social Science conducted a study on the working of MPLAD Scheme and brought out a booklet titled 'MPLADS – Concept, Confusion and Contradictions' authored by Shri Era Sezhiyan, ex-MP and ex-Chairman, PAC and Senior Fellow in Institute of Social Science, New Delhi. The author had vehemently opposed the operation of the MPLAD Scheme on the following grounds:—

- (i) The Scheme as instituted amounted to usurpation of powers of the executive by the legislature since it was not the function of the legislators to have budget of this kind – their sole function and responsibility being to legislate and highlight acts of omission and commission of the executive.
- (ii) The Scheme amounted to direct interference by the MPs and the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation in the functioning of the district administration, which was directly under and accountable only to State Government.
- (iii) By virtue of the powers to indicate their works of their choice to the tune of Rs.10 crore in one term of five years (Rs.12 crore for Rajya Sabha MPs for 6 years) the MPs wielded a power which was essentially executive and, therefore, beyond the pale of their legislative functions and as such, the scheme was violative of the basic tenet and the philosophy of the Constitution.
- (iv) With the virtual operation of the Scheme by the MPs, they were bound to develop a pecuniary interest and, therefore, their position was not short of holding of the office of profit – position, which they were debarred to hold under the Constitution.
- (v) The vesting of the choice of the works to be executed lead to favouritism and discrimination *vis-a-vis* other constituents whom the MP might consider a

sure vote bank for the future election or whom the MP felt that they did not possibly vote for or support him in the election. Political analyst had dubbed it 'loot or largesse'.

2.10 Two Hon'ble Members S/Shri R. Senthil and George Fernandes *vide* their letters dated 1 and 5 August, 2005 had desired that the MPLAD Scheme be scrapped as it was the root cause of corruption at various levels.

2.11 The **National Advisory Council (NAC)** had also advised the Centre to scrap the Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) and instead divert the funds to the panchayats for effective implementation of development programmes, judicious spending and greater decentralisation of power. The **National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution** had also recommended that the MPLAD Scheme be scrapped as it lead to unnecessary drain on the exchequer.

2.12 **The Committee at their sitting held on 20 September, 2005 deliberated on the criticisms levelled against the MPLAD Scheme in the C&AG Reports (1998 and 2001) and another report authored by Shri Era Sezhiyan, ex-MP and Chairman, PAC. The Committee expressed their serious concern over the lacunae pointed out in the reports like sanctioning of works by District Collectors without recommendations of the Members of Parliament, huge unspent balances with implementing agencies, non-submission of utilization certificates and levying of administrative/centage charges by implementing agencies, incomplete and abandoned works, failure to maintain asset registers, sanctioning of funds as grants or loans, weak monitoring mechanism etc. The Committee took note of the fact that in the C&AG's report, a majority of the problems and bottlenecks identified pertain to the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. At no point of time, the role/conduct of MPs had been questioned. The Committee were concerned to find the tardy implementation of the Scheme which was under the direct control and supervision of District Administration, State Governments and Central Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The Committee recommended that the Central Ministry and State agencies should find out the reasons for poor implementation of the Scheme, strengthen their monitoring apparatus and thereafter furnish a report to the Committee. The Committee recommended that strict action be taken against the errant officials who had disregarded the MPLAD Scheme guidelines, while approving/executing a project/work.**

2.13 **On a pointed criticism of the MPLAD Scheme that the scheme usurped the powers of the executive by the Legislature, interference by MPs and Central Ministry in the functioning of District Administration; was against the basic tenets and philosophy of the Constitution; diverted funds from rural and local bodies; increased the areas of conflict between District Administration and Panchayati Raj bodies, the Committee were of the view that the Scheme was a Government sponsored one and it was for the Government to ensure that it fit well into the Constitutional framework of the country; did not interfere in the functioning of District Administration and in no way compromise with the District planning. The Committee were of the view that the scheme had been conceptualized to supplement the efforts of the State and District institutions in planning and execution of developmental projects and plug the resource gap between the Central and State Government's funds.**

2.14 In the opinion of the Committee, the role of MP in the MPLAD Scheme was only to identify and recommend a work/project to a concerned District Collector only. The details of the execution of the works, in accordance with the rules & procedure of the State Government is undertaken by the District Collector. As such the District Collector alone accord technical and administrative sanction/approval of the projects/works subject to the condition that the proposed project/work was in accordance with the Guidelines on MPLAD Scheme. Even the implementing agency identified by District Collector and not by MP.

2.15 As regards the opinion that there was a duplication of works undertaken under MPLAD Scheme and District Planning, the Committee were of the view that since District Collector not only headed MPLAD Scheme but was also associated with the Panchayati Raj Institution, there was unlikely of any duplication of work. If it was apprehended that there might be some duplication of work, it became incumbent upon District Collector concerned to ensure that such works were avoided. In such cases, either the MP concerned could be impressed upon to withdraw the project or the Panchayati Raj Institution advised to shelve such project.

2.16 On the issue of constitutional impropriety of the Scheme, the Committee took note of the fact that a Public Interest Litigation was already pending before the Supreme Court. Therefore, the Committee viewed that as a final interpreter of the Constitution, the Supreme Court was best suited to take a decision in this regard and as the matter was sub-judice, any recommendation by the Committee at that stage might not be desirable.

2.17 The Committee opined that the problems and bottlenecks pointed out in the implementation of the Scheme were similar to those encountered in many of the Centrally Sponsored Schemes and other Government projects. An effort should be made to plug all loopholes and rectify the errors in the implementation of the Scheme.

2.18 The Committee desired that Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha be apprised of the views in the matter. Accordingly a letter was sent to him in this regard.

III

REVISED GUIDELINES ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (MPLADS)

3.1 The Minister of State (Independent Charge), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 9 June, 2005 (Appendix-XXI, Memorandum No. 19) to Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha regarding revision of Guidelines on MPLADS and had stated that the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha had furnished their suggestions on the proposal for revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS. Thereafter, interactions with Hon'ble Members of Parliament were held for improvement and revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS. Based on the suggestions received from MPs, Committees on MPLADS (Lok Sabha & Rajya Sabha) and views expressed by Comptroller and Auditor General in its reports on MPLADS, the Guidelines on MPLADS had been revised and finalized.

3.2 In this regard, the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha at their sitting held on 17 September, 2003 at Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu had considered the proposal forwarded by Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee in their Twelfth Report presented to Lok Sabha on 4th May, 2005 *vide* Para 23.3 had recommended *inter alia* as follows:—

“The Committee considered the proposal of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS and approved the same with the suggestions/modifications in some paras.....”

3.3 The Committee at their sitting held on 18th July, 2005, considered the proposal for revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS as forwarded by Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and took note of the clarifications furnished by the witness (officials of Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation) in respect of the revised Guidelines on MPLADS. After due deliberation, the Committee approved the proposed revision of the Guidelines with certain suggestions/modifications.

3.4 The Committee had made eleven recommendations, related to the revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS. However, the Ministry had accepted only three recommendations. From the revised Guidelines on MPLADS which had come into force from 16th November, 2005, it can be seen that decisions/recommendations made by the Committee w.r.t. Para Nos. 2.1, 2.8, 2.7, 2.12, 3.4, 3.7, 4.3 and 2.10 (New Additions) had not been accepted by the Ministry, whereas decisions/recommendations made w.r.t. Para Nos. 4.1, 6.5(iv) and 3.22 had been accepted by the Ministry and incorporated in the revised Guidelines on MPLADS. The list of the recommendations of the Committee, accepted/not accepted by the nodal

Ministry is given below :—

Recommendations of the Committee	Comments-whether the recommendation of the Committee has been accepted/or not accepted by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation
1	2
<p>Para 2.1-The annual MPLADS funds entitlement per MP constituency is Rs.2 crore.</p> <p>The Committee recommended that the annual MPLADS fund entitlement per MP be as per the decision of the Government from time to time.</p>	<p>Recommendation—not accepted. The Ministry has retained the Para 2.1.</p>
<p>Para 2.8-MPs from the non-affected areas of the State can also recommend permissible works up to a maximum of Rs.10 lakh per annum in the affected area(s) in that State.</p> <p>The Committee recommended that works ‘up to a maximum of Rs.10 lakh per annum’ be replaced with ‘up to a maximum of Rs.10 lakh for each calamity’.</p>	<p>Recommendation—not accepted. The Ministry has retained their proposed para <i>vide Para 2.7</i> of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.</p>
<p>Para 2.7-Each MP will recommend works up to the annual entitlement during the financial year preferably within 90 days of the commencement of the financial year in the format at Annex-III to the concerned District Authority.</p> <p>The Committee recommended that time limit of 90 days may not be prescribed as, it becomes difficult to adhere to such rigid time-frame due to pre-occupation of Member of Parliament with constituency work. The Committee were of the view that recommending proposals of various works should be a continuous process. As and when the works/projects are brought to the notice of Members, these are examined on merit and only selected works/projects recommended for funding under MPLAD Scheme.</p>	<p>Recommendation—not accepted. The Ministry has retained their proposed para</p>
<p>Para 2.12-The District Authority shall identify the agency through which a</p>	<p>Recommendation—not accepted. The Ministry has retained their proposed para</p>

(1)	(2)
particular work recommended by the MP should be executed.	<i>vide para 2.11</i> of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.
The Committee decided that MPs should also be informed of the agency identified at the selection stage by the District Authority.	
Para 3.4-The work and the site selected for the work execution by the MP shall not be changed, except with the concurrence of the MP concerned.	Recommendation— not accepted . The Ministry has retained the Para 3.4.
The Committee recommended that the works ‘the work’ be replaced with the words ‘the project’.	
Para 3.7-The shortfall in the estimated cost <i>vis-à-vis</i> the one recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP.	Recommendation— not accepted . However, the Para 3.9 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS provides that the shortfall in the estimated cost <i>vis-à-vis</i> the one recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP within 45 days of the receipt of the proposal.
The Committee proposed that any shortfall in the estimated cost as recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP within one month.	
Para 3.11-It shall be the responsibility of the Nodal District Authority to scrutinize all such recommended works within 45 days of the last date of the term of office of the MP either to accord necessary sanction as per the Guidelines, or to intimate the MP about the rejection with reasons.	Recommendation— accepted <i>vide para 3.11</i> of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.
The Committee recommended that the words ‘to intimate the MP’ be replaced with the words ‘to intimate the outgoing MP’.	
Para 4.1-The annual entitlement of Rs.2 crore will be released in two installments of Rs. One crore each by Government of India directly to the District Authority	Recommendation— accepted <i>vide para 4.1</i> of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.
The Committee recommended that ‘The annual entitlement be released in two equal installments by Government of India directly to the District Authority....’	

(1)	(2)
<p>Para 4.3-The second installment of the MPLADS funds will be released subject to the fulfillment of the following eligibility criteria :-</p> <p>(i) the unsanctioned balance amount available with the accounts of the District Authority after taking into account the cost of all works sanctioned is less than Rs.50 lakh;</p> <p>(ii) the unspent balance of funds of the MP concerned is less than Rs. One crore; and</p> <p>(iii) Utilisation Certificate for the previous financial year and the Audit Certificate for the funds released for each MP in the year prior to the previous year have been furnished by District Authority.</p> <p>The Committee recommended that Para 4.3(ii) may be deleted as it is creating problems in the release of MPLADS funds.</p>	<p>Recommendation—not accepted. The Ministry has retained the clause (ii) of Para 4.3.</p>
<p>Para 6.5-The implementing agencies shall also refund to the District Authority the svngs (balance amounts) including interest and contingency amount, if any, at their disposal and close the Bank Account opened for the purpose.</p> <p>The Committee recommended that the implementing agencies should refund the balance amount as provided in Para 6.5 within one month.</p>	<p>Recommendation—accepted <i>vide Para 5.3 and 6.5(iv) of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.</i></p>
<p>Para 3.22-In order to make the general public aware about the execution of the works costing Rs. 5 lakh and above, under MPLADS, a plaque (stone/metal) carrying the inscription ‘Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme Work’ indicating the cost involved, the commencement, completion and inauguration date and the name of the MP</p>	<p>Recommendation—accepted <i>vide Para 3.22 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.</i></p>

(1)	(2)
<p>sponsoring the project should be permanently erected.</p>	
<p>The Committee were of the view that the condition that only the works costing Rs. 5 lakh and above as stipulated in Para 3.22 may be deleted. As such all works executed under MPLADS should carry the inscription ‘MPLADS work’ and other details.</p>	
<p>Para 2.10-Provides that if a Member of Parliament finds the need to promote education and culture of a State/UT wherefrom the MP is elected or has chosen a nodal District (Nominated MPs only) in a place out side that State/UT, the MP can select works relating to education and cultural development not prohibited under these Guidelines up to maximum of Rs. 10 lakh in a financial year.</p>	<p>Recommendation—not accepted. The Ministry has retained their proposed para <i>vide Para 2.9</i> of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.</p>
<p>The Committee recommended besides ‘education and culture’ health should also be made eligible to draw funds under the scheme.</p>	
<p>Para 3.21 of the revised Guidelines <i>inter alia</i> reads as follows:—</p>	<p>The recommendation of the Committee regarding the definition of family was, however, not accepted by the Government and the revised Guidelines effective from 16.11.2005 incorporates the original definition as appeared in the draft Guidelines.</p>
<p>“The MPLADS funding is not permissible to a Society/Trust, if the recommending MP or any of his/her family Members is the Presiding/Chairman or Member of managing Committee or Trustee of the registered Society/Trust in question. Family Members would include MP and MP’s spouse which would comprise their parents, brothers and sisters, children, grandchildren and their spouses and their in-laws.”</p>	
<p>This was the original stated position of the Government. Subsequently, the Committee at their sitting held on 20th October, 2005 held the view that the definition of family, as proposed in the</p>	

(1)

(2)

revised Guidelines was too broad and no Indian Statute encompassed such a wide definition of a family. Accordingly the Committee recommended that the family, for this purpose, should be restricted to blood relatives only.

3.5 The Committee have observed from the above, that most and major recommendations of the Committee have not been accepted by the Government. The Committee, therefore, desire that Government should re-consider their decision in the matter.

IV

FUNDING OF PROPOSED NORTH EAST REGIONAL INSTITUTE OF PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES TRAINING AND RESEARCH (NERIPSTR) AT GUWAHATI FROM MPLADS FUNDS—PROPOSAL FROM HON'BLE SPEAKERS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLIES OF NORTH EASTERN STATES

4.1 Hon'ble Speakers of Legislative Assemblies of North-Eastern States (Meghalaya, Assam, Nagaland, Tripura, Sikkim, Mizoram, Manipur and Arunachal Pradesh) in their letter dated 30th July, 2005 (Appendix-XXII, Memorandum No. 4) had proposed funding of MPLADS funds for construction of building complex for North-East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR), a unique regional institute established in 1997 with the primary objective to promote parliamentary democratic polity and to address socio economic and political problems of the region. The estimated cost of the construction of the complex was Rs. 14 crore and the main sources for funding of the project were (i) contribution from 8 member states of the region; (ii) contribution from 39 MPs of the region at the rate of Rs. 2 Lakh each; and (iii) Grant-in-aid from Speaker, Lok Sabha. The 39 Hon'ble Members of Parliament of the region who were willing to contribute had expressed their inability to do so, as the Guidelines on MPLADS prohibited allocation of MPLADS funds outside the Parliamentary Constituency.

4.2 In this connection, the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha in their Seventh Report presented to Lok Sabha on 31 August, 2001 vide Para 10.3 had recommended *inter alia* as follows:—

“The Committee note the proposal regarding funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds and reject it as the extant Guidelines on MPLADS prohibit any work relating to construction of office building as well as allocation of funds by the Members of Parliament outside their constituency except in the case of natural calamity of rare severity.”

4.3 The then Guidelines on MPLADS prohibited any Member of Parliament to allocate MPLADS funds outside their constituency except in case of natural calamity of rare severity. Para 1.3 of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulated as follows:—

“MPs can also recommend works outside their constituencies/states for construction of assets that are permissible in the Guidelines, for rehabilitation measures in the event of “natural calamity of rare severity” in any part of the country for an amount not exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs, for each calamity.”

4.4 The then Guidelines on MPLADS also prohibited construction of any kind of office building related to Central or State Governments, Departments, Agencies or

Organisations. The Item 1 of the List of works not permissible under the MPLADS (Appendix-II) read as under:—

“Office building, residential buildings and other buildings relating to Central or State Governments, Departments, Agencies or Organisations.”

4.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 6th September, 2005, considered the proposal for funding of proposed North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies, Training and Research (NERIPSTR) at Guwahati from MPLADS funds and recommended that in view of Para 1.3 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS and Item 1 of the List of Works not permissible under MPLADS, the proposal might not be approved. The Committee opined that the project could be funded as a Government undertaking with enabling contributions from the eight North-eastern States.

4.6 The revised Guidelines on MPLADS, which had come into force from 16th November, 2005 also prohibit construction of any office and residential buildings belonging to Central & State Governments and their Departments/Agencies/Organisations.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISH LANDING CENTER WITH RCC JETTY AT ENAYAMPUHENTHURAI IN KANYAKUMARI DISTRICT AT AN ESTIMATED COST OF RS. 150 LAKH FROM THE CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, LOK SABHA FROM MPLADS FUNDS FOR REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION WORKS IN THE TSUNAMI AFFECTED AREAS

5.1 In pursuance of decision dated 18.03.2005 of the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha as enumerated in Chapter-I of the report, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, in consultation with the State Government of Tamil Nadu had decided that following works be undertaken at Kanyakumari:—

- (I) Dredging of Chinnamuttom Fishing Harbour and restoring of infrastructure facilities like generator room, water supply arrangements, auction hall, etc., with an approximate cost of Rs. 120 lakh.
- (II) Desalination plants for water supply at Simon Colony (two numbers of 50,000 ltrs. per day capacity each) with an approximate cost of Rs. 150 lakh.

5.2 The work at Sl. No. (i) had already been accorded administrative sanction by the District Collector, Kanyakumari. However, the District Collector, Kanyakumari had stated that the work at Sl. No. (ii) for construction of desalination plants was no longer required as the requirement of water had been met from other source (Appendix-XXIII, Memorandum No.17). The District Collector had, therefore, proposed construction of fish landing center with RCC Jetty at Enayampuhenthurai in Kanyakumari at an estimated cost of Rs.150 lakh instead of the desalination plant for water supply to Simon colony.

5.3 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation *vide* their letter No.C/71/2004-MPLADS(Part) dated 18th October, 2005 had clarified that the construction of proposed fish landing center was a new work. However, it could be treated as reconstruction work to be undertaken in tsunami affected areas as it sought to rehabilitate the tsunami affected people of the Kanyakumari District. The estimated cost of the project was Rs.150 lakh and involved construction of auction hall, office Building, toilet block, water supply arrangements, electrification arrangements, soil investigation and bathometric survey, labour Welfare Fund, unforeseen item and PS & contingencies. However, the construction of office building, labour welfare fund and contingency expenses were not admissible under MPLADS Guidelines. Soil investigation and bathometric survey would be required to select the type of foundation of the structure and hence the expenditure incurred on this account should be allowed.

5.4 The Committee considered the proposal at their sitting held on 20th October, 2005, and approved it on the condition that the funds be utilised only for works permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

VI

MPs PROPOSING CONTRIBUTION FROM MPLADS FUNDS OR THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS CANNOT BE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE RECIPIENT SOCIETY/ TRUST— PROPOSAL FROM SHRI SADASHIVRAO D. MANDLIK, MP (LOK SABHA) FOR WAIVING OFF THE CLAUSE

6.1 During the period the Committee were deliberating on the draft revised guidelines on MPLADS prepared by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP and a member of the Committee had given a suggestion for waiving off (with some financial limit) the Provision/Clause of the draft-guidelines which sought to debar a society/trust from receiving MPLADS funds, if the MP desirous of contributing the funds was himself or his spouse, children and other relatives were associated with the management of the society/trust in question (Appendix-XXIV, Memorandum No. 13).

6.2 According to Shri Mandlik such public trusts were formed mainly due to the initiative taken by the MPs and they (trusts) provide most useful services by undertaking installation of Sports Club, Gymnastic Centre, Cultural Houses, Physical Education, Educational Institutes including Technical Trades activities for the benefit of the local people.

6.3 The proposal was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 20th October, 2005. The Committee were of the view that the definition of family, which included the MP, his/her Spouse, Parents, Brothers, Sisters, Children, Grandchildren and their Spouses and their in-laws, as was proposed in the draft Guidelines was too broad and no Indian Statute encompassed such a wide definition of a family. The Committee did not agree with the proposed definition of the family as incorporated in the revised Guidelines and felt that it should be restricted to blood relations only. At the same time, the Committee did not approve the suggestion of Hon'ble Member to avail the benefit of MPLAD Scheme to a Trust/Society, where the recommending MP himself/herself is the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee or Trustee of the Registered Society/Trust under reference.

VII

CONSTRUCTION OF WAR MEMORIAL AT CHANDIGARH — PROPOSAL FROM SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (MP)

7.1 Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, MP (Lok Sabha) had desired to contribute a sum of Rs 5 lakh from his MPLADS funds towards construction of a war memorial at Chandigarh (Appendix-XXV, Memorandum No.3). His request was turned down by Chandigarh Administration on the grounds that construction of memorials or memorial buildings was not permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

7.2 However, Shri Bansal contended in his letter that the relevant provision in the Guidelines was designed to bar memorial or memorial Buildings dedicated to any individual. The case of Chandigarh war memorial was unique as it was meant for 9000 martyrs of the region who had laid down their lives for the sake of the country. The memorial was not to be named after any individual but as Chandigarh war memorial. It was being raised on the land belonging to the Chandigarh Administration and would be strictly a public property. It was also intended to be a unique landmark to add to the tourist attraction of Chandigarh. Shri Pawan Bansal further stated that in response to an appeal by 'The Indian Express Group of Publication', a large number of people had come forward to make donations for this project and the students of Chandigarh College of Architecture had designed the structure.

7.3 Accordingly, Shri Bansal had urged the Committee on MPLADS to review the decision of the Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh and sanction the execution of the work as recommended by him.

7.4 The matter was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation who had in July 2005 clarified as under :—

“Under MPLADS, addressing the locally felt developmental needs through creation of fixed assets is envisaged. ‘Memorials or Memorial building’ is not permissible as per item no. 5 in Appendix-2 of the Guidelines.”

7.5 The Committee considered the matter at their sitting held on 6th September, 2005, and noted that although construction of the memorials had been specifically prohibited under the then guidelines, the Ministry might reconsider the matter and if need be, revise the guidelines as it involved national pride and honour.

7.6 It is pertinent to note here, while the then existing guidelines, at the time of processing of the proposal of Shri Bansal, specifically prohibited construction of memorials or memorial building, the new guidelines, effective from 16.11.2005 does not have any such clause. It merely prohibits, “Assets to be named after any person’.

7.7 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation were requested *vide* Lok Sabha Secretariat’s OM dated 25th May and 5th June, 2006 to clarify whether the construction of memorial or memorial buildings (not to be named after any person) are

permissible under the revised Guidelines on MPLADS as the revised Guidelines merely prohibits 'Assets to be named after any person'. The Ministry stated that under MPLADS works based on locally felt needs with emphasis on creation of durable community assets are taken up. The revised Guidelines on MPLADS prohibits assets to be named after any person including memorial or memorial buildings. Memorial or memorial buildings, such as Chandigarh War Memorial are not utility-based assets, which address developmental needs of the people. They do not, therefore, satisfy the basic condition for admissibility and eligibility under MPLADS and are deviations from the objectives of the Scheme. Even the Comptroller and Auditor General has in its Reports on MPLADS had objected to construction of such memorials.

7.8 The Committee took note of the reasoning of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that memorial or memorial building are not covered under MPLADS as it would defeat the basic objective of the Scheme and decided not to pursue the matter further.

7.9 The Committee have learnt that the project under reference has come up in Chandigarh without availing the assistance from MPLADS.

VIII

UTILIZATION OF MPLADS FUNDS FOR PROVIDING SCHOLARSHIPS TO POOR CHILDREN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION – PROPOSAL OF SHRI SUDARSHAN AGARWAL, GOVERNOR OF UTTARANCHAL

8.1 Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Governor of Uttaranchal *vide* his letter dated 16.8.2004 (Appendix-XXVI, Memorandum No.7) had suggested earmarking of Rs. 1 crore (out of Rs. 2 crores) per MP per year out of MPLADS funds for providing Scholarships of Rs. 50,000/- each per year to children from disadvantaged section of society for pursuing professional courses of study. According to him, since investments of MPLADS funds in creating “Durable Assets” had not resulted in perceptible improvement in quality of the “assets” created out of this funds and had instead spawned corruption, it would be in the fitness of things to invest these funds in some more meaningful and more durable assets namely the bright children from the economically weaker sections of society who were denied the gift of higher education for want of financial resources to support higher professional studies.

8.2 The matter was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation who had opined “The main aim of MPLAD Scheme is to create durable assets. Grant and loan is not permissible under MPLADS”.

8.3 The Committee at their sitting held on 4th February, 2005, observed that the proposal of Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Hon’ble Governor of Uttaranchal was a laudable one. However, the main aim was to create durable assets. As such the grants and loans were not permissible under MPLAD Scheme. Therefore, the Committee did not approve the proposal.

IX

UTILIZATION OF MPLADS FUNDS FOR PROCUREMENT OF SPORTS ITEMS & SPORTS INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE COUNTRY — SUGGESTION FROM SHRI VIKRAM VERMA, HON'BLE MINISTER OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS AND PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA, MP

9.1 Shri Vikram Verma, Hon'ble Minister of Youth Affairs and Sports and Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, MP had mooted a proposal for allowing MPLADS funds upto Rs.20 lakh to be used for works related to sports-sports infrastructure, non consumable and consumable sports items (Appendix-XXVII, Memorandum No.5).

9.2 At the instance of the MPLADS Committee, Lok Sabha, the matter was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation at various point of time for their comments/observations/action. The Ministry, however, did not favour the proposal. Their opinion on the matter was as follows :—

“In view of the fact that the accountability of Public funds would become difficult if movable and consumable sports items are allowed to be purchased under the scheme, the Government is of the opinion that only sports infrastructure and fixed (immovable) sports equipments should be allowed under the scheme”.

9.3 **The Committee at their sittings held on 7th May, 2003 and 14th December, 2004 deliberated at length on the issue. Initially at their sitting held on 7th May, 2003 the Committee had recommended providing MPLADS funds to the tune of Rs. 2 lakh per year for the purpose. However, subsequently in the face of cogent argument of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation against the proposal, the Committee ultimately decided to follow suit. At their sitting held on 14.12.2004 the Committee took note of the facts presented by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that Government had not earmarked any amount for any particular work and earmarking of MPLADS funds for a particular project should not be done as it would lead to similar demands for other works also. Purchase of inventory items, consumable items like badminton shuttles etc., should not be permitted under MPLAD Scheme. However, immoveable items which could be fixed to the ground or to the walls like gymnasium, basketball etc., could be permitted under MPLADS. The Committee concurred with the views of the Government and recommended that only fixed structure i.e., the permanent asset creation works should be allowed under MPLAD Scheme.**

X

PAYMENT OF SALARY TO PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS – PROPOSAL OF SH. CHARANJIT SINGH ATWAL, HON'BLE DEPUTY SPEAKER, LOK SABHA

10.1 Shri Charanjit Singh Atwal, Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha had brought to the notice of the Chairman of the Committee, (Appendix-XXVIII, Memorandum No.8) that the schools in rural villages of the country and Punjab in particular were not functioning due to non availability of teachers as adequate funds were not there to pay salaries to them. This coupled with dilapidated school building with no boundary walls, toilets or drinking water facilities was reason for high drop out rate among the school going children. In order to reverse this trend, he had suggested providing salaries to the school teachers from MPLADS funds.

10.2 The Committee considered the above proposal at their sitting held on 4th February, 2005 and noted that as per the guidelines the funds released from MPLAD Scheme was primarily meant for creation of durable assets which must be available for public at large and could not be used for incurring expenditure like payment of salary etc. Accordingly the Committee did not approve the proposal for providing salaries to teachers of schools in rural areas from MPLADS funds.

XI

SOLAR ENERGY PROJECTS IN HARYANA – PROPOSAL FROM SHRI KISHAN SINGH SANGWAN (MP)

11.1 Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan (MP) in March 2005 in a written communication (Appendix-XXIX, Memorandum No.17) addressed to the Hon'ble Chairman of the Committee had expressed his desire to "give grant"- from his MPLADS funds for Solar Energy Projects in Haryana to solve problem of shortage of electricity.

11.2 The matter was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation who had replied as follows:—

“As per item 10 Appendix-I of the MPLAD Scheme the construction of common gobar gas plants, non conventional energy systems/devise for community use and related activities are permissible. However, no expenditure in items of inventory nature may be incurred and the benefit should accrue to the general public and not for individuals”.

11.3 The Committee considered the matter at their sitting held on 4th July, 2005. In view of the opinion given by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, the Committee decided that a clarification might be obtained from the Hon'ble Member to ascertain the real purpose of the proposal.

11.4 Accordingly, a letter was addressed of Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan on 28-07-2005, requesting him to intimate the specific projects/works for which he wished to contribute from his MPLADS funds. No reply was received from him in this regard, nor did he pursue the matter further.

XII

PURCHASE OF LAND FOR SCHOOL— PROPOSAL OF SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI, HON'BLE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES

12.1 Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, Honble Minister of Water Resources in April 2005 through a written communication (Appendix-XXX, Memorandum No.11) had urged the Hon'ble Chairman of the Committee to consider favourably his proposal for contributing from his MPLADS funds for buying land for a Hindi High School at Dalkhola under his Constituency Raigganj District-Uttar Dirajpur, West Bangal.

12.2 The Committee at their sitting held on 11th April, 2005 considered the proposal but could not make favourable recommendation on it as, Item 7 (Appendix-II) of the illustrative list of works of the then Guidelines of MPLAD Scheme prohibited acquisition of land or any compensation for land acquired.

XIII

CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOL BUILDING OUTSIDE THE PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCY—PROPOSAL OF SHRI PRIYARANJAN DASMUNSI, HON'BLE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES.

13.1 Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, Honble Minister of Water Resources in July, 2005 had addressed a communication (Appendix-XXXI, Memorandum No.5) to the Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS urging him to consider his request which in his words was as under:—

“The Head Master, Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School has requested me for allotment of Rs. 35 lakhs for the reconstruction of the old and dilapidated infrastructure in the School. Though this school is within my home district, but it is 16 km away from the limits of my parliamentary constituency. I had been a student of this school and the Teachers, Head Master and students have very high hopes on me to provide some funds out of my MPLADS allotments for this school. The class rooms where I used to attend classes, when I was a student, have been more or less fully damaged and require urgent repairs and renovation. The 75th year celebrations of the school are due in the near future. I would be very grateful if as a very special case under exceptional circumstances, I am allowed to contribute Rs. 20 lakhs from my MPLADS allotments for the reconstruction and improvement of this school. I would be grateful for an early and positive consideration of the case.”

13.2 The Committee deliberated on the proposal at their sitting held on 6th September, 2005, and had noted that while the construction of school building was permissible under the then MPLADS Guidelines, it had to be under the constituency limit of the member recommending the work. It was only under Para 1.3 of the then Guidelines that MPs could contribute for works outside their constituencies in cases of natural Calamities of severe nature. Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi's request could not be accepted by the Committee as the work recommended by him pertained to the area which was outside his Parliamentary Constituency.

XIV

PROPOSAL FROM SHRI BHANU PRAKASH SINGH, FORMER GOVERNOR AND UNION MINISTER FOR (I) ENHANCEMENT IN THE ALLOCATION OF MPLADS FUNDS; (II) CONSTITUTION OF JOINT PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON MPLADS; AND (III) SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS ON MPLADS BY HON'BLE MEMBERS TO JOINT PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

14.1 Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh, former Governor and Union Minister in a letter dated 3 January, 2006 (Appendix-XXXII, Memorandum No.20) addressed to the Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha had urged him to give serious thoughts on the suggestions given by him to the Hon'ble Prime Minister, in a separate communication, for improving the MPLAD Scheme in the wake of adverse publicity it had received in the recent past. According to Shri Singh, the MPLAD Scheme was an innocuous scheme which was introduced nearly fifteen years ago to ensure that some of the local needs of the areas represented by the MPs were taken care of without going into the rigmarole of administrative delays and ensuring their expeditious implementation by the Executing Agencies. He further wrote "It is really sad to hear some of the adverse comments of various sections of society as well casting aspersion on the MPs who have no role but to suggest certain schemes for the development of the area they represent"

14.2 Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh had made the following suggestion for reducing the tarnished image of supreme Legislative Body of the country *i.e.* Parliament and its Members :—

- (i) enhancement in the allocation of MPLADS funds;
- (ii) constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS; and
- (iii) submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee.

14.3 Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha referred the matter to the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha observing "It is left to the Hon'ble Chairman and the Hon'ble Members to decide whether to consider this suggestion or not".

14.4 **The Committee at their sitting held on 20th April, 2006 noted the suggestions of Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh, former Governor and Union Minister for (i) enhancement in the allocation of MPLADS funds; (ii) constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS; and (iii) submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee and were of the opinion that the existing allocation of Rs. 2 crore per year is insufficient and too meagre to meet the needs of the vast areas of the constituency and its constituents. Even the MLA's in some of the States where MLALAD Scheme exists get almost same. A Lok Sabha Parliamentary Constituency consists of seven or eight Assembly segments and with such a meagre amount Members of Parliament finds it difficult to meet the locally felt**

needs of the constituency. The Committee, therefore, recommend the allocation per MP per year be increased to Rs. 5 crore, so that Members of Parliament can fulfil the basic requirements of the constituencies in a more effective manner.

14.5 Regarding the second suggestion i.e. constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS, the Committee felt that the matter had already been taken note of in the past and was not found feasible. The Committee did not approve the proposal as the situation was still the same and unchanged. As the third suggestion i.e. submission of all the proposals related to MPLADS to Joint Parliamentary Committee was contingent upon the acceptance of the second suggestion, the Committee did not deliberate on it.

XV

SELECTION OF SUBJECT(S) FOR EXAMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (MPLADS)

15.1 The Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme, Lok Sabha is an ad-hoc Committee on Parliament and was first constituted on 22nd February, 1999. Thereafter, the Committee was constituted every year and consisted of 24 Members drawn from Lok Sabha. Initially, the Committee consisted of 20 Members. Later, more Members were nominated by Hon'ble Speaker to serve on the Committee.

15.2 The Committee on MPLADS has been vested with the powers to monitor and review periodically the performance and problems in the implementation of MPLAD Scheme (Lok Sabha); consider complaints of Members of Lok Sabha in regard to the Scheme and perform such other functions in respect of MPLAD Scheme as may be assigned to it by the Speaker from time to time. The other Parliamentary Committees of Lok Sabha have been barred to consider matters which are exclusively assigned to Committee on MPLADS.

15.3 Since the inception of the MPLADS Committee, the Committee has presented 12 Reports (10 Original and 2 Action Taken Reports).

15.4 An analysis of the Reports presented so far reveals that the Committee on MPLADS, so far had approved amendments to the MPLAD Scheme Guidelines; considered proposals received from Hon'ble Members and Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MS&PI) for according permission to fund projects/works costing more than Rs. 25 lakhs by relaxing Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS. Individual representations of Members of Parliament (Lok Sabha) on problems of their constituencies/complaints/suggestions had also been considered by the Committee and taken up with the Ministry for redressal and corrective action.

15.5 It may be pertinent to mention that the paramount function of the Committee to monitor and review periodically the performance and problems in the implementation of the Scheme had not been undertaken in the right earnest so far. As such the actual benefits of the Scheme realized, the deficiencies and pitfalls encountered in the implementation of the Scheme and the corrective measures which could be taken for the smooth implementation of the Scheme had not been addressed by the Committee so far. There was thus a need to undertake a horizontal study of the Scheme covering all the aspects in totality.

15.6 In view of the above, it was suggested that the subject namely 'Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme – A Review' might be taken up for examination in detail by the Committee on MPLADS (Appendix-XXXIII, Memorandum No. 21).

15.7 It was also suggested that a Press note might be inserted in print and electronic media, inviting the views of public at large about the perception of the scheme, the achievements obtained and suggestions for improvement, if any, in the working/implementation of the Scheme. It was also proposed to have the feedback from Members of Parliament, general masses, implementing agencies, State Governments and the Central Ministries on the suggestions for improvement in the Scheme so that the objective for which the Scheme was conceptualized is achieved.

15.8 The Committee at their sitting held on 8th February, 2006 took note of the fact that unlike other Parliamentary Committees, Committee on MPLADS were yet to select specific subjects for examination/study. Hitherto, the Committee had been performing routine jobs by giving recommendation on proposals under MPLADS and also giving relaxation in the ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work. With the introduction of the new Guidelines on MPLADS effective from 16th November, 2005, the cost ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work had been done away with and this had reduced the job of the Committee substantially.

15.9 Uptill now, the Committee had been monitoring and reviewing periodically the performance and problems in the implementation of the Scheme in piecemeal and not in totality. As such the actual benefits of the Scheme achieved, the deficiencies and pitfalls encountered in the implementation of the Scheme and the measures required to streamline the Scheme had not been addressed in the right earnest.

15.10 In the background of the recent developments and unsavoury incidents concerning MPLADS, as reported in the media, a need was felt to further strengthen the monitoring mechanism of the Scheme, in order to make the Scheme more effective and maintain credibility in public eyes. The Committee felt that it would be appropriate to undertake a detailed horizontal study on the issue and, therefore, decided to take up the subject 'Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme — A Review' for detailed examination and submit their Report to the Parliament.

XVI

SANCTION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF WORKS IN RELAXATION OF COST CEILING LIMIT OF RS. 25 LAKH IN RESPECT OF REGISTERED SOCIETY/TRUST

16.1 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation had addressed two communications both dated 10 July, 2006 (Appendix-XXXIV, Memorandum Nos. 24 & 25) and had sought relaxation in the limit of Rs. 25 lakh from MPLADS funds for registered Society/Trust namely Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust, Surat and Human Resource Development and Cultural Centre, Convention Hall at Vyavasayi Vidya Pratishthan, Vajdi Taluka Rajkot. Shri Kashiram Rana, MP (LS) had recommended Rs. 10 lakh, from MPLADS funds for the Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust, Surat which was involved in social service for the last seven years. Whereas for Human Resource Development and Cultural Centre, Convention Hall at Vyavasayi Vidya Pratishthan, Dr. V.R. Kathiria, MP (LS) had recommended Rs. 15 lakh from MPLADS funds. The remaining funds are being contributed by Rajya Sabha Members.

16.2 The new Guidelines on MPLADS which had come into force from 16 November, 2005 prohibits a registered society/trust from availing more than Rs. 25 lakh if it had already availed Rs 25 lakh from MPLADS funds. Therefore, the aforesaid proposals were not considered by the Government. However, requests have been pouring from the District Authorities of various States/UTs and Members of Parliament that the proposals costing more than Rs. 25 lakh recommended prior to the issue of new Guidelines might be considered by the Government. Accordingly, the Government of India *i.e.* Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation had decided to consider such proposals costing more than Rs. 25 lakh for a particular registered society/trust received by the respective District Authority before the issue of the revised Guidelines *i.e.* 16 November, 2005 and also consult the Committee on MPLADS, both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha for their views. The Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha had already *suo-moto* recommended the aforesaid proposals.

16.3 In this regard, Para 3.21 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS envisages as follows:—

“.....Not more than Rs. 25 lakh can be spent from MPLADS funds for one or more works of a particular Society/Trust. If a Society has availed of the MPLADS funds up to Rs. 25 lakh, no more work can be recommended for that Society/Trust under the Scheme.....”.

16.4 The provision of the Para 3.21 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS, prohibits a registered society/trust from availing more than Rs. 25 lakh. However, as the proposals were received by the District Authority prior to the issue of the revised Guidelines *i.e.* 16 November, 2005, the proposals need relaxation by the Committee on MPLADS. The Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha earlier had been relaxing the provisions of Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS and allowing works in relaxation to the cost limit of

Rs. 25 lakhs per work. Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work is as follows:—

“Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent).”

16.5 The Committee at their sitting held on 3rd August, 2006 deliberated over the proposals for allocating more than Rs. 25 lakh from MPLADS for various works of Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust, Surat and construction of Human Resource Development and Cultural Centre, Convention Hall at Vyavasyi Vidya Pratishtan and decided to approve the proposals by giving relaxation in Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS as the proposals were received prior to the issue of revised Guidelines on MPLADS.

16.6 The Committee also desired that Government should furnish the details of similar cases/projects/works, which they could consider by relaxing Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines. The Committee also took note of the fact that there were a number of projects/works/cases, which were entitled to draw funds from MPLADS as per the provisions of the then Guidelines on MPLADS. However, with the enforcement of new Guidelines w.e.f. 16th November, 2005 funding under MPLADS could not be made. The Committee desired that the details of such cases/works/projects received in the Ministry/District Authority date-wise be furnished to them for their consideration by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.

XVII

APPROVAL OF WORKS IN RELAXATION TO COST CEILING LIMIT OF RS. 25 LAKHS

17.1 As per new Guidelines, which have been made effective from 16th November, 2005, not more than Rs. 25 lakh can be spent from MPLADS fund for one or more works of a particular Society/Trust. If a Society has availed of the MPLADS funds up to Rs. 25 lakh, no more work can be recommended for that Society/Trust under the Scheme. No ceiling of cost has, however, been prescribed for the works pertaining to Central/ State Governments and their departments. However, as per the recent decision of the Government it has been decided to consider proposals costing more than Rs. 25 lakh for a particular society/trust received by the District Authority prior to the issue of revised Guidelines w.e.f. 16th November, 2005.

17.2 One of the major works of the MPLADS Committee, prior to implementation of the new guidelines w.e.f. 16 November, 2005, was to consider proposals which required granting relaxation to cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakhs under Clause 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

The following proposals were received under this category :—

1. **Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP (13th Lok Sabha)** — Construction of a bridge across the river Kaksha under Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs. 63.78 lakh. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XXXV)
2. **Shri Hannan Mollah, MP**—Construction of an auditorium at Uluberia Parliamentary Constituency of West Bengal under MPLADS at a total cost of Rs. 1.67 crores. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XXXVI)
3. **Dr. H.T. Sangliana, MP**— Repair of Road from Yelahanka – Vijayapura road to join Budigere Cross via Sathanur, Bagalur, Gopalapura, Yediyur, M.Hosahalli onto Budigere Cross in Jala Hobli, Bangalore North Taluk, Bangalore Urban District costing Rs.125 lakh in Bangalore North Parliamentary constituency. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XXXVII)
4. **Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP**— Contribution of Rs. 25 lakh for the construction of RCC retaining wall of existing play ground at Namunagar, Andaman and Nicobar Islands. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XXXVIII)
5. **Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya, MP**—Contribution of Rs. 25 lakh for the construction of a shed in ‘Block Parisar’ of Saifayee in Etawah Parliamentary constituency of Uttar Pradesh to be constructed at an estimated cost of Rs. 433.75 lakhs from MPLADS funds. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XXXIX)
6. **Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon’ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology**—Construction of Library and Class Rooms for the Government Polytechnic at Purasawakkam, Chennai at an estimated cost of Rs. 2.50 crore under MPLADS. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XL)

7. **Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology**—Construction of five class rooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78-Zone-V at an estimated cost of Rs. 27.50 lakh. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XLI)
 8. **Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP**—Construction of compound wall around graveyard at Stertwart Gunj, Andaman and Nicobar Islands at an estimated cost of Rs. 28,89,474/-. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XLII)
 9. **Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP**— Construction of road from main road (ATR) to house site colony Kadamtala village of Andaman and Nicobar Islands at an estimated cost of Rs. 29,83,284/-. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XLIII)
 10. **Shri Sachin Pilot, MP**— Construction of Hingota Anicut for providing irrigation and drinking water facility in Dausa Parliamentary constituency of Rajasthan at an estimated cost of Rs. 40.62 lakh out of which Rs. 32.44 lakh was to be contributed from MPLADS funds. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XLIV)
 11. **Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP**— Construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road in Narela Zone at an estimated cost of Rs. 35,00,400/-. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XLV)
 12. **Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology**— Construction of RCC retaining wall, formation of bus bay with shelter and foot path in Dn-82, Zone-VI at an estimated cost of Rs. 118.60 lakh out of which Rs. 1,15,70,010.76 was to be met from MPLADS funds. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XLVI)
 13. **Shri Francis Fanthome, MP and Maj.Gen. (Retd.) Shri Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri, MP**—Construction of Blood Bank Building for the Indian Medical Blood Bank Society of Uttaranchal, Dehradun at an estimated cost of Rs. 1,03,82,957/-. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XLVII)
 14. **Shri Kapil Sibal, Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology)** — Construction of Community Hall-cum-Market at Asaf Ali Road at an estimated cost of Rs. 89.50 lakh under MPLADS. Although the proposal was considered by the Committee at its sitting held on 8th February, 2006, the request was received prior to the issue of revised Guidelines on MPLADS *i.e.* 16th November, 2006. (For details kindly refer Appendix-XLVIII)
- 17.3 **The Committee considered the above proposals at various sittings held on 29 October, 2004; 4th February; 20th May; 4th July; 6th September; 3rd and 20th October, 2005 and 8th February, 2006 and approved them by giving relaxation to cost ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakh under Clause No. 4.1 of the then existing Guidelines.**

NEW DELHI;
28 September, 2006
 6 Asvina, 1928 (Saka)

PRASANNA ACHARYA,
Chairman,
Committee on Members of Parliament
Local Area Development Scheme,
Lok Sabha.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

**MINUTES OF SECOND SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Thursday, the 30th September, 2004 from 1500 to 1605 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Kumar Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Pankaj Chaudhery
3. Dr. Ramachandra Dome
4. Shri Raghuveer Singh Kaushal
5. Shri A. Krishnaswamy
6. Shri Bhubneshwar Prasad Mehta
7. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
8. Shri Raja Ram Pal
9. Shri P. Rajendran
10. Shri Sajjan Kumar
11. Shri Chandrapal Singh Yadav
12. Shri Sitaram Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D. Malvalia — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

**Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and
Programme Implementation (MS&PI)**

1. Dr. V.P. Goel — *Director*
2. Shri Abrar Hussain — *Consultant*

2. At the outset, the Committee took up for consideration the memoranda which were deferred in their earlier sitting held on 9 September, 2004. The decisions/recommendations are given memoranda-wise seriatim:—

- (i) Memorandum No. 1 regarding, "**Construction of High School-cum-cyclone shelters from the contribution of MPLADS funds made by the MPs of Lok Sabha in the cyclone affected areas of Orissa.**"

The Committee considered the facts presented the facts presented by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and took a serious view of the lapse that even after four years, drafts sent by the District Magistrates/Collectors have not been received by the implementing agency. It was also decided that names of only those Members of Parliament should be deleted from the list who have withdrawn their consent and names of Members of Parliament whose drafts have been sent should not be deleted from the list. Investigation should also be conducted to trace the drafts and fix responsibilities for the delay and thereafter the committee be apprised of the outcome.

- (ii) **Memorandum No. 2 regarding, "Construction of a Bridge across the River Kaksha under Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs. 63.78 lakh under MPLADS on the recommendation of Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP (13th Lok Sabha)."**

The Committee took note of facts presented by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and viewed the lapses seriously. Steep price escalation of the cost of the Bridge shows that the estimate made was not based on technical facts and the name of the project/river was changed in between. The Committee directed the Ministry to conduct an enquiry into it within the time frame of one month and thereafter remedial action should be taken so that the bridge is completed as huge investments has already been incurred on it.

3. Some Members also made certain suggestion on order to streamline the Scheme which are as follows:—

- (1) An MPLADS cell should be established in ever nodal district for effectively implementing and monitoring the Scheme.
- (2) Provision of vehicle should be made from MPLADS funds for effectively monitoring the execution of works under the MPLAD Scheme.
- (3) Provision should be made in the Guidelines so that MPs can have an office in the Collectorate to have interaction with agencies implementing MPLADS works.
- (4) Reports should be called from District Heads about utilisation of ½% contingency by them. Concerned MP should also be informed how the contingency expenditure was utilised.
- (5) District Collectors/Magistrates should conduct review meetings every three months about the ongoing projects under MPLADS as per the guidelines.

4. The Committee also decided that the Ministry should give a direction to all the State Governments to conduct review meetings every three or four months at the highest level in which Collectors and Chief Secretaries of the State should participate.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

**MINUTES OF THIRD SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Friday, the 29th October, 2004 from 1500 to 1600 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Kumar Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Raghuveer Singh Kaushal
3. Shri Chandrakant Khaire
4. Shri A. Krishnaswamy
5. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
6. Shri Bhubneshwar Prasad Mehta
7. Shri Punnulal Mohale
8. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
9. Shri Raja Ram Pal
10. Shri Basangouda R. Patil (Yatnal)
11. Shri P. Rajendran
12. Shri Gurjeet Singh Rana
13. Shri Sajjan Kumar
14. Shri Mahadeorao Shivankar
15. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
16. Shri Sitaram Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri M. Rajagopalan Nair — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

**Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation
(MS&PI)**

1. Shri A. K. Saxena — *Joint Secretary*
2. Dr. V.P. Goel — *Director*
3. Shri Abrar Hussain — *Consultant*

2. At the outset, the Committee took up for consideration the following memoranda. The decisions/recommendations are given memoranda-wise seriatim:—

- (i) Memorandum No. 3 regarding, "**Construction of a Bridge across the River Kaksha under Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs. 63.78 lakh under MPLADS on the recommendation of Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP (13th Lok Sabha).**"

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation apprised the Committee that they had written to concerned District Magistrate and Chief Secretary for steep price escalation in the construction of the bridge. The original cost was based on box type system with 27mt. length and thereafter the slab type system was adopted in place of box type system. The actual site was also shifted by a distance of 150 mts. in the downstream of the river on the demand of the villagers. The new estimates were prepared by the Murshidabad Zila Parishad with an estimated cost of Rs. 47.98 lakh for the construction of the slab bridge of 45 metre span. Thereafter a second revision was done and estimate was revised as Rs. 63.78 lakh. Now, 80 per cent of the work has been completed.

The Committee deliberated over the facts presented by the Ministry and approved the construction of a Bridge across the River Kaksha under Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs.63.78 lakh under MPLADS on the recommendation of Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP(13th Lok Sabha) on the condition that this approval should not be taken as a precedent.

- (ii) Memorandum No. 4 regarding, "**Proposal of Sri Hannan Mollah, M.P. (LS) regarding construction of an auditorium at Uluberia Parliamentary constituency of West Bengal under MPLADS.**"

The Committee took note of the facts presented by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that the proposal is for upgradation and improvement of Rabindra Bhawan auditorium at Uluberia which is within the ambit of the Guidelines on MPLADS and Hon'ble Member Shri Hannan Mollah is providing Rs. 1 crore out of his MPLADS funds whereas the rest of the fund will be met from various grants and general fund of the municipality. The Executing Agency is Howrah Improvement Trust and the maintenance will be looked after by the municipality.

The Committee thereafter approved the proposal for upgradation and improvement of an auditorium at Uluberia Parliamentary constituency of West Bengal under MPLADS.

3. Some Members also made certain suggestions in order to streamline the Scheme which are as follows:—

- (i) Reports should be called from District Collectors about utilisation of ½% contingency by them. Concerned MP should also be informed how the contingency expenditure was utilised.
- (ii) Provision of vehicle should be made from MPLADS funds for effectively monitoring the execution of works under the MPLAD Scheme.
- (iii) Works under MPLADS should be completed within a specific time frame. But if the Collector is unable to implement the project due to some reason then the existing project should be replaced by a new one.

- (iv) Provision should be made in the Guidelines so that MPs can have an office in the Collectorate to have interaction with agencies implementing MPLADS works. Staff may also be deputed.

4. In addition to the above suggestions, most of the Members also raised their individual problems faced by them in the implementation of the Scheme in their constituencies. Hon'ble Chairman, however, desired that the Members should submit their suggestions which should be compiled and sent to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for their comments.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX III

MINUTES OF FOURTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LOK SABHA)

The Committee sat on Tuesday, the 14th December, 2004 from 1530 to 1640 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Chandrakant Khaire — *In the chair*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
3. Shri A. Krishnaswamy
4. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
5. Shri Bhubneshwar Prasad Mehta
6. Shri P. Rajendran
7. Shri M. Sreenivasulu Reddy
8. Shri Chandrapal Singh Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D. Malvalia — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

1. Shri R.C. Panda — *Additional Secretary*
2. Dr. V.P. Goel — *Director*

2. In the absence of the Chairman, the Committee choose Shri Chandrakant Khaire, MP to act as Chairman under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the following Memorandum related to amendment in the Guidelines on MPLADS. The decisions/recommendations are given as follows:—

Memorandum No. 5 regarding, "**Suggestion from Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, MP (LS) regarding utilisation of funds under MPLAD Scheme for procurement of sports items and sports infrastructure in the country to the tune of Rs. 20 lakh per annum.**"

The Committee took note of the facts presented by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that Government have not earmarked any amount for any particular work and earmarking of MPLADS funds for a particular project should not be done as it would lead to similar demands for other works also. Purchase of inventory items, consumable items like badminton shuttles etc., should not be permitted under MPLAD Scheme. However, immovable items which can be fixed to the ground or to the walls like gymnasium, basketball etc., can be permitted under MPLADS.

The Committee in the light of the views of the Ministry decided that only fixed structure *i.e.*, the permanent asset creation works should only be allowed under MPLAD Scheme.

4. Some Members also made certain suggestions in order to streamline the MPLAD Scheme which are as follows:—

- (i) Provision of vehicle should be made from MPLADS funds for effective monitoring the execution of works under the MPLAD Scheme.
- (ii) Provision should be made in the Guidelines so that MPs can have an office in the Collectorate to have interaction with agencies implementing MPLADS works.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX IV

**MINUTES OF FIFTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Friday, the 4th February, 2005 from 1100 to 1210 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Kumar Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Pankaj Chaudhery
3. Dr. Ramachandra Dome
4. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
5. Shri Raja Ram Pal
6. Shri P. Rajendran
7. Shri M. Sreenivasulu Reddy
8. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
9. Shri Chandrapal Singh Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D. Malvalia — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

1. Shri R.C. Panda — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri K.L. Banerjee — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri Abrar Hussain — *Consultant*

2. At the outset, Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS and observed that after the Tsunami tragedy they were meeting for the first time. Therefore, before starting the meeting, the Chairman said that the Committee might convey their heart felt condolences to the victims of the Tsunami Tragedy. The Committee then passed the following Resolution:—

"The Committee express their heartfelt deep sorrow on the large scale devastation, heavy loss of lives and property caused by the Tsunami that hit Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands on 26.12.2004."

3. Hon'ble Chairman has also informed the Members of the Committee that so far 104 Members have given their consent to contribute from their MPLADS funds which ranges from Rs. 1 lakh to Rs. 1 crore each out of their MPLADS fund.

4. Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation apprised the Committee that now the Government has considered that full coordination and monitoring of fund release would be done in consultation with both the Committees. One Member of the Committee pointed out that some cheques of MPs contributed by them during the super cyclone in Orissa are still untraceable. Chairman also pointed out that three cheques including the cheque of Hon'ble Speaker was missing and observed that the cheques should immediately be traced out and accounted for. The Ministry has informed the Committee that three cheques are yet to be accounted for. The cheques have not been encashed and they are tying up with the Chief Secretaries of the States as well as DMs.

5. On a point whether a Member can suggest that his/her money can be utilised for a particular project in a particular area, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation informed the Committee that the Member can himself suggest that a specific work may be carried out with his/her contribution in a particular area. The Government is proposing now that the District Collector of the affected area would indicate that a particular work has been completed from the funds contributed by such and such MPs. Now, the name of the Member will be inscribed in a plaque that a particular building/work has been constructed/set up from MPLADS funds of so and so Member.

6. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the following Memoranda. The decisions/recommendations are given memoranda-wise seriatim:—

- (1) Memorandum No. 6 regarding, "**Reformation of Road from Yelahanka—Vijayapura road to join Budigere Cross via Sathanur, Bagalur, Gopalapura, Yediyur, M. Hosahalli onto Budigere Cross in Jala Hobli, Bangalore North Taluk, Bangalore Urban District on the recommendation of Dr. H.T. Sangliana, MP (LS) costing Rs. 125 lakh in Bangalore North Parliamentary constituency.**"

The Committee considered the proposal of Dr. H.T. Sangliana, MP(LS) for according sanction of Rs. 125 lakh for reformation of road from Yelahanka—Vijayapura to join Budigere Cross in Bangalore North Parliamentary Constituency by giving relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh, the permissible limit as per Para 4.1 of the MPLADS Guidelines. The Committee took note of the facts presented by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that the condition of the road is very bad and it is an important link between the two areas *viz.*, Yelahanka—Vijayapura and it will be helpful to a large section of the people of Bangalore North Taluk and Bangalore Urban District.

Some Members did not agree with the facts presented by the Ministry and were of the view that the road Projects are not durable assets as the roads would sustain only for 2-3 years and also in view of the fact that more than 50 per cent of the fund are being spent on such type of 'Special repairs' and suggested that such type of works should be discouraged under MPLAD Scheme.

However, the Committee approved the proposal as a "special case" and observed that it should not be quoted as a "precedent" and also such type of works should be "discouraged" in future.

- (2) Memorandum No. 7 regarding, "**Proposal for providing MPLADS funds for higher education.**"

The Committee took note of the facts presented by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that the proposal of Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Governor, Uttaranchal for providing MPLADS funds for higher education is very good but the main aim of MPLAD Scheme is to create durable assets. Grant and loan are not permissible under MPLAD Scheme.

The Committee agreed with the views of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that this proposal can not be implemented.

- (3) Memorandum No. 8 regarding, "**Proposal of Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha for providing salaries to teachers of schools in rural areas from MPLADS funds.**"

The Committee agreed with the views of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that the funds released from MPLAD Scheme is primarily meant for creation of durable assets which must be available for public at large and therefore may not be used for incurring any recurring expenditure like the payment of salary etc. Therefore, the Committee did not approve the proposal for providing salaries to teachers of schools in rural areas from MPLADS funds.

Some Members also made certain suggestions in order to streamline the scheme and make it more effective which are as follows:—

- (a) Provision that the next instalment of MPLADS funds would be released only when the unspent balance is less than Rs. 1 crore should be waived off.
- (b) MPLADS funds should be allowed to be used for Swajaldhara Scheme.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX V

**MINUTES OF SIXTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Friday, the 18th March, 2005 from 1500 to 1610 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Kumar Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
3. Shri Punnulal Mohale
4. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
5. Shri Gurjeet Singh Rana
6. Shri Manvendra Singh
7. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
8. Shri Sitaram Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D. Malvalia — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

1. Shri R.C. Panda — *Additional Secretary*
2. Dr. V.P. Goel — *Director*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS and thereafter the Committee took up for consideration Memorandum No. 9 regarding contribution by Members of Parliament from their quota of MPLADS funds towards rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

3. The Additional Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation apprised the Committee that they had visited the tsunami affected States and had discussions with the Chief Secretaries of the States. The purpose was to formulate a priority list of works based on locally felt needs required for rehabilitation and reconstruction purpose in the tsunami affected areas. The Committee deliberated over the facts presented by the Ministry and considered the priority list of works forwarded by Government of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh & Kerala to be undertaken from MPLADS funds contributed by

Hon'ble Members of Parliament on the appeal of Hon'ble Speaker in relaxation of Para 4.1 of MPLADS Guidelines for the tsunami affected areas for undertaking rehabilitation and reconstruction works and decided as follows:—

- (a) MPLADS funds contributed for tsunami affected areas be released and utilised in the ratio proposed by the Ministry.
- (b) Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should monitor and coordinate the release and utilization of funds in consultation with the authorities of concerned State Governments.
- (c) Funds should be utilised only for works permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- (d) The nodal District Collector of the affected area should ensure execution of work in a time frame.
- (e) Details of each MP's contribution *i.e.* release of amount from each MP's fund to District Collector, place of work, nature of the project etc., be furnished to each MP and the Committee.
- (f) Each Hon'ble Member who has contributed from MPLADS funds should be regularly informed about the progress of works undertaken from the amount contributed by him.
- (g) The details of the utilization of the funds of each MP should be regularly furnished to the MP and the Committee on monthly basis.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VI

**MINUTES OF SEVENTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Monday, the 11th April, 2005 from 1100 to 1230 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Kumar Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Dr. Ramachandra Dome
3. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
4. Shri Raghuveer Singh Kaushal
5. Shri A. Krishnaswamy
6. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandik
7. Shri Punnulal Mohale
8. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
9. Shri Raja Ram Pal
10. Shri P. Rajendran
11. Shri Manvendra Singh
12. Shri Chandramani Tripathi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D. Malvalia — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Smt. Balwant Kaur Saimbhi — *Committee Officer*
3. Smt. Kamlesh Pahwa — *Committee Officer*

**Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and
Programme Implementation**

1. Shri R.C. Panda — *Additional Secretary*
2. Dr. V.P. Goel — *Director*
3. Shri R. Rajesh — *Deputy Director*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS and thereafter the Committee took up for consideration

Memoranda Nos. 10 and 11 and Draft Report. The decisions/recommendations are given memoranda wise-seriatim:—

- (1) Memorandum No. 10 regarding, "**Contribution by Members of Parliament from their quota of MPLADS funds towards rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.**"

The Committee decided that if an MP who has contributed from his MPLADS funds towards tsunami rehabilitation and reconstruction works and gives suggestion for the utilization of funds contributed for specific purpose/work, then the amount he has contributed should be used only for the specific suggested work.

- (2) Memorandum No. 11 regarding, "**Proposal for purchase of land for construction of building of Hindi High School, Dalkhola, West Bengal under MPLADS in Raiganj Parliamentary Constituency of West Bengal.**"

The Committee took note of the facts presented by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and agreed to the views of the Ministry that the MPLADS funds be not used for purchase of land as the MPLADS Guidelines prohibits utilization of funds for such purposes.

3. The Committee also considered the Draft Twelfth Report—'Proposals to amend Guidelines on MPLADS' and adopted the same without any modification.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VII

MINUTES OF EIGHTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LOK SABHA)

The Committee sat on Friday, the 20th May, 2005 from 1100 to 1230 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Kumar Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
3. Shri Chandrakant Khaire
4. Shri Raja Ram Pal
5. Shri P. Rajendran
6. Shri M. Sreenivasulu Reddy
7. Shri Sajjan Kumar
8. Shri Chandramani Tripathi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D. Malvalia — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*
3. Smt. Balwant Kaur Saimbhi — *Committee Officer*
4. Smt. Kamlesh Pahwa — *Committee Officer*

Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

1. Shri R.C. Panda — *Additional Secretary*
2. Dr. V.P. Goel — *Director*
3. Shri R. Rajesh — *Deputy Director*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS and thereafter the Committee took up for consideration the following memoranda related to relaxation in para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS. The decisions/recommendations are given as follows:—

- (1) Memorandum No.12 regarding, "**Construction of RCC retaining wall of existing play ground at Namunaghar, Andaman and Nicobar Islands on the recommendation of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs.37,68,468/- under MPLADS.**"

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of Shir Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) and decided to give relaxation beyond the limit of Rs.25 lakh under MPLAD Scheme for construction of RCC retaining wall of existing play ground at Namunaghar, Andaman and Nicobar Islands at an estimated cost of Rs.37,68,468/-.

The Committee, however, desired that estimate prepared for the project should not be revised frequently as it creates lots of problem. At this the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation assured that they would write to Deputy Commissioner for the delay in preparing the estimate.

- (2) Memorandum No.13 regarding, "**Proposal of Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya, MP (LS) regarding contribution of Rs. 25 lakh for the construction of a shed in 'Block Parisar' of Saifayee in Etawah Parliamentary Constituency of Uttar Pradesh to be constructed at an estimated cost of Rs.433.75 lakhs from MPLADS funds.**"

The Committee took note of the facts presented by Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that the proposal recommended by Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya, MP(LS) has been withdrawn by the Member himself without giving any reason.

The Committee opined that as the Hon'ble Member has himself withdrawn his proposal of contribution for the project, it needs no approval from the Committee.

- (3) Memorandum No.14 regarding, "**Proposal for construction of Library and Class Rooms for the Government Polytechnic at Purasawakkam, Chennai recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunication and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 2.50 crore under MPLADS.**"

The Committee considered the proposal of Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunication and Information Technology regarding construction of Library and Class Rooms for the Government Polytechnics Purasawakkam, Chennai at an estimated cost of Rs. 2.50 crore and decided to approve it by giving relaxation in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

3. Some Members also made certain suggestions in order to streamline the Scheme which are as follows:—

- (i) Provision should be made in the Guidelines on MPLADS so that MPs can contribute funds for construction of Gram Panchayat office buildings.
- (ii) MPLADS funds be allowed to be used as a substitute of 10% contributions to be made by public/beneficiary for drinking water projects under the various schemes of State Governments.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VIII

**MINUTES OF NINTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Monday, the 4th July, 2005 from 1100 to 1215 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Kumar Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Pankaj Chaudhery
3. Shri Raghuvveer Singh Kaushal
4. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
5. Shri Bhubneswar Prasad Mehta
6. Shri Punnulal Mohale
7. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
8. Shri Asaduddin Owaisi
9. Shri Raja Ram Pal
10. Shri P. Rajendran
11. Shri Sajjan Kumar
12. Shri Mahadeorao Shivankar
13. Shri Chandramani Tripathi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D. Malvalia — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*
3. Smt. Balwant Kaur Saimbhi — *Committee Officer*
4. Smt. Kamlesh Pahwa — *Committee Officer*

Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

1. Shri R.C. Panda — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri Anil Ganeriwala — *Director*
3. Shri S.C. Das — *Senior Analyst*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS and thereafter the Committee took up for consideration

Memoranda Nos. 15 to 19. The decisions/recommendations are given memoranda wise-seriatim:—

- (1) Memorandum No. 15 regarding, **"Proposal for construction of five class rooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78-Zone-V recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 27.50 lakh under MPLADS."**

The Committee considered the proposal of Shri Dayandhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology for construction of five class rooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78-Zone-V at an estimated cost of Rs. 27.50 lakh and decided to approve it by giving relaxation of Para 4.1 of Guidelines or MPLADS.

- (2) Memorandum No. 16 regarding, **"Construction of compound wall around graveyard at Stertwart Gunj, Andaman and Nicobar Islands on the recommendation of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP(LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 28,89,474/- under MPLADS."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP(LS) and decided to give relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh under MPLADS for construction of compound wall around graveyard at Stertwart Gunj, Andaman and Nicobar Islands at an estimated cost of Rs. 28,89,474/-.

The Committee, however, expressed its serious concern over the undue delay in sanctioning of the works and desired that the limit of 45 days for sanctioning the works as stipulated in the Guidelines on MPLADS must be adhered to.

- (3) Memorandum No. 17 regarding, **"Proposal of Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan, MP(LS) for providing grant from MPLADS funds for solar energy projects."**

The Committee took note of the facts presented by the Ministry that the grants are not permissible under MPLADS. However, the Committee opined that the Hon'ble Member Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan in his proposal is desirous of giving funds for solar energy projects for MPLADS funds. The Committee, therefore, decided that a clarification in this regard may be obtained from the Hon'ble Member to ascertain the real purpose of the proposal.

- (4) Memorandum No. 18 regarding, **"Contributions by Members of Parliament, Lok Sabha from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the Tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands."**

The Committee deliberated over the proposal received from Rajya Sabha Secretariat (i) since the funds so generously given by the MPs of both the Houses are not for any projects in specified constituencies and cover the felt needs, whether it would be appropriate to keep these moneys in a separate fund to be managed by a Joint Committee consisting of representatives of the MPLADS Committee of both the Houses. Money could be released from time to time for the approved projects by this Joint Committee and (ii) whether a Trust could be created consisting of MPs of the MPLADS Committee of both the Houses and some Ex-MPs out of the surplus money which may be left after execution of the approved projects (The Trust would cater to the immediate needs of future calamities and certain other physically challenged children

who were either handicapped or orphaned) and the comments received from Committee Branch-I. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation also apprised that the Minister of State of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation had also participated in the meeting where the issue pertaining to formation of trust was discussed and it was conveyed that the Ministry does not favour the proposal to have a separate trust/foundation and a separate account for the execution of rehabilitation works of the natural calamities under MPLADS where the MPs have consented to provide funds for such rehabilitation measures. The Ministry favoured the implementation of rehabilitation works in the natural calamities affected areas through the District Authorities and preferably through the local self-governments under the direct supervision of the State Governments. Therefore, the proposal to have a separate trust or foundation and a separate account for the execution of the rehabilitation works during natural calamities is not practicable. The Committee, therefore, decided unanimously that the proposal to have separate Trust/Foundation with a separate account may not be entertained in the present situation. Hon'ble Members of Parliament had always contributed from MPLADS funds for undertaking relief and rehabilitation works in the areas affected by natural calamities, therefore, there is no need for creation of a trust.

(5) Memorandum No. 19 regarding, "**Revised Guidelines on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS).**"

The Committee considered the proposal forwarded by Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS and decided to defer it to the next sitting of the Committee on MPLADS.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX IX

**MINUTES OF TENTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Monday, the 18th July, 2005 from 1500 to 1715 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Kumar Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
3. Shri Chandrakant Khaire
4. Shri Bhubneshwar Prasad Mehta
5. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
6. Shri Raja Ram Pal
7. Shri Basangouda R. Patil
8. Shri P. Rajendran
9. Shri Sajjan Kumar
10. Shri Manvendra Singh
11. Shri Chandrapal Singh Yadav
12. Shri Sitaram Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri M. Rajagopalan Nair — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.D. Malvalia — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

1. Shri R.C. Panda — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri Anil Ganeriwala — *Director*
3. Smt. Kiran Vasudeva — *Under Secretary*

2. At the outlet, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS and informed the Members that the Committee on MPLADS (2003) at their sitting held on 17 September, 2003 had given some suggestions on the revision of Guidelines on MPLADS. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme

Implementation taking into consideration the suggestions of the Committee have now finalized the revised guidelines.

3. The witnesses were then called in Hon'ble Chairman, while welcoming the witnesses, to the Committee, apprised them of the Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha which reads as under:—

"The proceedings of a Committee shall be treated as confidential and it shall not be permissible for a member of the Committee or any one who has access to its proceedings to communicate, directly or indirectly, to the Press any information regarding its proceedings including its report or any conclusions arrived at, finally or tentatively, before the report has been presented to the House."

4. The Committee thereafter took up for consideration Memorandum No. 20 regarding, "**Revised Guidelines on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS)**" forwarded by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.

5. The Committee then sought certain clarifications from the witnesses with respect to the revised guidelines. After some discussions, the Committee approved the proposed revised guidelines with certain suggestions/modifications which are shown in Annexure-I.

6. The Committee then took note of the proposal of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, MP (LS) for contributing Rs. 5 lakh from MPLADS funds for construction of building of Chandigarh War Memorial and decided to consider the matter at the next sitting.

7. A verbatim record of the proceedings of the sitting of the Committee has been kept separately.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE-I

**SUGGESTIONS/MODIFICATIONS IN THE PROPOSED GUIDELINES
ON MPLAD SCHEME**

Para No. of the Guidelines	Gist of Guidelines	Decision of the Committee
2.1	The annual MPLADS fund entitlement per MP constituency is Rs. 2 crore.	The Committee recommended that the annual MPLADS fund entitlement per MP be as per the decision of the Government from time to time.
2.8	MPs from the non-affected areas of the State can also recommend permissible works up to a maximum of Rs. 10 lakh per annum in the affected area(s) in that State.	The Committee recommended that words "up to a maximum of Rs. 10 lakh per annum" be replaced with "up to a maximum of Rs. 10 lakh for each calamity."
2.7	Each MP will recommend works up to the annual entitlement during the financial year preferably within 90 days of the commencement of the financial year in the format at Annexure-III to the concerned District Authority.	The Committee recommended that time limit of 90 days may not be prescribed as, it becomes difficult to adhere to such rigid time frame due to pre-occupation of Member of Parliament with constituency work. The Committee were of the view that recommending proposals of various works should be a continuous process. As and when the works/projects are brought to the notice of Members, these are examined on merit and only selected works/projects recommended for funding under MPLAD Scheme.
2.12	The District Authority shall identify the agency through which a particular work recommended by the MP should be executed.	The Committee decided that MPs should also be informed of the agency identified at the selection stage by the District Authority.
3.4	The work and the site selected for the work execution by the MP shall not be changed, except with the concurrence of the MP concerned.	The Committee recommended that the words 'the work' be replaced with the words 'the project'.
3.7	The shortfall in the estimated cost <i>vis-a-vis</i> the one recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP.	The Committee proposed that any shortfall in the estimated cost as recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP within one month.

Para No. of the Guidelines	Gist of Guidelines	Decision of the Committee
3.11	It shall be the responsibility of the Nodal District Authority to scrutinize all such recommended works within 45 days of the last date of the term of office of the MP either to accord necessary sanction as per the guidelines, or to intimate the MP about the rejection with reasons.	The Committee recommended that the words 'to intimate the MP' be replaced with the words 'to intimate the outgoing MP'.
4.1	The annual entitlement of Rs. 2 crore will be released in two instalments of Rs. One crore each by Government of India directly to the District Authority.....	The Committee recommended that "The annual entitlement be released in two equal instalments by Government of India directly to the District Authority....."
4.3	The second installment of the MPLADS funds will be released subject to the fulfilment of the following eligibility criteria:—	The Committee recommended that Para 4.3 (ii) may be deleted as it is creating problems in the release of MPLADS funds.
	(i) the unsanctioned balance amount available with the accounts of the District Authority after taking into account the cost of all the works sanctioned is less than Rs. 50 lakh;	
	(ii) the unspent balance of funds of the MP concerned is less than Rs. One crore; and	
	(iii) utilization Certificate for the previous financial year and the Audit Certificate for the funds released for each MP in the year prior to the previous year have been furnished by the District Authority. The Utilisation Certificate and Audit Certificate formats are at Annex. VIII and IX respectively.	

Para No. of the Guidelines	Gist of Guidelines	Decision of the Committee
6.5 (iv)	The implementing agencies shall also refund to the District Authority the savings (balance amounts) including interest and contingency amount, if any, at their disposal and closed the Bank Account opened for the purpose.	The Committee recommended that the implementing agencies should refund the balance amount as provided in Para 6.5 within one month.
3.22	In order to make the general public aware about the execution of the works costing Rs. 5 lakh and above, under MPLADS, a plaque (stone/metal) carrying the inscription 'Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme Work, indicating the cost involved, the commencement, completion and inauguration date and the name of the MP sponsoring the project should be permanently erected.	The Committee were of the view that the condition that only the works costing Rs. 5 lakh and above as stipulated in Para 3.22 may be deleted. As such all works executed under MPLADS should carry the inscription 'MPLADS work' and other details.
2.10 (New Additions)	Provides that if a Member of Parliament finds the need to promote education and culture of a State/UT wherefrom the MP is elected or has chosen a Nodal District (Nominated MPs only) in a place outside that State/UT, the MP can select works relating to education and cultural development not prohibited under these Guidelines up to maximum of Rs. 10 lakh in a financial year.	The Committee recommended that besides 'education and culture' 'health' should also be made eligible to draw funds under the scheme.

APPENDIX X

**MINUTES OF FIRST SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Tuesday, the 6th September, 2005 from 1120 to 1200 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Pankaj Choudhary
3. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
4. Shri Raghuvir Singh Kaushal
5. Shri Bhubneshwar Prasad Mehta
6. Shri Raja Ram Pal
7. Shri Basanagouda R. Patil
8. Shri Narsingrao H. Suryawanshi
9. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
10. Shri Chandra Pal Singh Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri John Joseph — *Secretary*
2. Shri A.K. Singh — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri R.S. Kambo — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the first sitting of the newly constituted Committee on MPLADS (2005-06). Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 1 to 7. The decisions/recommendations of the Committee are given memoranda wise-seriatim:—

- (1) Memorandum No. 1 regarding, "**Proposal for construction of Community Hall-cum Market at Asaf Ali Road on the recommendation of Shri Kapil Sibal, Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology) at an estimated cost of Rs. 89.50 lakh under MPLADS.**"

The Committee considered the proposal of Shri Kapil Sibal, Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology) for construction of Community Hall cum Market at Asaf Ali Road at an estimated cost of Rs. 89.50 lakh under MPLADS. Since the

Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Delhi in his letter dated 27 June, 2005 addressed to the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated that "the community hall is required for use of the Muslim Community", the Committee recommended that a clarification be obtained from the Ministry in this regard, as the Guidelines on MPLADS do not permit utilization of funds for religious purposes. (Item No. 9 of the List of works not permissible under MPLADS).

- (2) Memorandum No. 2 regarding, "**Construction of road from main road (ATR) to house site colony Kadamtala village of Andaman and Nicobar Islands on the recommendation of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 29,83,284/-under MPLADS.**"

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) and recommended that a sum of Rs. 29.83 lakh be spent for the construction of Road, from MPLAD fund. The Committee also expressed its serious concern over abnormal delay of almost ten months in sending the estimates and other details of the project to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for approval. The Committee, therefore, recommended that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should issue a fresh circular to all Deputy Commissioners/Collectors to strictly adhere to the time limit of 45 days for sanctioning the works as stipulated in the Guidelines on MPLADS.

- (3) Memorandum No. 3 regarding, "**Proposal from Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, MP(LS) for contributing Rs. 5 lakh from MPLADS funds for construction of building of Chandigarh War Memorial.**"

The Committee deliberated over the proposal of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, MP (LS) and took note of the fact that the proposed Chandigarh War Memorial is not dedicated to any individual but is a matter of national pride and honour as it pays homage to 9000 martyrs who made the supreme sacrifice in the service of the motherland. However, taking note of the objections of Comptroller and Auditor-General of India regarding construction of war memorials and also the fact that construction of Memorials has been specifically prohibited by Item No.5 of the List of works not permissible under MPLADS, the Committee recommended that the Ministry may reconsider their decision and if need be, revise the Guidelines, in matters involving national pride and honour.

- (4) Memorandum No. 4 regarding, "**Proposal for funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds.**"

The Committee considered the proposal for funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies, Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds and recommended that in view of Para 1.3 of the Guidelines on MPLADS and Item 1 of the List of works not permissible under MPLADS, this proposal may not be approved. The Committee opined that this project can be funded as a Government undertaking with enabling contributions from the eight North-Eastern States.

- (5) Memorandum No. 5 regarding, "**Proposal for contributing Rs. 20 lakh from MPLADS funds for reconstruction of Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School, Kaliyaganj, Uttar Dinajpur outside the Parliamentary constituency of Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources.**"

The Committee considered the proposal of Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources for contributing Rs. 20 lakh from MPLADS funds for reconstruction of Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School, Kaliyaganj, Uttar Dinajpur outside his Parliamentary constituency and recommended that in view of Para 1.3 of the Guidelines of MPLADS which permits contribution outside the constituency of an Hon'ble Member only in cases of natural calamity of severe nature, this proposal may not be approved as it will set a precedent for relaxation in such cases in future.

- (6) Memorandum No. 6 regarding, "**Proposal from Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP(LS) for waiving of condition that the benefits of MPLAD Scheme would not be given to a registered society/trust if the Member who has forwarded the proposal was himself the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee etc., or Trustee of Registered Society/Trust in question.**"

The Committee deferred the proposal to be taken up in the next meeting as certain issues required further deliberations.

- (7) Memorandum No. 7 regarding, "**Proposal for construction of Hingota Anicut for providing irrigation & drinking water facility in Dausa Parliamentary constituency of Rajasthan at an estimated cost of Rs. 40.62 lakh out of which Rs. 32.44 lakh is being contributed from MPLADS funds.**"

The Committee considered the proposal for construction of Hingota Anicut for providing irrigation and drinking water facility in Dausa Parliamentary constituency of Rajasthan at an estimated cost of Rs. 40.62 lakh out of which Rs. 32.44 lakh is being contributed from MPLADS funds and decided to approve it by giving relaxation in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

3. The Committee then deliberated upon the need to streamline the working of MPLADS Scheme and recommended that (i) the ongoing works/projects should not be held in abeyance/stopped mid-way, for want of adequate flow of MPLAD funds; (ii) the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should review the progress of all the incomplete works/projects and furnished a detailed statement showing the works/projects pending under MPLADS for the last three years or more in each district/constituency, for the consideration of the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XI

**MINUTES OF SECOND SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Tuesday the 20th September, 2005 from 1100 to 1240 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Pankaj Choudhary
3. Shri Raghuvir Singh Kaushal
4. Shri A. Krishnaswamy
5. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
6. Shri Bhubneshwar Prasad Mehta
7. Shri A.F.G Osmani
8. Shri Raja Ram Pal
9. Shri Basanagouda R. Patil
10. Shri Narsingrao H. Suryawanshi
11. Shri Sitaram Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri John Joseph — *Secretary*
2. Shri R.S. Kambo — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman Welcomed the Members to the second sitting of the Committee on MPLADS (2005-06). Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 8 and 9. The decisions/recommendations of the Committee are given memoranda wise-seriatim:—

- (1) Memorandum No. 8 regarding, "**Proposal from Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP (LS) for waiving of condition that the benefits of MPLAD Scheme would not be given to a registered society/trust if the Member who has forwarded the proposal was himself the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee etc., or Trustee of Registered Society/Trust in question.**"

3. The Committee opined that in the proposed Guidelines on MPLADS, the extended definition of an MP's family which goes much beyond his/her nuclear family should be restricted to some extent. A pecuniary limit may be set for sanctioning funds to a particular registered society/trust. But a blanket ban in this matter may lead to a situation where many deserving cases like educational institutions in need of financial assistance may be left unattended. Taking into consideration, the various ambiguities involved in funding mechanism of MPLAD Scheme with regard to a registered society/trust, the Committee decided to seek further clarification from the officials of Ministry of Statistics and Programme implementation and deferred any decision on the present memorandum.

(2) Memorandum No. 9 regarding, "**Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS).**"

4. The Committee deliberated on the criticisms levelled against the MPLAD Scheme in the C&AG Reports (1998 and 2001) and another report authored by Shri Era Sezhiyan, ex-MP and Chairman, PAC. The Committee expressed its serious concern over the lacunae pointed out in the reports like sanctioning of works by District Collectors without recommendations of the Members of Parliament, huge unspent balances with implementing agencies, non-submission of utilization certificates and levying of administrative/centage charges by implementing agencies, incomplete and abandoned works, failure to maintain asset registers, sanctioning of funds as grants/loans, weak monitoring mechanism etc. The Committee took note of the fact that in the C&AG's report a majority of the problems and bottlenecks identified pertain to the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. At no point of time, the role/conduct of MPs has been questioned. The Committee were concerned to find the tardy implementation of the Scheme which is under the direct control and supervision of District Administration, State Governments and Central Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The Committee recommended that the Central Ministry and State Agencies should find out the reasons for poor implementation of the Scheme, strengthen their monitoring apparatus and thereafter furnish a report to this Committee. The Committee recommended that strict action be taken against the errant officials who had disregarded the MPLAD Scheme Guidelines, while approving/executing a project/work.

5. On a pointed criticism of the MPLAD Scheme that the scheme usurps the powers of the Executive by the Legislature, encourages interference by MPs and Central Ministry in the functioning of District Administration, is against the basic tenets and philosophy of the Constitution, diverts funds from rural and urban local bodies and increases the areas of conflict between district administration and Panchayati Raj bodies, the Committee were of the view that the MPLAD Scheme is a Government sponsored Scheme and it is for the Government to ensure that the Scheme fits well into the constitutional framework of the country, does not interfere in the functioning of District Administration and in no way compromises the District Planning. The Committee were of the view that the Scheme has been conceptualized to supplement the efforts of the State and District Institutions in Planning and execution of developmental projects and plug the resource gap between the Central and States Government's funds.

6. In the opinion of the Committee the role of MP in the MPLAD Scheme is only to identify and recommend a work/project to a concerned District Collector. The District Collector alone accords technical and administrative sanction/approval of the projects/works subject to the condition that the proposed project/work is in accordance with the Guidelines on MPLD Scheme. Even the implementing agency is identified by District collector and not by MP.

7. As regard to the opinion that there is a duplication between works undertaken under MPLAD Scheme and District Planning, the Committee were of the view that since District Collector not only heads MPLAD Scheme but is also associated with the Panchayati Raj Institution, there is an unlikely chance of any duplication of work. If it is apprehended that there may be some duplication of work, then it becomes incumbent upon the District Collector concerned to ensure that such works are avoided. In such cases, either the MP concerned can be impressed upon to withdraw the project or the Panchayati Raj Institution advised to shelve such project.

8. On the issue of constitutional impropriety of the Scheme, the Committee took note of the fact that a Public Interest Litigation is already pending before the Supreme Court. The Committee viewed that as a final interpreter of the Constitution, the Supreme Court is best suited to take a decision in this regard and as the matter is sub-judice, any recommendation by the Committee at this stage may not be desirable.

9. The Committee opined that the problems and bottlenecks pointed out in the implementation of the Scheme are similar to those encountered in many of the Centrally Sponsored Schemes and other Government Projects. An effort should be made to plug all loopholes and rectify the errors in the implementation of the Scheme.

10. The Committee desired that the views of the Committee be apprised to Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha and accordingly a letter be sent to him from the Chairman of the Committee.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XII

**MINUTES OF THIRD SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Monday, the 3rd October, 2005 from 1500 to 1535 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Chandrakant Bhaurao Khaire — *In the chair*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
3. Shri Raghuvir Singh Kaushal
4. Shri A. Krishnaswamy
5. Shri Bhubneshwar Prasad Mehta
6. Shri Raja Ram Pal
7. Shri Basanagouda R. Patil
8. Shri P. Rajendran
9. Shri M. Sreenivasulu Reddy
10. Prof. Mahadeorao Shiwankar
11. Shri Narsingrao H. Suryawanshi
12. Shri Chandra Pal Singh Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A.K. Singh — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R.S. Kambo — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

1. Shri R.C. Panda — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri A.K. Ganeriwala — *Director*
3. Shri R. Rajesh — *Deputy Director*

2. In the absence of the Chairman, the Committee chose Shri Chandrakant Bhaurao Khaire, MP to act as Chairman under Rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. At the outset, the Committee took note of a letter from the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, indicating the reasons for the absence of Secretary from the sitting of the Committee. The Committee expressed their displeasure over the failure of the Secretary in seeking leave of absence from the sitting from the Chairman of the Committee and desired that Secretary should appear before the Committee as and when called. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration memoranda Nos. 10 to 12. The decisions/recommendations of the Committee are given memorandum-wise seriatim:—

- (1) Memorandum No. 10 regarding, **"Proposal from Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik MP (LS) for waiving of condition that the benefits of MPLAD Scheme would not be given to a registered society/trust if the Member who has forwarded the proposal was himself the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committees., or Trustee of Registered Society/Trust in question."**

4. The Committee considered the proposal of Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP and decided to defer it for the next sitting of the Committee, as in the absence of Secretary of the Department, it would not be prudent to take policy decision.

- (2) Memorandum No. 11 regarding, **"Proposal for construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road in Narela Zone on the recommendation of Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 35,00,400/- under MPLADS."**

5. The Committee deliberated over the proposal for construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road in Narela Zone on the recommendation of Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 35,00,400/- under MPLADS and decided to approve it by giving relaxation in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

- (3) Memorandum No. 12 regarding, **"Selection of subject(s) for examination by Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS)."**

6. The Committee deferred the proposal regarding selection of subject(s) for examination by Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) for the next sitting of the Committee.

7. Thereafter, the Committee considered the question of funding rural drinking schemes from MPLAD funds. The Committee was of the view that when MLALADs funds can be used as a substitute of community contribution in States like Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan for installation of handpumps, then there are no reasons for denying this facilities under MPLADS. After some discussion, the Committee decided to seek clarification from the Government and desired that the matter be discussed in detail in their next sitting.

8. The Committee then considered the need to undertake tour and decided to visit some of the Tsunami affected areas of Tamil Nadu, Andaman and Nicobar Islands etc. in connection with the review of rehabilitation/reconstruction works undertaken from MPLADS funds.

9. A verbatim record of the proceedings of the sitting of the Committee has been kept separately.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XIII

**MINUTES OF FOURTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Monday, the 20th October, 2005 from 1500 to 1645 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
3. Shri Raghuvir Singh Kaushal
4. Shri Chandrakant Bhaurao Khaire
5. Shri A. Krishnaswamy
6. Shri Bhubneshwar Prasad Mehta
7. Shri A.F.G Osmani
8. Shri Raja Ram Pal
9. Shri P. Rajendran
10. Prof. Mahadeorao Shiwankar
11. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
12. Shri Sitaram Yadav

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri A.K. Singh | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R.S. Kambo | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri P.D. Mahawar | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

Representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.S. Rana | — | <i>Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R.C. Panda | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri A.K. Ganeriwala | — | <i>Director</i> |

**Representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply
(Ministry of Rural Development)**

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Smt. Sunila Basant | — | <i>Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri Rakesh Behari | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri R.M. Deshpande | — | <i>Additional Adviser</i> |
| 4. Shri R. K. Sinha | — | <i>Director</i> |

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration memoranda Nos. 13 to 18. The decisions/recommendations of the Committee are given memoranda-wise seriatim:

- (1) Memorandum No. 13 regarding, **"Proposal from Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP (LS) for waiving of condition that the benefits of MPLAD Scheme would not be given to a registered society/trust if the Member who has forwarded the proposal was himself the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee., or Trustee of Registered Society/Trust in question."**

3. The Committee took note of the facts presented by Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that the proposed provision in the draft MPLAD Scheme Guidelines under which the benefit of the scheme would not be given to a registered society/trust, if the Member giving the proposal is himself the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee., or Trustee of Registered Society/Trust in question had been incorporated after due deliberation. The Committee were of the view that the definition of family which comprises of MP, MP's spouse, parents, brothers and sisters, children, grand children and their in-laws as proposed in the draft Guidelines on MPLADS is too broad and covers far and wide relations. Further, no Indian statute encompasses, such a wide definition of a family. The committee did not agree with the proposed definition and recommended that family should be restricted to blood relatives only.

The Committee did not agree with the proposal of Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP (LS) for waiving of condition under which the benefit of MPLADS cannot be given to a registered Society Trust, if the member proposing the proposal in himself/herself the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee, or Trustee of Registered Society/Trust in question.

- (2) Memorandum No. 14 regarding, **"Proposal for using MPLADS funds as a substitute of 10% community contribution to be made by beneficiary for drinking projects."**

4. The representatives of the Department of Drinking Water Supply (Ministry of Rural Development) apprised the Committee that under the Swajaldhara Scheme, 90% funds of a project is borne by the Central Government and the remaining 10% is generated from community contribution. The 10% Cost to be borne by the community can be in the form of 50% in cash and the balance in the form of kind/labour/land or a combination of these. However, in areas inhabited by Scheduled Castes/Tribe Community, 75% of public contribution can be in the form of kind/labour/land and the remaining 25% in cash. The concept of community contribution was introduced with the objectives to encourage people's participation, sense of ownership and the responsibility towards the operation and maintenance (O&M) by the beneficiary community through the Gram Panchayat.

The representatives of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation also apprised the Committee that the Guidelines on MPLADS do not permit substitution of public contribution with MPLADS funds in any Central or State programme/schemes. As the MPLADS funds are Government funds, it cannot be used to substitute the contribution of public or community in any Central or State Scheme.

The Committee then pointed out that in States like Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, MLAs are vested with powers to sanction certain number of hand pumps for drinking purpose and desired that the Ministry of Rural Development should find out and submit a report that under which Schemes, MLALADS funds are being used to substitute community contribution.

- (3) Memorandum No. 15 regarding, "**Proposal for construction of RCC retaining wall, formation of bus bay with shelter and foot path in Dn-82, Zone-VI recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunication and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 118.60 lakh out of which Rs. 1,15,70,010.76 is to be met from MPLADS funds.**"

5. The Committee deliberated over the proposal for construction of RCC retaining wall, formation of bus bay with shelter and foot path in Dn-82, Zone-VI recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunication and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 118.60 lakh out of which Rs. 1,15,70,010.76 is to be met from MPLADS funds and decided to approve it by giving relaxation in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

- (4) Memorandum No. 16 regarding "**Relaxation in the upper limit of Rs. 25 lakh for construction of Blood Bank Building for the Indian Medical Blood Bank Society of Uttaranchal, Dehradun on the recommendation of Shri Francis Fanthome, MP(LS) and Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Shri Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri, MP(LS) from MPLADS funds.**"

6. The Committee discussed the aforesaid proposal and decided to give relaxation in the upper limit of Rs. 25 lakh as stipulated in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS for construction of Blood Bank Building for the Indian Medical Blood Bank Society of Uttaranchal, Dehradun on the recommendation of Shri Francis Fanthome, MP(LS) and Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Shri Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri, MP(LS) from MPLADS funds subject to the fulfilment of the following conditions:—

- (a) The Part cost for the proposed project should be for a clearly identifiable part of the work.
- (b) The funds from MPLADS be released towards the end of the project and the use of MPLADS funds should result in completion of the work.
- (5) Memorandum No. 17 regarding, "**Construction of fish landing centre with RCC Jetty at Enayamputhenthurai in Kanyakumari District at an estimated cost of Rs. 150 lakh from the contributions made by members of Parliament, Lok Sabha from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas.**"

7. The Committee considered the proposal for construction of fish landing centre with RCC Jetty at Enayamputhenthurai in Kanyakumari District at an Estimated cost of Rs. 150 lakh from the contributions made by Members of Parliament, Lok Sabha from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas instead of the desalination plant for water supply at Simon Colony on the

condition that the funds be utilised only for works permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

- (6) Memorandum No. 18 regarding, "**Selection of subject (s) for examination by Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS).**"

8. The Committee deferred the proposal regarding selection of subject(s) for examination by Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) for the next sitting of the Committee.

9. A verbatim record of the proceedings of the sitting of the Committee has been kept separately.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XIV

**MINUTES OF FIFTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Wednesday, 8th February, 2006 from 1100 hours to 1230 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
3. Shri Chandrakant Bhaurao Khaire
4. Shri Punnulal Mohale
5. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
6. Shri Asaduddin Owaisi
7. Shri Basangouda R. Patil (Yatnal)
8. Shri P. Rajendran
9. Shri Narsingrao H. Suryawanshi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A.K. Singh — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R.S. Kambo — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri Kusal Sarkar — *Assistant Director*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 19 to 21. The decisions/recommendations of the Committee are given memoranda-wise seriatim:—

- (i) Memorandum No. 19 regarding, “**Proposal for Construction of Community Hall-cum Market at Asaf Ali Road on the recommendation of Shri Kapil Sibal, Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology) at an estimated cost of Rs. 89.50 lakh under MPLADS**”.

The Committee were apprised that as per the recommendation of Shri Kapil Sibal, Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation on 30 June, 2005 had forwarded a proposal for consideration of the Committee for construction of a Community Hall-cum-Market at Asaf Ali

Road at an estimated cost of Rs. 89.50 lakh under MPLAD Scheme by relaxing the ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakh required under the Guidelines. While considering the proposal, the Committee had noted that the MCD, the nodal implementing agency of the Project, in their letter dated 27 June, 2005 had stated that the Community Hall was required for the use of the 'Muslim Community'. This was objected to by the Committee as the Guidelines did not permit utilization of MPLADS fund for religious purposes. MCD, however, had subsequently clarified that the word 'Musilim Community' had been inadvertently used in the letter and that the proposed Community Hall was not meant for any religious group but to be used by the general public. The committee was satisfied with the clarification. The other matter on which the Committee's approval was sought relate to relaxation of ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakh for a project. However, in the meantime the revised Guidelines for MPLADS, which came into force w.e.f. November, 2005, removed this ceiling limit. As such there was no need to refer such issues before the Committee in future.

The Committee, after taking into consideration the above facts, felt that permission be accorded for construction of Community Hall-cum-Market.

- (ii) Memorandum No. 20 regarding, **“Proposals from Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh, former Governor and Union Minister for (i) enhancement in the allocation of MPLADS funds; (ii) constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS; and (iii) submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee”**.

The Committee were informed that Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh, former Governor and Union Minister had sent a letter to the Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha enclosing a copy of the proposal, which he had originally addressed to the Hon'ble PM for revamping of MPLADS. In his proposal Shri Singh had suggested three measures for effective implementation and monitoring of MPLADS. These were:—

- (i) enhancement in allocation of MPLADS funds;
- (ii) consitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS; and
- (iii) submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee.

The Committee took note of the fact that the letter had been addressed to the HS and he had not given any specific direction in the matter. The Committee felt that it would only be apt to get a direction from the HS on whether the Committee should deliberate and give their views on the proposals of Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh. As such Committee desired that orders of Hon'ble Speaker be solicited in the matter.

- (iii) Memorandum No. 21 regarding, **“Selection of subject(s) for examination by Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme”**.

The Committee were apprised that unlike other Parliamentary Committees, Committee on MPLADS were yet to take up specific subjects for examination/study. Hitherto, the Committee had been doing the routine jobs mainly giving recommendation on various proposals under MPLADS. A major chunk of the job was to give relaxation in the ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakh. With the introduction of the new MPLADS Guidelines this job had also been reduced substantially. Also the committee was monitoring and

reviewing periodically the performance and problems in the implementation of the Scheme in piecemeal. The scheme as such was not seen in totality. As such the actual benefit of the scheme realized, the deficiencies and pitfalls encountered in the implementation of the scheme and the corrective measures, which could be taken for smooth implementation of the Scheme, had not been addressed by the Committee so far in the right earnest.

In the background of the recent developments and unsavoury incidents concerning MPLADS, as reported in the media, a need was felt to further strengthening the monitoring mechanism of the scheme, in order to make the scheme more effective and maintain credibility in public eyes. It was felt that it would be appropriate to undertake a detailed horizontal study on the issue and, therefore, decided to take up the following subject for examination.

‘Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme—A Review’

Towards this end, the Committee decided to insert in print and electronic media, public notice, inviting the views of public at large about the perception of the scheme, the achievements obtained and suggestions for improvement, if any, in the working/implementation of the scheme.

It was also proposed to have the feedback from Political Parties, Members of Parliament, general masses, implementing agencies, State Governments and various Central Ministries on the suggestions for improvement in the Scheme so that the objective for which the Scheme was conceptualized, achieved. In order to broaden the scope for utilization of funds under MPLADS, suggestions/views from various Central Ministries, Government of India were also suggested.

The Committee then proceeded to discuss the Constitution of sub-Committees for examining in detail the subject on State to State basis. The Committee decided in principle to constitute sub-Committees to examine the subject in detail. The Committee directed the Secretariat to submit a detailed proposal in this regard for their consideration in its next sitting.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XV

**MINUTES OF SIXTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT
LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LOK SABHA)—2005-06**

The Committee sat on Thursday, 20th April, 2006 from 1500 hours to 1600 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
3. Shri Raghuvveer Singh Kaushal
4. Shri Chandrakant Bhaurao Khaire
5. Shri Sajjan Kumar
6. Shri Asaduddin Owaisi
7. Shri Basangouda R. Patil (Yatnal)
8. Shri Narsingrao H. Suryawanshi
9. Shri Chandramani Tripathi
10. Shri Sitaram Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A.K. Singh — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration Memoranda Nos. 22 and 23. The decisions/recommendations of the Committee are given memoranda-wise seriatim:—

- (i) Memorandum No. 22 regarding, **“Proposals from Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh, former Governor and Union Minister for (i) enhancement in the allocation of MPLADS funds; (ii) constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS; and (iii) submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee”**.

The Committee took note of the above suggestions made by Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh, former Governor and Union Minister in regard to implementation and monitoring of MPLAD Scheme. The Committee deliberated at length on the issue of enhancement of funds under MPLADS. The Committee was of the opinion that the present allocation of Rs. 2 crore was insufficient, as they have to cover a vast area and population with this meagre amount. Even the MLAs in some of the States where MLALAD

Scheme exists get almost the same amount. A Lok Sabha constituency consists of seven or eight Assembly segments and with such a meagre amount the MP finds it difficult to accommodate the need of a vast area.

The Committee recommended that the MPLAD fund should be raised to Rs. 5 crore per MP, so as to make the scheme more effective.

Regarding the second issue *i.e.*, constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLAD, the Committee observed that the matter had been considered in the past also but was not found feasible. And the situation remained unchanged. Accordingly, the Committee did not approve the proposal.

Since the third issue *i.e.*, submission of all the proposals of MPLADS to Joint Parliamentary Committee was contingent upon the acceptance of the above proposal (second issue), this matter was not taken up for further consideration.

- (ii) Memorandum No. 23 regarding, **“Delay in furnishing information by Ministry of Statistics and Programme implementation”**.

The Committee were apprised that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in several cases have not furnished the factual comments/desired information due to one reason or the other and sometimes the concerned State/District Collector/officials adopted an indifferent attitude. A list of some of such cases was placed before the Committee for perusal.

The Committee were concerned to note the undue delay in giving the requisite information/taking follow up action by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and directed to call the senior officers of the Ministry at the next sitting of the Committee for explaining the position.

3. Besides the above memoranda, the Committee also deliberated on the reconstruction/rehabilitation works being undertaken from the MPLADS funds in the Tsunami affected areas of Andaman and Nicobar Islands. It noted that some observations/suggestions/recommendations were made by the Committee during its tour to the Union Territory in October, 2005 on the rehabilitation works. The Committee directed that a report be obtained from the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation covering various aspects of the activities. After receipt of the Comments, the same be placed before the Committee for their consideration at its next sitting.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XVI

**MINUTES OF SEVENTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Friday, 16th June, 2006 from 1500 hours to 1700 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
3. Shri Munawar Hasan
4. Shri Chandrakant Bhaurao Khaire
5. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
6. Shri Bhubaneshwar Prasad Mehta
7. Shri Punnulal Mohale
8. Shri A.F. Golam Osmani
9. Shri Asaduddin Owaisi
10. Shri Rajesh Verma
11. Shri Basanagouda R. Patil (Yatnal)
12. Shri P. Rajendran
13. Prof. Mahadeorao Shiwankar
14. Kunwar Manvendra Singh
15. Shri Chandramani Tripathi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A.K. Singh — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R.S. Kambo — *Deputy Secretary*

Representatives of Andaman and Nicobar Administration

1. Shri Shumsher K. Sheriff — *Chief Secretary*
2. Shri Dharam Pal — *Commissioner*
3. Shri K.S. Singh — *Deputy Commissioner*
4. Shri Naresh Kumar — *Resident Commissioner*

Representatives of Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management)

1. Shri B.S. Laili — *Secretary*
2. Dr. K.S. Sugathan — *JS(UT)*
3. Shri Ashim Khurana — *JS(DM-I)*
4. Smt. Aindri Anurag — *Director*

Representatives of Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation

1. Shri A.K. Ganeriwala — *Director*
2. Shri Dharam Pal — *Deputy Secretary*

Representatives of Planning Commission

1. Shri L.P. Sonkar — *Advisor, Tsunami Planning Commission*
2. Shri K.N. Pathak — *Deputy Advisor, Programme Evaluation Organisation*

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members and the representatives of Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration, Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management), Planning Commission and Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and apprised them of the objective of the sitting i.e. to review the progress of rehabilitation works in the Tsunami affected areas. Reference was also made to the study tour undertaken in October, 2005 to Port Blair to review rehabilitation works. Hon'ble Chairman while welcoming the witnesses to the Committee apprised them of the contents of the Direction 55(1) of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha and directed the witnesses to observe it in letter and spirit.

3. Thereafter, the Committee proceeded to discuss the works undertaken by Andaman and Nicobar Administration in the Tsunami affected areas. The following points emerged out of discussion:—

1. There has been some delay in undertaking rehabilitation and reconstruction works in Andaman and Nicobar Islands due to geographical location, scattered population, inaccessibility, material and manpower shortage, etc.
2. Five projects one school and four community halls had been identified for construction from MPLADS funds and they are likely to be completed by July/August, 2007.
3. Works are being executed by CPWD, NGOs and other Government Departments and the construction of 9,714 permanent houses are likely to be constructed by March, 2008.
4. Village level Committees have been constituted to assess the relief works and a 24 hour control room is being established to meet any future eventuality.
5. A Core Group was set up in Planning Commission and after consultation with the Union Territory Government an amount of Rs. 2,676 crore was made available for Andaman and Nicobar Islands for various relief scheme. The foundation work for housing has been made and the houses will be completed

by December, 2008. Similarly in agricultural sector, lot of initiatives had been taken on the lines of Swaminathan Committee's recommendations.

6. The recent Supreme Court directive had further aggravated the problem as only 8 per cent of the land is available for rehabilitation/reconstruction purpose and the local population is unwilling to shift to new areas. With great difficulty land has been made available and CPWD is to construct the permanent shelters which is to be earthquake proof and the same are likely to be made available by December, 2007.
 7. The problem of transfer of funds by nodal Districts to Andaman and Nicobar Islands had been almost resolved. Till date funds of 58 MPs had been received and only 12 are left. The position is being reviewed on constant basis and the entire information is available on website.
 8. Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, the nodal Ministry and the custodian of MPLADS funds regularly reviewing the progress of works and projects identified would be handled by individual task force so as to compress the implementation time and to expedite the work before the onset of monsoon.
4. The Committee took note of the views of the representatives and was not satisfied with the ongoing relief works and was critical on the following issues:—
- (1) Loss of lives as reported by the Planning Commission and Andaman and Nicobar Administration vary and there is a huge difference between the figures. If the exact figures are not known, how the relief measures can be planned or estimated;
 - (2) There has been a long delay in executing the works even though the funds were pledged long back. Even the tenders had not been opened. Normally in disasters like this of such a magnitude relief works should have been completed but the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration has failed to do so. The reason given for tardy progress of works like shortage of manpower and material cannot be accepted after one and half years of the tragedy;
 - (3) The Committee undertook a study visit in October, 2005 to assess the rehabilitation and reconstruction works and expressed its concern over the tardy progress of works. However, it appears that the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration lackadaisical attitude still continues. The Committee therefore, desired to know the specific deadlines for implementing the works;
 - (4) Background note reveals that Nodal Districts had not transferred the amounts pledged by MPs. The Committee during its study tour had recommended direct transfer of funds, however, the same has not been done;
 - (5) The limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work Guidelines on MPLADS has been done away with in the revised Guidelines on MPLADS in force from November, 2005. but still reference on this account for relaxation is being made to Ministry of statistics and Programme Implementation resulting in delays;

- (6) Delay has occurred as estimates are being revised frequently, sites are not accessible but still they had been identified for works. The delay in execution will further result in cost escalation of the project.

5. The Committee expressed its dissatisfaction over the tardy progress of works and was critical about the functioning of the various Departments, Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management), Andaman and Nicobar Island Administration, Planning Commission and Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The Committee found that there was no coordination among these Departments which are working in different directions which is major cause of delay in rehabilitation and reconstruction works. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration should have been more sensitive towards the suffering of the local population.

6. The Committee were critical on the variation of figures related to loss of lives as reported by the Planning Commission and Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration. In the absence of exact figures the Committee wondered how relief measures can be planned or estimated. The reasons given for the delay like shortage of manpower & material cannot be accepted after one and half years of the tragedy. The Committee found that even the tenders had not been opened/floated yet after one and half years of the disaster, though the magnitude of the disaster required immediate relief. Estimates had been frequently revised resulting in delay and further cost escalation of the project. The site selected for construction of community hall at Joginder Nagar, Campbell Bay, Nicobar District is not yet accessible. The funds should not have been blocked for such a project and should have been utilised for some other project. Nodal districts had failed to transfer the funds to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration.

7. The Committee during its study visit to Port Blair in October, 2005 had expressed its concern over the tardy progress of work and had recommended direct transfer of funds from Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration. However, the Committee found that same had not been given a thought and the lackadaisical attitude still continues. The Committee, therefore, desire that Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration should expedite the reconstruction and rehabilitation works and furnish a utilization/completion report to the Committee within six months.

8. At the end Hon'ble Chairman thanked the representatives of the Ministry of Home Affairs (Disaster Management), Andaman & Nicobar Islands Administration and Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and Planning Commission for appearing before the Committee.

9. A copy of the verbatim proceedings of the sitting of the Committee has been kept on records.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XVII

**MINUTES OF EIGHTH SITTING OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF
PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Thursday, 3rd August, 2006 from 1500 hours to 1600 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Munawar Hasan
3. Shri A. Krishnaswamy
4. Shri Sadashivrao Dadoba Mandlik
5. Shri Punnulal Mohale
6. Shri P. Rajendran
7. Shri Narsingrao H. Suryawanshi
8. Shri Chandrapal Singh Yadav

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Shri A.K. Singh | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri R.S. Kambo | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri P.D. Mahawar | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 4. Shri Kushal Sarkar | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

2. At the outset, the Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS and thereafter the Committee took up for consideration Draft Report and Memoranda Nos. 24 and 25. The decisions/recommendations are given as follows:—

- (1) **Draft Report on the business transacted by the Committee during the period August, 2004 to October, 2005.**

The Committee decided to defer the consideration and adoption of the Report under reference to a future date.

- (2) Memorandum No. 24 regarding, "**Proposal for allocating more than Rs. 25 Lakh from MPLADS for various works for Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust, Surat.**"

The Committee deliberated over the proposal for allocating more than Rs. 25 lakh from MPLADS for various works for Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust. Taking note of the decision of the Government to consider proposals costing more than Rs. 25 lakhs for a particular registered Society/Trust received by District Authority before the issue of the revised Guidelines *w.e.f.* 16.11.2005, the Committee decided to approve it by giving relaxation in Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS as the proposal was received prior to the issue of revised Guidelines.

- (3) Memorandum No. 25 regarding, **"Proposal for allocating more than Rs. 25 lakhs from MPLADS funds for construction of Human Resource Development and Cultural Centre, Convention Hall at Vyavasayi Vidya Pratisthan, Virda-Vajdi, Taluka Rajkot."**

The Committee considered the proposal for allocating more than Rs. 25 lakhs from MPLADS funds for construction of Human Resource Development and Cultural Centre, Convention Hall at Vyavasayi Vidya Pratisthan and decided to relax the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work as stipulated in Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS. The Committee accordingly approved the proposal.

The Committee desired that Government should also furnish the details of similar cases/projects/works, which they can consider by relaxing Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines.

The Committee also took note of the fact that there are a number of projects/works/cases, which were entitled to draw funds from MPLADS as per the provision of the then Guidelines. However, with the enforcement of new Guidelines *w.e.f.* 16.11.2005 funding under MPLADS cannot be made. The Committee desire that the details of such cases/works/projects received in the Ministry/District Authority, date-wise be furnished to them for their consideration.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XVIII

**MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS
OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
(LOK SABHA)**

The Committee sat on Thursday, 28th September, 2006 from 1130 hours to 1230 hours.

PRESENT

Shri Prasanna Acharya — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Ilyas Azmi
3. Shri Pankaj Choudhary
4. Shri Surendra Prakash Goyal
5. Shri Raghuvir Singh Kaushal
6. Shri Sajjan Kumar
7. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Libra
8. Dr. Chinta Mohan
9. Shri A.F.G. Osmani
10. Shri Toofani Saroj
11. Kunwar Manvendra Singh
12. Shri Sita Ram Singh
13. Shri Narsingrao H. Suryawanshi
14. Shri Chandra Pal Singh Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri J.P. Sharma — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri R.S. Kambo — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri P.D. Mahawar — *Under Secretary*

2. The Committee considered the Draft 13th Report on the activities undertaken by the Committee during the period, August 2004 to August 2006 and adopted the same without any modification.

3. The Committee authorized the Chairman to finalize the report and also to make verbal and consequential changes, if any, arising out of factual verification by the Ministry and present the same to Lok Sabha.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX XIX

(Vide Chapter 1 of the Report)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 9

Subject: Contribution by Members of Parliament from their quota of MPLADS funds towards rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed communications dated 18 and 25 February, 2005 enclosing therewith the priority list of works suggested by Government of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 25 February, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to refer to Lok Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. 13/2/2004-MPLADSC dated 23rd February, 2005 on the above subject.

This Ministry has so far received consents from 142 Lok Sabha Members and 148 Rajya Sabha Members for Rs. 16.62 crore and Rs. 24.45 crore for rehabilitation works in the tsunami affected areas.

The Government of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala have sent to this Ministry the priority lists of works which have been forwarded to the Chairman, MPLADS Committee, Rajya Sabha and the MPLADS Committee, Lok Sabha on 1st February, 2005 for their views in the matter. Their views are awaited.

After receipt of the recommendations of the aforesaid Committees, locations and projects to be taken up and the procedure for release of fund will be finalised."

3. The Minister of State (Independent Charge) of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in his letter dated 18 February, 2005 addressed to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS stated as under:—

"There has been a good response to the appeals made by the Speaker, Lok Sabha and the Chairman, Rajya Sabha, to the Members of Parliament to accord their consent to take up rehabilitation works in the Tsunami affected areas. While a few Members have suggested works to be executed in specific areas, most of the MPs have left the choice of work to the Government.

In order to prepare suitable shelf of works, I asked my officers to discuss with the Chief Secretary and the concerned officers of the State Governments and UT Administration to seek their suggestions in the matter. Accordingly, Secretary and Additional Secretary held discussions with the Chief Secretary and the concerned officers of the Governments of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

During discussions, the State Governments were of the firm view that the transfer, utilisation and accountability of MPLADS funds should be done as per the extant Guidelines. They pointed out the funds for rehabilitation are flowing from various sources, namely, Government of India, State Governments, Prime Minister's Relief Fund, Chief Minister's Relief Fund, NGOs etc. In the above circumstances, to avoid duplication and omission, they have, prepared a priority list to meet the locally felt needs. During the course of discussion, it was pointed out that works of community assets of significance and importance would be better appreciated. The record notes of discussions including the priority list of works suggested by the State Governments and UT Administration is attached. In view of the above, it would be appropriate to implement the priority works suggested by the State Government and UT Administration.

With respect to the Lok Sabha, the list of MPs who have accorded their consent is enclosed. It is expected that in the course of year more MPs may come forward to give their consent. MPLAD Funds will be allocated for identified works from the amounts consented by specific MPs. Their names will be inscribed in a plaque, which will be installed when the works are completed. Monthly progress reports of the sanctioned works will be provided to the concerned MPs and to Central and State Governments. Due regard will be paid to the specific choices indicated by any MP when identifying works.

In this context, taking into account the severity of damage in different States and UTs, it is broadly proposed to allocate the MPLADS fund accrued by the recommendations of the MPs in the following ratio:—

Andaman & Nicobar Islands	40
Tamil Nadu	40
Andhra Pradesh, Kerala and Pondicherry	20

I am sure that the Members will be anxious to ensure the grounding of the identified works early and hence I solicit your cooperation to the above proposed course of action."

4. The Committee may consider the proposed priority list of works forwarded by Government of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala to be undertaken in the tsunami affected areas for rehabilitation and reconstruction purpose.

New Delhi;

Dated the 16 March, 2005.

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 10

Subject: Contribution by Members of Parliament from their quota of MPLADS funds towards rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

The Committee on MPLADS (Lok Sabha) at their sitting held on 18 March, 2005 considered the priority list of works forwarded by Government of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala to be undertaken in the tsunami affected areas for rehabilitation and reconstruction purpose and decided as follows:—

- (a) MPLADS funds contributed for tsunami affected areas be released and utilised in the ratio proposed by the Ministry.
- (b) Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should monitor and coordinate the release and utilization of funds in consultation with the authorities of concerned State Governments.
- (c) funds should be utilised only for works permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- (d) The nodal District Collector of the affected area should ensure execution of work in a time frame.
- (e) Details of each MP's contribution i.e. release of amount from each MP's fund to District Collector, place of work, nature of the project etc., be furnished to each MP and the Committee.
- (f) Each Hon'ble Member who has contributed from MPLADS funds should be regularly informed about the progress of works undertaken from the amount contributed by him.
- (g) The details of the utilization of the funds of each MP should be regularly furnished to the MP and the Committee on monthly basis.

2. As per the proposed priority list of works forwarded by Government of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala to be undertaken in the tsunami affected areas the following items as per the Guidelines on MPLADS have been classified as permissible and non-permissible works:

Permissible works

1. Construction/Reconstruction of bridges
2. Construction of buildings for old age persons

3. Reconstruction of the pilgrim town of Velankanni (roads, street light, water supply, drainage, pay and use toilets, hospital and groynes)
4. Construction/Reconstruction of roads
5. Construction/Reconstruction of Anganwadis
6. Construction of new Public Health Centre and additional block for PHC
7. Purchase of ambulance
8. Additional block for Government school
9. Construction of library cum common study hall
10. Construction of community hall
11. Construction of community toilets, public toilets
12. Construction of school buildings
13. Providing water supply and toilets in schools
14. Construction of school with hostel facility

Non-permissible works

1. Construction of service home
2. Construction of children home
3. Desalination plants
4. Reconstruction of District Headquarters Hospital
5. Creation of modern infrastructure facilities at harbours
6. Reconstruction of noon meal centres, fish market and vegetable market
7. Centre for fisheries science and technology development
8. Cyclone/tsunami shelter
9. Training cum production centre
10. Fish drying yards
11. Disaster shelter
12. Community water harvesting
13. Storage sheds for nets etc.
14. Cold storage plants
15. Fisheries Department—Net mending centers
16. Construction of fishing dry platform
17. Panchayati Raj—Construction of additional room in MPES
18. Medical Health—construction of sub-centre building
19. Construction of check dam

20. Providing oil Gensets

21. Construction of super speciality department like Cardiology, Nephrology and Neurology

3. In addition to this Hon'ble Members S/Shri Rahul Gandhi, Zora Singh Mann and Swadesh Chakraborty have suggested specific proposals (i) funds be utilised for reconstruction of an orphanage for orphaned children in the coastal district of Nagapattinam in Tamil Nadu; (ii) funds be utilised for relief/resettlement work in Great Nicobar Island, for the villages of Govindnagar and Jogindernagar near Campbell Bay on Great Nicobar; and (iii) funds be exclusively utilised for relief works in tsunami affected areas of Andaman and Nicobar Islands respectively for execution from MPLADS funds contributed by them for tsunami affected areas.

4. The Committee may consider.

New Delhi;

Dated the 8th April, 2005.

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME
MEMORANDUM NO. 18

Subject: Contributions by Members of Parliament, Lok Sabha from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

Hon'ble Members of Parliament, Lok Sabha in response to the appeal made by Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha *vide* his letter dated 11 January, 2005 had contributed from their MPLADS fund for undertaking rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. So far 187 Members of Lok Sabha had contributed Rs. 2118.51 lakh from their MPLADS funds.

2. The Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha in their sitting held on 18 March, 2005 deliberated over the priority list of works forwarded by Government of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh & Kerala to be undertaken from MPLADS and decided as follows:—

- (a) MPLADS funds contributed for tsunami affected areas be released and utilised in the ratio proposed by the Ministry i.e. 40% to Tamil Nadu, 40% to Andaman and Nicobar Islands and 20% to Pondicherry, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala.
- (b) Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should Monitor and coordinate the release and utilization of funds in consultation with the authorities of concerned State Governments.
- (c) Funds should be utilised only for works permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- (d) The nodal district Collector of the affected area should ensure execution of work in a time frame.
- (e) Details of each MP's contribution i.e. release of amount from each MP's fund to District Collector, place of work, nature of the project etc., be furnished to each MP and the Committee.
- (f) Each Hon'ble Member who has contributed from MPLADS funds should be regularly informed about the progress of works undertaken from the amount contributed by him.
- (g) The details of the utilization of the funds of each MP should be regularly furnished to the MP and the Committee on monthly basis.

3. The Committee in their sitting held on 11 April, 2005 had further decided that if an MP who has contributed from his MPLADS funds towards tsunami rehabilitation and reconstruction works and gives suggestion for the utilization of funds contributed for specific purpose/work, then the amount he has contributed should be used only for the specific suggested work.

4. However the Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha visited the Tsunami affected areas in Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry and Andaman and Nicobar Islands from 1st to 7th February, 2005 and held discussions with State Governments and Union Territory Administration. Based on the discussions, the Committee recommended following rehabilitation works at an estimated cost of Rs. 14.89 crores to be undertaken from MPLADS funds contributed by Members of Rajya Sabha:—

- (i) Establishment of Fisheries Training Institute one each at Karaikal in Pondicherry and Cuddalore in Tamil Nadu.
- (ii) Three orphanages — two at Nagapattinam and one at Kanniyakumari in Tamil Nadu.
- (iii) One ITI/workshed at Car Nicobar in Andaman and Nicobar Islands.
- (iv) School hostels for 25 orphans each at Campbell Bay, Teressa and Katchal Islands in Andaman and Nicobar Islands.
- (v) Institutionalised mechanism for provision of artificial limbs to injured/handicapped persons.

5. In the meeting between Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha and Hon'ble Chairman, Rajya Sabha held on 3 May, 2005, it was decided that a joint meeting of the Chairmen of Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha be held to finalise a common plan of action for utilization of funds donated by Hon'ble Members of Parliament for undertaking relief and rehabilitation works in the Tsunami affected areas.

6. In this regard, Rajya Sabha Secretariat *vide* their note dated 10 June, 2005 (Annexure) has stated that the Chairman, Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha based on their Gujarat experience had further decided as follows:—

- (a) The Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha may be the custodian of the funds contributed by the MPs of Rajya Sabha out of their MPLADS funds.
- (b) The funds may be kept in a separate Bank Account to be opened in the name of the Committee on MPLADS of Rajya Sabha. The account so opened, will be operated by an authorized representative of the Committee.
- (c) The Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha may appoint/identify an executing agency, in consultation with concerned State Government/Union Territories administration for the rehabilitation projects that are to be undertaken in the Tsunami affected areas.
- (d) The State Government of Tamil Nadu/Union Territories Administration of Pondicherry and Andaman and Nicobar Islands may be requested for allotment of land, free of cost, in the places identified by the Committee for rehabilitation projects.

- (e) Design and cost of the projects may be approved by the Committee.
- (f) The Committee will periodically monitor the physical progress of the project, executed by the agency.

7. The Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha had also proposed that keeping in view the fact that natural calamities may occur in future also, surplus funds after meeting the cost of the projects approved by both the Committees be kept in a separate account managed by a Trust consisting of MPs of both the Houses and certain distinguished ex-MPs. The trust would also look into other areas where relief could be provided like helping handicapped children, orphans etc.

8. Rajya Sabha Secretariat had further proposed that the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha may consider the following proposals:—

- (i) Since the funds so generously given by the MPs of both the Houses are not for any projects in specified constituencies and cover the felt needs, whether it would be appropriate to keep these moneys in a separate fund to be managed by a Joint Committee consisting of representatives of the MPLADS Committee of both the Houses. Money could be released from time to time for the approved projects by this Joint Committee.
- (ii) Whether a Trust could be created consisting of MPs of the MPLADS Committee of both the Houses and some ex-MPs out of the surplus money which may be left after execution of the approved projects? This Trust could cater to the immediate needs of future calamities and certain other physically challenged children who were either handicapped or orphaned.

9. Accordingly, a joint meeting of the Hon'ble Chairmen both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha was held on 16 June, 2005 and the issue of formation of Joint Committee and formation of a trust consisting of MPs of both the Houses and distinguished ex-MPs so as to keep the funds in a separate account managed by trust were deliberated and it was decided that the matter would be discussed in the sitting of the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha before arriving at any decision.

10. The Committee may consider the following proposals forwarded by Rajya Sabha Secretariat:—

- (i) **Since the funds so generously given by the MPs of both the Houses are not for any projects in specified constituencies and cover the felt needs, whether it would be appropriate to keep these moneys in a separate fund to be managed by a Joint Committee consisting of representatives of the MPLADS Committee of both the Houses. Money could be released from time to time for the approved projects by this Joint Committee.**
- (ii) **Whether a Trust could be created consisting of MPs of the MPLADS Committee of both the Houses and some ex-MPs out of the surplus money which may be left after execution of the approved projects? This Trust could cater to the immediate needs of future calamities and certain other physically challenged children who were either handicapped or orphaned.**

New Delhi;

Dated the 1st July, 2005.

Addenda to Memorandum No. 18 regarding contributions by Members of Parliament, Lok Sabha from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas of Coastal India and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

The difficulties in formation of joint committee and trust consisting of MPs of both the Houses and distinguished ex-MPs so as to keep the funds in a separate account to be managed by the trust were deliberated in the joint meeting of the Hon'ble Chairmen, Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha held on 16 June, 2005 and it was decided that the comments of Committee Branch-I (CB-I) may also be obtained on the following issues:—

- (i) Whether a Parliamentary Committee is juristic entity to undertake such kind of works?
- (ii) Whether a Joint Committee consisting of representatives of MPLADS Committee of both the Houses (Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha) can be constituted and a separate fund out of MPLADS funds be created by the Joint Committee?
- (iii) Whether Trust/foundation could be created consisting of MPs of the MPLADS Committee of both the Houses and some ex-MPs to deal with natural calamities in future and whether the trust/foundation can suggest/recommend/monitor/choose implementing agencies so as to undertake rehabilitation works in the affected areas out of the surplus money which may be left after execution of the approved projects?
- (iv) Who will be the statutory authority to operate the accounts?
- (v) Whether Government can be asked to create a separate account/fund for natural calamities occurring in future and MPs of both the Committees can manage/operate the funds and whether some distinguished ex-MPs can also be nominated to operate/manage the funds meant for natural calamities?

2. Committee Branch-I *vide* their note dated 27 June, 2005 has furnished their point-wise comments on the aforesaid issues which are as follows:—

- (i) By definition, a juristic or legal entity is an entity (as a corporation or labour union) having under the law rights and responsibilities and especially the capacity to sue and be sued. The Rules of Procedure in Lok Sabha do not define the Parliamentary Committees as such. It may be stated that under the provisions of the Constitution and Rules of Procedure, the proceedings of Parliament and its Committees are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Court. On the other hand Parliamentary Committees have been vested with certain privileges and powers to enable them to discharge their mandate effectively. The Parliamentary Committees, have also been empowered to seek to punish through the House any one for any act of omission or commission amounting to contempt or breach of its privileges. Viewed in this context, a Parliamentary Committee cannot be called a juristic or legal entity.

- (ii) & (iii) A Joint Parliamentary Committee is constituted either on a motion adopted by one House and concurred in by the other, or by communication between the Presiding Officers of the two Houses, or under the rules. However, the mandate of such a Joint Committee should be within the mandate of the Parliament. In other words, it should not infringe upon the jurisdiction of the Executive.

Creation of a trust/foundation with funds drawn out of MPLADS funds and its administration by the proposed JPC with powers to disburse funds for implementation of schemes/projects for the rehabilitation of the victims of natural calamities may involve the question of office of profit. However, the opinion of the nodal Ministry concerned may be sought in this regard.

So far no Committee of this kind has been set up with executive and financial powers.

- (iv) No comments.

- (v) Considering the above position, it is desirable to consult the Ministries of (i) Finance; and (ii) Law and Justice; and (iii) Statistics and Programme Implementation regarding creation of a separate account/fund for natural calamities and its management by the members of MPLADS Committees of both the Houses and ex-MPs etc.

3. The Committee may consider the proposals forwarded by Rajya Sabha Secretariat as given in Para 10 of the Memorandum No. 18.

New Delhi;
Dated 1st July, 2005.

APPENDIX XX

Vide Chapter 2 of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 9

Subject: Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS).

Shri Somnath Chatterjee, Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha addressed a letter dated 23 July, 2005 to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS on the observations of audit Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (1998 and 2001), and adverse criticism of MPLAD Scheme by Shri Era Sezhiyan, ex-MP and ex-Chairman, PAC, in a study undertaken by Institute of Social Science, New Delhi for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha, in his letter, *inter alia*, stated as follows:—

"Your attention may have been drawn to two reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, mainly, Report for the year ended March 1997 (Union Government (Civil) Performance Appraisals No. 3 of 1998) on the functioning of MPLADS (Chapter 5, Pages 85 to 109) and also to another Report for the year ended March, 2000 on the MPLADS. The later report deals entirely with MPLADS.

Recently, Shri Era Sezhiyan, former member of Lok Sabha and former Chairman of P.A.C. has prepared a Report about the functioning of the MPLADS, a copy of which is enclosed for your ready reference.

I shall be happy if the MPLADS Committee under your Chairmanship looks into these reports and give their views and comments thereon.

You may be aware that divergent views are being expressed on the proper implementation of the Scheme and in fact, many Hon'ble Members are even questioning the propriety of the continuance of the Scheme. In view of the aforesaid, I would be happy to receive the Committee's opinion in the matter before any further step is taken."

3. The Audit Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General—1998 on MPLAD Scheme had pointed out various discrepancies in implementation of MPLAD Scheme and gross violation of Guidelines on MPLADS. The findings of the Audit Report are as follows:—

- (i) **Shortfall in utilisation of MPLADS funds:** Funds under MPLADS have not been utilized fully. Heavy balance of Rs. 1039.10 crore were lying unspent

with the District Collectors as of March, 1997. The Major States having large unspent balances were: Andhra Pradesh (Rs. 98.74 crore), Bihar (Rs. 100.64 crore), Gujarat (Rs. 75.35 crore), Karnataka (Rs. 69.95 crore), Kerala (Rs. 57.50 crore), Maharashtra (Rs. 109.83 crore), Orissa (Rs. 56.83 crore), Tamil Nadu (Rs. 74.04 crore), Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 104.07 crore) and West Bengal (Rs. 74.57 crore).

- (ii) **Unspent balances not refunded by implementing agencies:** Implementing agencies in 37 Districts of 8 States/UTs have not refunded the unspent amount of Rs. 3.08 crore even though the works awarded were completed or cancelled or had not been taken up.
- (iii) **Non-submission of Utilisation Certificates:** Implementing agencies were required to submit utilization certificates in prescribed forms to District Collectors after completion of the work. However, utilization certificates for Rs. 339.57 crore had not been received.
- (iv) **Sharing of funds:** MPLADS funds have been shared with other funds of other scheme in total violation of the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- (v) **Supervision/centage charges:** The Minister of State for Planning and Programme Implementation addressed a letter in August 1995 to all the Chief Ministers requesting them to consider MPLADS as an exception for levy of supervision/centage charges by implementing departments. The Ministry reiterated this in the revised Guidelines of February, 1997. However, centage charges of Rs. 3.90 crore at the rate ranging between 1 to 24 per cent were levied during 1993-97. The levy of supervision/centage charges reduced the funds available for use on the Scheme.
- (vi) **Incomplete/abandoned works:** During the period 1994-97, 802 works in 33 districts of 15 States were either abandoned or left incomplete midway due to dispute pertaining to title of land, insufficient provision of funds, wrong selection of executing agencies etc. An amount of Rs. 5.75 crore had already been spent on these works prior to their abandonment.
- (vii) **Violation in entrustment of works to contractors:** Works were entrusted to contractors by District Collectors in total violation of the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- (viii) **Works executed without any recommendation from the MPs:** District Collectors incurred an expenditure of Rs. 51.52 crore on execution of 4569 works which were not recommended by MPs concerned in 28 Districts in 13 States.
- (ix) **Works sanctioned on the recommendation of the MPs representatives:** Works to the tune of Rs. 24.89 crore were sanctioned by the District Collectors on the recommendation of the representatives of the Hon'ble MPs in total violation of the Guidelines of MPLADS.
- (x) **Loss of interest accrued on MPLADS funds:** In large number of cases in 40 districts of 15 States/UTs, indicating operation of non-interest bearing account, non-refunding of interest earned by executing agencies to the Scheme

funds, transfer of funds to Revenue Deposits/Civil Deposits of State Governments on the instruction of State Government resulting in loss of interest aggregating Rs. 3.67 crore during 1993-97.

- (xi) **Interest accrued and its utilisation:** The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation issued instructions that interest accrued on the funds released under the Scheme should not be utilised till a decision was taken by the Government in that regard. However, interest accrued on MPLADS funds amounting to Rs. 46.70 lakh were utilized which was in contravention of the instructions of the Ministry.
- (xii) **Execution of works not permissible under the MPLAD Scheme:** Works not permissible under the MPLAD Scheme were taken up in total violation of the Guidelines on MPLADs. Following works not permissible under the Scheme were carried out:—
- (a) Rs. 4.06 crore was spent on inadmissible works of construction of office/residential buildings.
 - (b) Funds amounting to Rs. 1.53 crore were spent on works belonging to commercial organizations, trusts, registered societies, private institutions or cooperative institutions etc., in total violation of the Guidelines of MPLADS.
 - (c) In 45 districts of 13 States expenditure of Rs. 4.86 crore was incurred for repair and maintenance of 675 works in total disregard of the Guidelines on MPLADS.
 - (d) Grants and loans are prohibited items under Illustrative List of works not permissible under the Guidelines of MPLADS. However, an amount of Rs. 17.02 crore were sanctioned for grants and loans out of MPLADS funds.
 - (e) An amount of Rs. 2.05 crore were spent on the purchase of store or stock (Generators, submersible pumpsets, stabilizers, furniture items, fixtures with tube lights and lamps, water cooler, tractor with dozer, boats, books, TV, VCR, duplicating machine, electric typewriter, deep freezer, air conditioner etc.) not permissible under the MPLAD Scheme.
 - (f) An amount of Rs. 58.75 lakh in six states namely Andhra Pradesh, Manipur, Nagaland, Orissa, Tripura and Uttar Pradesh were spent on works related to religious places.
- (xiii) **Failure to maintain asset register:** Nodal authorities are required to maintain an Asset Register. However, in 23 States/Union Territories asset registers were not maintained for the works completed.
- (xiv) **Shortcomings in the Monitoring mechanism:** Even after the clear guidelines for monitoring the Scheme, test check of records in the Ministry and various States revealed following weaknesses/shortcomings:—
- (b) Nodal department was not designated in the States of Meghalaya, Manipur, Arunachal Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, West Bengal and Mizoram.

- (c) Inspection of 10 per cent of works every year by DCs was either not conducted or relevant records of such inspection not maintained/furnished in test checked districts.
- (d) The Department of Programme Implementation has not laid down schedule of inspection prescribing the minimum number of field visits for each supervisory level functionary of the implementing agency as envisaged in the Scheme though the Scheme is in operation for more than three years.
- (xv) **No proper evaluation of the Scheme:** The MPLAD Scheme has been operation since 1993-94, however, no evaluation has been done to look into the achievements made with regard to the objectives of the Scheme.

4. Similarly, the Audit Report of the **Comptroller and Auditor General—2001** on MPLAD Scheme had pointed out many irregularities and deficiencies in implementation of MPLAD Scheme. The findings of the Audit Report are as under:—

- (i) **Poor administration of utilisation of the MPLADS funds:** The unspent funds as on 31 March, 2000, *i.e.* at the end of the period covered by audit, were Rs. 1796.59 crore, which constituted 35.80 per cent of total releases. It shows the failure of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to have better utilization of scarce public financial resources.
- (ii) **District Collectors failed to obtain Utilisation Certificates from the implementing agencies:** District Collectors are required to have a comprehensive picture of the utilization of the funds, by keeping a close watch over the utilization of the funds released. In the CAG's Report of 1998, a mention was made of many cases where the DCs did not obtain the UCs after completion of works which persisted in the present audit also. In the audit sample of 111 constituencies, covering 17 States and UTs, audit found that the DCs had obtained the UCs only in 29.78 per cent of total works. The works of over Rs. 161 crore were not supported by the UCs.
- (iii) **Unspent balance not refunded by the Implementing Agencies:** The implementing agencies had not refunded the amount to the District Collectors even after the works were cancelled. In audit sample of 241 constituencies, implementing agencies of 85 constituencies retained Rs. 8.13 crore out of Rs. 24.55 crore released to them, which worked out to 33.12 per cent of total funds released to them during 1997-2000. The malady had persisted despite mention in the CAG's earlier Report of 1998.
- (iv) **Irregular clubbing of MPLADS funds with the funds of other Schemes:** The Guidelines on MPLADS prescribed that its funds may not to be used for other schemes except for partially meeting the cost of a larger work only in case where it results in completion of the work and the part of work requiring such resource application is clearly identifiable. However, audit examination of 96 cases in 18 constituencies of 10 States revealed irregular clubbing involving Rs. 3.21 crore of scheme funds. The malady persisted despite mention in the CAG's Report of 1998.

- (v) **Diversion of funds to inadmissible works:** The CAG's report of 1998 had mentioned instances where MPLADS funds had been used for inadmissible works under the MPLAD Scheme. In the audit sample of 18 constituencies in 8 States it was found that District Collectors have accorded sanction of Rs. 18.33 crore to following inadmissible works.
- (a) An expenditure of Rs. 9.16 crore on 518 works of commercial organizations, trusts, clubs, societies, private institutions, etc., were accorded in 47 constituencies of 17 States 2 UTs.
 - (b) An expenditure of Rs. 26.59 crore was incurred on 1552 repair and maintenance works such as repair/resurfacing of roads, streets, repair of school buildings, walls ponds, drains, community hall, parks, inspection bungalow etc.
 - (c) The District Collectors allowed expenditure of Rs. 74.12 lakh on 66 works belonging to places of religious worship such as development work of Ram Krishna Mission, construction of fishery tanks with masjids, boundary walls of temples, sarai, guest houses in temples, construction of Gumpa etc.
 - (d) Irregular expenditure of Rs. 54.55 lakh in the audit sample of 13 works of memorial buildings in five States involving seven constituencies (Assam: Rs. 5.00 lakh, Bihar: Rs. 31.05 lakh, Karnataka: Rs. 1.00 lakh, Manipur: Rs. 3.00 lakh and West Bengal: Rs. 14.50 lakh) has been permitted for construction of memorials.
 - (e) There was irregular sanction of loans, grants and donations totaling Rs. 81.45 lakh, in contravention of the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- (vi) **Delay in sanction of works:** District Collectors in 17 constituencies of six States and two UTs had sanctioned works extending upto 761 days. The reasons for delay as given to audit were: non-receipt of technical sanctions in time, change of site by the MP, shortage of funds, announcements of code of conduct for elections, late receipt of plans and estimates etc., which are irrelevant.
- (vii) **Delay in completion of works:** In seven States, viz., Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Mizoram, Rajasthan and Tripura and one UT, Chandigarh, it was found that in the completion of 568 works at a total cost of Rs. 7.30 crore, the delay in completion was upto five years.
- (viii) **Execution of works without the recommendation of the MPs:** In the audit sample of eight States, the DCs incurred an expenditure of Rs. 3.97 crore on 570 works not recommended by the MPs. This serious breach in propriety persisted despite similar mention in the CAG's Report of 1998.
- (ix) **Works executed without technical sanction/administrative approval:** In an audit sample of 20 constituencies of 10 States and one Union Territory, 3397 works at an estimated cost of Rs. 35.79 crore were taken up for execution without technical sanction while eight works at an estimated cost of Rs. 2.90 lakh in

three constituencies of one State were taken up for execution without any administrative approval during 1997-2000. The practice of getting the works executed without technical sanction/administrative approval persisted despite mention in the CAG's Report of 1998.

- (x) **Suspected fraud/misappropriation of funds:** There were 13 cases of suspected fraud/misappropriation of funds in seven sample States, involving Rs. 118.36 lakh. While in one case (Tamil Nadu) the amount had been refunded and in another case (Madhya Pradesh), recovery has stated to be in process.
- (xi) **Incomplete/abandoned works:** In 31 sample constituencies of 14 States/UTs, 99 works were either abandoned or left incomplete midway due to dispute over title to land, insufficient provision of funds, objection raised by local people/government department; unsatisfactory progress of works etc. An amount of Rs. 1.10 crore was already spent on these works prior to their abandonment.
- (xii) **Payment of supervision, centage charges:** The MPLADS does not allow the implementing agencies to collect any administrative charges, centage etc., for their services of preparatory work, implementing, supervision etc. Yet, the audit found that centage charges of Rs. 278.75 lakh were charged in 480 cases in 17 States/UTs during 1997-2000.
- (xiii) **Non-maintenance of records of assets:** The nodal agencies did not maintain the asset registers as required under MPLADS. The malady persisted despite mention in the CAG's Report 1998.
- (xiv) **Mishandling of assets:** The district Collectors in most of the States did not plan the upkeep and maintenance of assets before their creation and the completed assets were not handed properly to the user agencies. The District Collectors and the implementing agencies did not adequately followed the transfer of assets resulting in mishandling of the assets. In some cases, the created assets under the Scheme were found useless.

5. The Reports of the C&AG on MPLAD Scheme were to be examined by the Public Accounts Committee. Accordingly, the PAC Branch was requested to furnish their action taken report on the Audit Reports relating to MPLADS. However, the PAC in their comments dated 19 March, 2005 has stated that—

"A note has been received from MPLADS Committee Branch seeking action taken report on the Audit Reports relating to MPLADS for the information of Hon'ble Speaker. In this regard, it is submitted that paragraph 5 of Audit Report No. 3 of 1998 and the entire Audit Report No. 3A of 2001—both relating to MPLADS—were selected for detailed examination by the PAC (1998-1999) and the PAC (2001-2002) during the respective period. However, due to paucity of time, the Committee could not pursue these subjects. Subsequent Committees did not re-select these subjects for detailed examination."

6. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation were requested to furnish their factual comments on the action taken on the Audit Reports of C&AG of

1998 and 2001. The Ministry *vide* their O.M. dated 20 May, 2005, *inter alia*, stated as follows:—

It is a fact that C&AG has submitted two Audit Reports—one for the period ending March, 1997 and the other for the period ending March, 2000. Both these reports were submitted to Lok Sabha in 1998 and 2001. Brief details of the audit paras and the action taken by this Ministry are given in the succeeding paragraphs.

There are 34 audit paras in the first report and 45 audit paras in the second report. The audit paras are mainly on the following:—

- i. Continued poor administration of utilization of the MPLADS funds.**
- ii. The Ministry released the MPLADS funds without any correlation with their end use.**
- iii. Non-receipt of utilization certificates from implementing agencies.**
- iv. Non-refund of unspent balance by implementing agencies.**
 - v. Mis-reporting of financial progress of works by the DCs.**
 - vi. Irregular clubbing of MPLADS funds with funds of other schemes.**
 - vii. Irregular diversion of funds to inadmissible purposes.**
- viii. Execution of inadmissible works.**
- ix. Sanction of works for commercial and private organizations.**
 - x. Irregular sanction of repair and maintenance works.**
 - xi. Purchase of stores out of MPLADS funds.**
 - xii. Irregular expenditure on places of religious worships.**
 - xiii. Irregular expenditure on memorials.**
 - xiv. Irregular sanction for works on private land etc.**

Replies to the 9 audit paras of the first report and 14 audit paras of second report have already been forwarded to the Director General of Audit for vetting.

The remaining 25 audit paras of the first report and 31 audit paras of the second report pertain to the State Governments/UT Administrations and District Administrations with whom the matter is being pursued vigorously through letters, reminders, personal discussions. Information from some States/UTs/District Administrations have been received and from some others is still awaited. Replies to these audit paras will be forwarded to the Director General of Audit for vetting as soon as information from all the States/UTs is received. Therefore, replies to all the paras of the two reports will be submitted to the Public Accounts Committee."

7. The findings of the Audit Reports highlights that the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme is not satisfactory. Audit findings had suggested that a significant part of the released money had not been utilised and the works executed in large

number of cases did not qualify for the definition of durable assets. A large number of them remained incomplete thereby defeating the very objective of the MPLAD Scheme. Several other works were either inadmissible or were not recommended by the Members of Parliament. The main findings of the Audit Report (1998 & 2001) pertaining to the implementation of the Scheme are—

- Funds under MPLADS have not been utilized fully and are lying unspent with the District Collectors.
- Implementing agencies had failed to submit utilization certificates in prescribed forms to District Collectors after completion of the work.
- MPLADS funds have been shared with other funds of other scheme in total violation of the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- Works had been left abandoned or incomplete midway.
- Works had been entrusted to contractors in total violation of the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- Funds were sanctioned by the District Collectors on the recommendation of the representatives of the Hon'ble MPs in violation of the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- Funds have been spent on inadmissible works like— repair and maintenance of works, grants and loans, works related to religious places etc., in total disregard of the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- Nodal authorities have failed to maintain an Asset Register.
- The implementing agencies had not refunded the amount to the District Collectors even after the works were cancelled.
- Implementing agencies had collected administrative charges, centage etc., for their services of preparatory work, implementing, supervision etc.

8. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation who is responsible for monitoring and evaluation of Scheme had admitted that they are not in a position to effectively monitor the Scheme at the operational level. In fact the Ministry did not have any picture of works under implementation and quoted the Committee of Secretaries decision that central monitoring of large number of works was neither practicable nor desirable. The Ministry's view runs counter to the stated role of the Ministry in the area of monitoring as provided in the Guidelines. The Ministry's role, in effect, was confined to providing resources only without any responsibility for its use. The Audit had found that Ministry had not done any book-keeping and it was unable to provide even the particulars of year-wise release of funds to district heads and the expenditure incurred. The Ministry has also failed to use the information technology facilities to monitor constituency wise progress and their role is limited to having an overall picture of the amount released.

9. The Audit Report has, therefore, desired that the Central Government should thoroughly review the present arrangements for the implementation of the Scheme. Such a review should cover the present manner of resource transfer as also the technical and administrative arrangements.

10. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation commissioned a study by Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission, to evaluate the design, implementation and impact of the scheme and to identify the areas of weakness and strength for the improved performance of the Scheme. The study was based on the data and information gathered for the period 1994-95 to 1998-99. The Evaluation Report was submitted in November, 2001. Some of the findings of Evaluation Report is as under:—

- (i) Although the cost-estimates of a work recommended by the MPs is required to be worked out at time of sanctioning of the work, in reality it was found that the cost estimates were prepared afterwards, perhaps made to conform to the amount allocated by the MP. Consequently many of the works were either completed by supplementing the fund allocated by the MP by fund procured from other sources or compromising the quality of the asset created.
- (ii) There was financial mismanagement of the Scheme and consequent inflated reporting of amount spent.
- (iii) Non-maintenance of a satisfactory accounting system for the Scheme and absence of monitoring for the expenses actually incurred.
- (iv) **The evaluation team during their field visits failed to locate a few of the assets claimed to have been created. Such cases, largely the out come of weak monitoring, perhaps encourage various types of irregularities to thrive.**
- (v) A disproportionately large amount of money was flowing in some of the districts out of MPLADS funds. Apart from an uneven distribution of works this led to increase the workload for the officials leading to weak monitoring and supervision.
- (vi) Many of the MPs did not have full information even about the works they had recommended.
- (vii) A small group having easy access to the MP at times may impress upon his to recommend works according to *their* felt needs. Consequently the felt needs of many others got overlooked.
- (viii) Non-refund of unspent amount.
- (ix) Quality of assets created: Allocation of inadequate funds often failed to ensure durability and usefulness of assets.
- (x) A large number of works were executed by contractors' inspite of prohibiting the engagement of contractors.
- (xi) Inadequate infrastructure available to the Collectors vested with the responsibility of MPLAD Scheme, lead to weak monitoring and supervision.
- (xii) Failure to maintain assets register. The inconsistency in the information from sources points to weaknesses in maintenance of records and in monitoring of the on going work. **Once a District Collector sanctions a work and releases the fund, there was generally a tendency to treat the work as executed.**

11. The following **suggestions were made out of Evaluation Report** to improve the MPLAD Scheme:—

- (i) Adequate arrangements need to be made for making a relevant information available to MP. Upper limit of number of projects and completion of the same as per specifications with appropriate fund need to be ensured in the guidelines.
- (ii) The State nodal Department needs to be strengthened in terms of staff and other infrastructure. Relevant information about other development activities in the district may also be made available to the MP. Equipped with these detailed information MP is likely to be in a more comfortable position to recommend specific works.
- (iii) PRIs be asked to provide a list of work to be recommended to the MPs annually. It would be appropriate to think in terms of coordination of works recommended under Legislature Area Development Scheme (MLA LAD) together with those recommended for the respective Member of Parliament constituencies and utilize in a more fruitful way without interfering with the MPs and MLAs to recommend works for their choice within their budgetary limits.
- (iv) MP may consider allocation of funds only after the cost estimate is prepared and detailed work plan and coordination mechanism made available to him.
- (v) Making the MPLADS funds lapsable.
- (vi) Displaying the details of works at site to be made mandatory.

12. The **Institute of Social Science conducted a study on the working of MPLAD Scheme and brought out a booklet titled 'MPLADS—Concept, Confusion and Contradictions' authored by Shri Era Sezhiyan, ex-MP and ex-Chairman, PAC and Senior Fellow in Institute of Social Science, New Delhi.** The author has vehemently opposed the operation of the MPLAD Scheme on the following grounds:—

- (i) The Scheme as instituted amounts to usurpation of powers of the executive by the legislature since it is not the function of the legislators to have budget to this kind—their sole function and responsibility being—to legislate and highlight acts of omission and commission of the executive.
- (ii) The Scheme amounts to direct interference by the MPs and the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation in the functioning of the district administration, which is directly under and accountable only to State Government.
- (iii) By virtue of the powers to indicate their works of their choice to the tune of Rs. 10 crore in one term of five years (Rs. 12 crore for Rajya Sabha MPs for 6 years). The MPs wield a power which is essentially executive and, therefore, beyond the pale of their legislative functions and as such, the Scheme is violative of the basic tenet and the philosophy of the Constitution.
- (iv) That with the virtual operation of the Scheme by the MPs, there is bound to develop an pecuniary interest and, therefore, their position is not short of

holding of the office of profit—position, which they are debarred to hold under the Constitution.

- (v) The vesting of the choice of the works to be executed leads to favouritism and discrimination *vis-a-vis* other constituents whom the MP might consider a sure vote bank for the future election or whom the MP feels that they did not possibly vote for or support him in the election. Political analysts have dubbed it 'loot or largesse'.

13. Hon'ble two Members S/Shri R. Senthil and George Fernandes *vide* their letters dated 1 and 5 August, 2005 (Annexure-II and III) had desired that the MPLAD Scheme be scrapped as it is the root cause of corruption at various levels.

14. The National Advisory Council (NAC) had also advised the Centre to scrap the Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) and instead divert the funds to the panchayats for effective implementation of development programmes, judicious spending and greater decentralisation of power. The National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution had also recommended that the MPLAD Scheme be scrapped as it leads to unnecessary drain on the exchequer.

15. The working of MPLAD Scheme has been reviewed by CAG Reports (1998-2001). The Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission also conducted a study to evaluate the design, implementation and the impact of the scheme and identify the areas of weakness and strength for the improved performance of the scheme. The Institute of Social Science, New Delhi in a study undertaken, pointed out certain deficiencies in the implementation of the Scheme and even questioned the propriety and constitutional validity for the scheme. In this regard, it is stated that the Reports of CAG are to be considered and examined by Public Accounts Committee of the Parliament. Due to paucity of time the Public Accounts Committee could not complete their study during the period when the subject of MPLAD scheme were selected by them (1998-99) and (2000-2002). Further the Committee did not pursue these subjects in the subsequent Committees for detailed examination. The Committee on MPLAD do not have any mandate to examine and consider the CAG Reports. However, due to adverse criticism and public outcry over the deficient implementation of the scheme, the Committee can take due notice of certain observations of CAG Reports especially with regard to deficiencies in the implementation of the scheme since the Committee on MPLADS has been vested with powers to periodically monitor and review the implementation of the scheme. It may be further pointed out that CAG has highlighted the deficiencies in the implementation of the Scheme and suggested corrective measures which the Government is required to act upon.

16. There have been criticisms of the Scheme such as usurpation of powers of the executive by the Legislature, direct interference by MPs and Ministries in the functioning of District Administration, the scheme is violative of basic tenets and philosophy of Constitution of India, develops pecuniary interest of MPs in the operation of the Scheme and thereby incur disqualification by virtue of holding Office of Profit, favouritism and discrimination *vis-a-vis* other constituents, diversion of funds from rural and urban local bodies, increasing the areas of conflict between district administration and Panchayati Raj bodies by creating duplication of work between

them etc. In this context, it is submitted that the scheme under operation is a Government sponsored Scheme and it is for the Government to ensure that the scheme fits well into constitutional framework of the country, does not interfere in the functioning of District Administration and in no way the incumbent MP hold the Office of Profit etc. A Public Interest Litigation is pending before the Supreme Court against the scheme and as a final interpreter of the Constitution, the Supreme Court, and not the Committee on MPLADS, can decide on the ultra vires of this scheme.

17. The scheme in no way compromises the district planning but supplements the efforts of the State and district institutions in planning and execution of developmental projects. The scheme has been conceptualized to plug the resource gap where the Central and State Government funds are not able to fulfil the locally felt needs as the Members are best aware of the needs and aspirations of the people who have chosen them. Based on the locally felt needs of the constituency, a Member recommends the works/projects to the concerned District Collector who accords administrative and technical sanction for the proposed works subject to the condition that the works/projects proposed are in accordance with the Guidelines on MPLAD Scheme. Even the implementing agency is identified by the District Collector and not by MP. Only after that the funds are released by the DC concerned.

18. Another criticism of the Scheme that there is duplicator between works undertaken under MPLAD Scheme and District Planning, does not hold good since the District Collector not only heads the MPLAD Scheme but is also associated with Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs). In the event of duplication of work, if any, it becomes incumbent upon the District Collector concerned to ensure that such duplication of works is avoided so as to plug any wastage of funds. When any duplication of work is apprehended, either the MP concerned can be impressed upon to withdraw the said project/work or the PRIs advised on the need to shelve the project/work.

19. The Committee may consider the above Para Nos. 15 to 18.

New Delhi;
Dated the 16th September, 2005.

APPENDIX XXI

Vide Chapter 3 of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 19

Subject: Revised Guidelines on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS).

The Minister of State (Independent Charge), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 9 June, 2005 to Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha regarding revision of Guidelines on MPLADS and has sought Hon'ble Speaker's suggestions on it before finalizing it.

2. The Minister of State (Independent Charge), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in his letter dated 9 June, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The Lok Sabha Committee on MPLADS had met on 17.9.2003 and conveyed its views on revision of MPLADS Guidelines *vide* letter No. 8/1/MPLADS/2003 dated 29.9.2003. Subsequently, I have been interacting with Hon'ble Members of Parliament for improvement and revision of these Guidelines. After taking into account the suggestions received from the Lok Sabha Committee, the Rajya Sabha Committee on MPLADS, MPs and having considered the views expressed by the Comptroller and Auditor General in his two Reports, we have revised and finalized the Guidelines on MPLADS.

I enclose a copy of the Guidelines for your kind perusal. I have separately written to the Chairman of the Lok Sabha Committee on MPLADS for his views on these Guidelines. Before the same is finally approved for release, I request you to favour us with your suggestions."

3. The Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003 at Tuticorin in Tamil Nadu considered the proposal of Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for revision of the Guidelines which was as follows:—

"Suggestion for revision of Guidelines on MPLADS

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 4 March, 2003 to the Lok Sabha Secretariat regarding proposal for revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

The Ministry in their communication dated 4 March, 2003 stated as under:

"The MPLAD Scheme was announced on the 23rd December, 1993. Detailed Guidelines on the Scheme were issued in February, 1994 by the Ministry of Rural Development which was initially in charge of the Scheme, Revised Guidelines were issued by this Ministry in December, 1994, February, 1997 and September, 1999. Thereafter, amendments to some of the provisions of the Guidelines were issued from time to time. Incorporating these amendments, fresh print of the Guidelines was issued by this Ministry in April, 2002.

Suggestions have been received to amend some of the paras of the Guidelines for better clarity of the existing provisions and for incorporation of new provisions. The Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) of the Planning Commission have made an evaluation study of the MPLADS and have given certain useful suggestions in their report for improving the implementation of the Scheme.

A need has, therefore, been felt to have a comprehensive revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

A revision of the Guidelines, therefore, has been carried out and a copy of the proposed revised Guidelines is forwarded herewith with a request that the same may please be placed before the Committee on MPLADS for their review/comments. A copy of the table giving para numbers of the existing Guidelines and corresponding para numbers of the proposed Guidelines is also enclosed as Annexure-I". (As per column No. 2)

Recommendation

The Committee considered the proposal of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for revision of the Guidelines on MPLADS and approved the same with the suggestions/modifications in some paras as in Annexure-II." (As per column No. 3)

4. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their proposed new revised Guidelines has made some amendments, new additions apart from retaining some of the existing provisions. A comprehensive analysis of these amendments along

with the decisions of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003 is as follows:—

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>1.1 Members of Parliament are approached by their Constituents, quite often, for small works of capital nature to be done in their Constituencies. Hence, there was a demand made by MPs that they should be able to recommend works to be done in their Constituencies. Considering these suggestions, the Prime Minister announced in Parliament on 23rd December, 1993, the "Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme". Detailed guidelines on the Scheme concept, implementation and monitoring of MPLADS were subsequently issued by the Ministry of Rural Development in February, 1994 who initially handled the Scheme. The guidelines were revised in December, 1994 by this Ministry. Pursuant to these guidelines, the Ministry issued Circulars, from time to time, on matters relating to operational details, based on suggestions received from Members of Parliament and others. Revised Guidelines were issued in February, 1997 and September, 1999. Thereafter, amendments to some provisions of the guidelines were issued from time to time. These guidelines are issued after incorporating amendments.</p>	<p>1.1 The people approach Members of Parliament (MPs) for provision of certain basic facilities including community infrastructure in their areas. Government of India considered the need for a mechanism to respond to such requests and decided to have a scheme to meet the felt needs of the people.</p> <p>1.2 On 23rd December 1993 Prime Minister announced in the Parliament the Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS). Initially the MPLADS was under the control of the Ministry of Rural Development. The Guidelines were issued in February 1994, covering the concept, implementation and monitoring of the Scheme. The subject relating to the MPLADS was transferred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in October 1994. The Guidelines were periodically updated in December 1994, February 1997, September 1999 and lastly in April 2002. With the experience gained over a decade, and having considered the suggestions made by the Members of Parliament in the inter active discussions taken by the Minister of State (Independent Charge) of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation; MPLADS Committees of the Parliament; Planning Commission and Comptroller and Auditor General of India in its two Reports, it was felt necessary to carry out a comprehensive revision of the Guidelines.</p> <p>1.4 In 1993-94, when the Scheme was launched, an amount of Rs. 5 lakh per Member of Parliament was allotted which became Rupees one crore per annum from 1994-95 per MP constituency. This was stepped up to Rs. 2 crore from 1998-99.</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>1.2 Under this scheme, each MP will have the choice to suggest to the Head of the District works to the tune of Rs. 1 crore per year, to be taken up in his/her constituency. Elected Members of Rajya Sabha representing the whole of the State as they do, may select works for implementation in one or more district(s) as they may choose. Nominated Members of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha may also select works for implementation in one or more districts, anywhere in the country. The allocation per MP per year stands increased to Rs. 2 crores from the year 1998-1999.</p>	<p>2.1 The MPLADS is a Plan Scheme fully funded by Government of India. The annual MPLADS fund entitlement per MP constituency, is Rs. 2 crore.</p> <p>2.2 Lok Sabha Members can recommend works for their respective constituencies. The elected Rajya Sabha Members shall select one district in the State of their election and can recommend works in that district. The nominated Members of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha shall select one district in the country and can recommend works for that district.</p> <p>2.3 The elected Rajya Sabha Members may opt for the second district within their respective term and the State of their election and such option for the second district shall be at least for a period of full financial year. The nominated Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Members may opt for the second district within opt for the second district within their respective term in the country and such option for the second district shall be for a period of one or more full financial year.</p> <p>2.4 The choice of the District shall be furnished by elected and nominated Rajya Sabha Members and Nominated Lok Sabha Members to the Director (MPLADS) of the Ministry with copy to the State Nodal Department and the District Authority in the format at Annex-I. In the case of elected Members of Lok Sabha, no such option is necessary.</p>	<p>The Committee deliberated on the issue of enhancement of MPLAD funds from present level of Rs. 2 crores to Rs.5 crores per MP per year and decided to approach the Hon'ble Speaker for taking up the matter with the GOI to enhance it at least to Rs. 3 crores with the provision for earmarking some percent of MPLADS funds for creation of durable assets on national priorities <i>viz.</i>, (a) drinking water (b) education (c) health (d) roads and (e) electrification.</p> <p>Comments—Members had been regularly demanding from time to time to enhance MPLADS funds so as to meet the growing locally felt needs of the constituency.</p>
<p>1.3 MPs can also recommend works outside their constituencies/states for construction of assets that are permissible in the guidelines, for rehabilitation measures in the event of "natural calamity of rare severity" in any part of the country for an amount not</p>	<p>2.8 Natural Calamities: MPLADS works can also be implemented in the areas affected by the calamities like floods, cyclone, tsunami, earthquake, tornado and drought. MPs from the non-affected areas of the State can also recommend permissible works up to a maximum of Rs. 10 lakh per annum in the affected area(s) in that State. The funds would be released by the Nodal</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs, for each calamity.</p>	<p>district of the MP concerned to the District Authority of the affected district. MPLADS funds may be pooled by the District Authority of the affected district for works permissible in the Guidelines. The Works Completion Report, Utilization Certificate and Audit Certificate for such works and funds will be provided by the District Authority of the affected districts to the respective District Authority from whom the funds were received.</p>	
	<p>2.9 In the event of "Calamity of severe nature" in any part of the country, an MP can recommend works up to a maximum of Rs.50 lakh for the affected district. Whether a calamity is of severe nature or not, will be decided by the Government of India. The funds in this regard will be released by the District Authority of Nodal District of the MP concerned to the District Authority of the affected district to get permissible works done. The Works Completion Report, Utilization Certificate and Audit Certificate for such works and funds will be provided by the District Authority of the affected districts to the respective District Authority from whom the funds were received.</p>	
<p>2.1 Each MP will give a choice of works to the concerned Head of the District who will get them implemented by following the established procedures, that is, he may be guided by the procedure laid down by the State Government subject to these Guidelines. In regard to works in urban areas their implementation can be done through Commissioners/Chief Executive Officers of Corporations, Municipalities, etc., or through the Heads of District concerned</p>	<p>2.7 Each MP will recommend works up to the annual entitlement during the financial year preferably within 90 days of the commencement of the financial year in the format at Annex-III to the concerned District Authority. The District Authority will get the eligible sanctioned works executed as per the established procedure laid down by the State Government for implementation of such works subject to the provision in these Guidelines.</p>	
	<p>2.11 District Authority: District Collector/District Magistrate/Deputy Commissioner will generally be the District Authority to implement MPLADS in the district. If the District</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>as per the option of the MPs. Implementing Agencies can be either Government or Panchayati Raj Institutions or any other reputed non-governmental organisation who may be considered by the District Head as capable of implementing the works satisfactorily. Engagement of private contractors is prohibited, wherever extant Guidelines do not permit such engagement. For purposes of execution of works through Public Works Department (PWD), wings not necessarily exclusively dealing with civil construction, but having competence in civil construction can be engaged-like for example, Public Health Engineering, Rural Housing Departments/Wings, Housing Boards, Electricity Boards, Urban Development Authorities etc. The Head of the District shall identify the agency through which a particular work recommended by the MP should be executed.</p>	<p>Planning Committee is empowered by the State Government, the Chief Executive Officer of the District Planning Committee can function as the District Authority. In case of Municipal Corporations, the Commissioner/Chief Executive Officer may function as the District Authority. In this regard if there is any doubt, Government of India in consultation with the State/UT Government, will decide the District Authority for the purpose of MPLADS implementation.</p> <p>2.12 Implementing Agency: The District Authority shall identify the agency through which a particular work recommended by the MP should be executed. The executing agency so identified by the District Authority is the implementing agency. The Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) will preferably be the Implementing Agency in the rural areas and works implementation should be done through Chief Executive of the respective PRI. The Implementing Agencies in the urban areas should preferably be urban local bodies and works implementation should be done through Commissioners/ Chief Executive Officers of Municipal Corporations, Municipalities. Further, the District Authority may choose either Government Department unit or Government agency or reputed Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) as capable of implementing the works satisfactorily as Implementing Agencies. For purposes of execution of works through Government Departments, District Authority can engage units for example, Public Health Engineering, Rural Housing, Housing Boards, Electricity Boards and Urban Development Authorities etc, as Implementing Agencies.</p> <p>3.1 Each MP shall recommend eligible works on MP's letter head duly signed. A letter format from the MP to the</p>	<p>The implementing agency can be either Government agency or Panchayat Raj Institutions or any other reputed Non-Governmental organisation including managing committee of an educational institution which may be considered by the District Collector as capable of implementing the work satisfactorily.</p> <p>The issue whether the authority for identifying the implementing agency be with the District Collector was discussed at length. All MPs except Shri R.R. Pramanik, MP agreed in favour of the District Collector to identify the implementing agency. It was accordingly decided to retain the Para 3.5 as it is. However, Shri R.R. Pramanik opined that MPs should be empowered to recommend the implementing agency to the District Collector.</p> <p>Comments— Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.</p>

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>2.2 The works under the scheme shall be developmental in nature based on locally felt needs. The emphasis is on creation of durable assets. Funds provided under the scheme should not be used for incurring revenue expenditure. The funds can also be used for purposes such as provision of service support facilities. However, they will not include any recurring expenditure like on staff to maintain such facilities.</p> <p>2.5 The site selected for execution of the work by the MP shall not be changed except with the concurrence of the MP himself.</p> <p>2.7 An illustrative list of works that may be taken up under the scheme is presented in Appendix 1. A list of works which shall not</p>	<p>District Authority is at Annex-III. Recommendations by representative(s) of MPs are not admissible.</p> <p>3.3 The District Authority shall identify the Implementing Agency capable of executing the eligible work qualitatively, timely and satisfactorily. The District Authority shall follow the established work scrutiny; technical, work estimation, tendering and administrative procedure of the State/ UT Government concerned in the matter of work execution, and shall be responsible for timely and effective implementation of such works.</p> <p>1.3 The objective of the scheme is to enable MPs to recommend works of developmental nature with emphasis on the creation of durable community assets based on the locally felt needs to be taken up in their constituencies. Right from inception of the Scheme, durable assets of national priorities viz drinking water, primary education, public health, sanitation and roads are being created.</p> <p>3.4 The work and the site selected for the work execution by the MP shall not be changed, except with the concurrence of the MP concerned.</p> <p>2.5 All works to meet the locally felt community infrastructure and development needs with emphasis on the creation of durable assets in the respective constituency are eligible</p>	<p>The words "the site selected" be replaced with "the project and the site selected."</p> <p>Comments—Instead of word "the project" as recommended by the Committee "the work" has been used.</p> <p>The list of works prohibited under the Scheme should only be furnished in the Guidelines.</p>

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
be allowed under the scheme is presented in Appendix 2.	under MPLADS except those prohibited in Annexure-II. MPs may choose some works for creation of durable assets of national priorities namely drinking water, education, public health, sanitation and roads under the Scheme.	Therefore, there is no need for illustrative list of works which can be taken up under the Scheme. Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.
2.9 The Heads of District should ensure that provision for maintenance and upkeep of the works to be taken up under this Scheme is forthcoming from the concerned local body or the relevant agency, that is, Government-aided institution registered society etc.	3.6 The District Authority should get in advance a firm commitment about the operation, upkeep and maintenance of the proposed asset from the User Agency concerned before the execution of the work is sanctioned.	
3.1 In identifying and selecting work and giving administrative sanction for the same, the Head of the District should invariably get the concurrence of the Member of Parliament. Normally, the advice for the MP should prevail unless it be for technical reasons such as land selected for work not being suitable for execution etc. Where the Head of the District considers that a work suggested by an MP cannot be executed, he should send a comprehensive report with reasons to the MP under intimation to the Department of the State Government dealing with the subject and to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.	3.5 Where the District Authority considers that a recommended work cannot be executed due to some reason, the District Authority shall inform the reasons to the MP concerned, under intimation to the Government of India and the State/UT Government. 3.7 The work should be sanctioned and executed only if the MP concerned has allocated the full estimated cost of the work in the year. If the commitment for the full estimated amount is not forthcoming and the amount recommended by the MP is less than the estimates for the work and there are no other sources from which the deficit can be made good, then the work should not be sanctioned, as in such an eventuality, the project will remain incomplete for want of sufficient funds. The shortfall in the estimated cost <i>vis-à-vis</i> the one recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP. 3.9 The District Authority may sanction works as per the recommendation of the MP up to the full entitlement. However, the release of funds will be regulated as specified in these Guidelines.	At the end of this para, the following may be added "The shortfall in the estimated cost <i>vis-à-vis</i> the one recommended by the MP be quickly intimated to the MP". Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
3.2 As far as possible, all sanctions for works should be accorded within 45 days from the date of receipt of the proposal from the concerned MP.	3.11 All works for which recommendations are received in the office of the District Authority till the last date of the term of the MP are to be executed, provided these are as per norms and within the entitlement of MPLADS funds of the MP. Such works cannot be changed by MP even if the MP is re-elected. It shall be the responsibility of the Nodal District Authority to scrutinize all such recommended work within 45 days of the last date of the term of office of the MP either to accord necessary sanction as per the Guidelines, or to intimate the MP about the rejection with reasons.	Apart from state nodal department, clarification should be sent to MP also. Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.
	3.12 On receipt of the recommendation from the MP, the District Authority should verify the eligibility and technical feasibility of each recommended work. All such eligible works should be sanctioned within 45 days from the date of receipt of recommendation. In case of delay due to genuine reasons, a clarification for delay should be incorporated in the sanction letter. The same may be intimated to the MP and State/UT Government. If a recommended work is not eligible or not feasible, the District Authority shall intimate the same with reasons to the MP and the Government of India and State/UT Government.	
	3.13 The sanction letter/order shall stipulate a time limit for completion of the work to the Implementation Agency. The time limit for the works should generally not exceed one year. In exceptional cases, where the implementation time exceeds one year, specific reasons for the same shall be incorporated in the sanction letter/order. The sanction letter/order may also include a clause for suitable action against the Implementation Agency in the event of their failure to complete the work within the stipulated time as per the State Government Procedure.	The time limit in normal circumstances should not exceed one year. In exceptional cases, where it may be for more than one year, specific reasons also to be mentioned in the sanction letter. Comment—Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>3.3 So far as technical and administrative sanctions are concerned, decision making should be only at the district level. If need be for the purpose of implementation of this scheme, full and final powers should be delegated to the District technical and administrative functionaries.</p>	<p>3.14 Decision making powers in regard to technical, financial and administrative sanctions to be accorded under the Scheme, vest in the district level functionaries. To facilitate quick implementation of projects under this Scheme, full powers should be delegated by the State/UT Governments to the district functionaries. The District Authorities will have full powers to get the works technically approved and financial estimates prepared by the competent district functionaries before according the final administrative sanction and approval. The District Authority should, before sanctioning the work, ensure that all clearances for such works have been taken from the competent authorities and the work conforms to the Guidelines.</p>	
<p>3.4 In case, a constituency fall in more than one district, the Head of the district who receives the money released by the Government of India shall make the required funds available to the other concerned district(s) in keeping with MP's choice so that the Head(s) of such other district (s) could implement the works suggested by the MP in his district(s).</p>	<p>3.2 In case a constituency comprises more than one district, and the MP wishes to recommend works in the district other than the Nodal District, the works list in the prescribed format shall be given to the District Authority of the Nodal District with copy to the District Authority in whose jurisdiction the proposed works are to be executed. The District Authority in whose jurisdiction, the proposed works are to be executed, will maintain proper accounts, follow proper procedure for sanction and implementation for timely completion of works. He will furnish monthly progress reports, work completion reports, and audit certificates for such works to the Nodal District Authority.</p>	
<p>3.6 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, would have the nodal responsibilities for this scheme at the Centre. The Department concerned of the State Government will issue</p>	<p>1.5 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation has been responsible for the policy formulation, release of funds and prescribing monitoring mechanism for implementation of the Scheme. A Department in the State or the Union Territory (UT) is designated as the Nodal Department with the overall</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>general instructions to all the planning and implementing agencies at the district level to con-operate, assist and implement the works referred to them under this scheme by the Heads of the districts. Copies of such instructions shall also be sent to the MPs at their constituencies and at their Delhi addresses.</p>	<p>responsibility of supervision, monitoring and coordination of the MPLADS implementation with the district and other Line Departments. The Government of India forms the State Nodal Department about the MPLADS funds relate to the District Authorities. The District Authorities report the status of MPLADS implementation to the Government of India and State Nodal Department. The District Authority gets the MPLADS implemented through Local Self Government or through Government Agencies. In some cases, the District Authority engages reputed Non Government Organizations (NGOs) for execution of MPLADS works.</p>	
<p>3.7 The normal financial and audit procedures would apply to all actions taken under this scheme subject to these Guidelines, especially guidelines contained in para 3.3 .</p>	<p>5.3 On completion of a work, the Implementing Agency shall quickly finalize the accounts for that work and shall furnish a work completion report and utilization certificate and return the un-utilized balance (savings) including contingency charges and interest amount with 30 days to the District Authority concerned. The model work completion report is at Annex-VII. The District Authority and the Implementing Agency would arrange to transfer the asset to the User Agency without any delay. The User Agency should take it on its books for normal operation and maintenance.</p>	<p>(i) Addition of 'and utilization certificate' after the words 'completion certificate'.</p> <p>(ii) Addition of 'within one month' after the words 'interest amount'.</p> <p>Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.</p>
	<p>5.4 The District Authority and Implementing Agencies will properly maintain MPLADS accounts. District Authority will furnish Utilization Certificate every year in the form prescribed in the Guidelines (Annex-VIII) to the State Government and the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. These accounts and Utilization Certificates will be audited by the Chartered Accountants or the Local Fund Auditors or any Statutory Auditors as per the State/UT Government procedure. The Auditors should be engaged by State/UT</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
	<p>Government for each District Authority on the basis of the recommendation of the Accountant General of State/UT concerned. The District Authority will submit for every year the audited accounts, reports and certificates to the State Government and the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The normal audit procedure would apply under the Scheme for auditing the accounts of the District Authority and Implementing Agencies. In addition, the Comptroller and Auditor General of India will undertake test audit and sent reports to the District Authorities, the State Government and the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.</p>	
	<p>5.5 The Audit Report should be prepared MP wise and should <i>inter alia</i> cover the following aspects: (i) number of Savings/other Bank Accounts being maintained by the District Administration and the Implementing Agencies; (ii) any fund held in fixed deposits (Fixed deposits are not permissible); (iii) whether interest accrued in Savings Account has been taken as receipt and utilized for the Project; (iv) delay, if any, in crediting the Accounts of the District Authority and the Implementing Agencies by the receiving Bank — if so, the period of delay; (v) Whether Bank reconciliation in respect of Cash Book balance and Pass Book balance is being done every month; (vi) The Bank reconciliation should also cover interest accruals. The Bank reconciliation statement as on 31st March should be attached to the Audit Report; (vii) Proper maintenance of Cash Book by the District Authority and Implementing Agencies; (viii) Cheques issued but not encashed as on 31st March as per Bank reconciliation, (ix) Actual expenditure incurred out of advances to the Implementing Agencies; and closing balances with them;</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
	<p>(x) Diversion of funds, works prohibited and inadmissible items of expenditure (The details along with the views of District Authority in each case shall form part of the audit report for the District Authority to get such audit objection settled and follow up audit in succeeding year); and (xi) Utilization of earmark funds for SC and ST areas.</p>	
	<p>5.6 The Audit Certificate furnished by the Chartered Accountants, will be submitted every year by the District Authority along with replies to each of the audit objections. It will be the responsibility of the District Authority to ensure that all audit objections are settled forth with. The Implementing Agencies are to submit works, completion report and associated fund utilization report to the District Authority. The Chartered Accountants will audit all such reports and records and furnish their certificate in a model Audit Certificate prescribed in these Guidelines (Annex- IX). The audit fee may be paid under contingency expenses as per item iv (b) of paragraph 4.15.</p>	
	<p>5.6. There are former elected and nominated Members of Rajya Sabha and nominated Member of Lok Sabha who recommended works under MPLADS. Those are yet to be completed, for which Works Completion Report, Utilisation and Audit Certificate are to be furnished by the District Authorities along with Monthly Progress Report (Annex-VI)</p>	
	<p>5.7 The District Authorities have been implementing MPLADS since 1993-94. They are to submit periodically works Completion Report, Utilization Certificate, and Audit Certificates. These Certificates are to be furnished to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation right from inception. Following time frame is</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
---------------------------------	---	---

drawn up for the District Authorities to submit these Completion Reports, Utilization Certificates, and Audit Certificates.

Year	All Works Completion Reports	Utilization and Audit Certificates
1993-94 to 1998-99	30-9-2005	31-12-2005
1999-2000 to 2002-03	31-03-2006	30-06-2004
2003-04 and 2004-05	30-06-2006	30-09-2006

3.9 When there is a change in the MP, for whatever reason it may be, the following principles should be followed, as far as possible in executing works:

- If the work identified by the predecessor MP is under execution, it should be completed.
- If the work identified by the predecessor MP is pending sanction due to administrative reasons beyond a period of 45 days from the date on which advice was received for taking up the work, it should also be executed provided the work is otherwise as per norms.
- If the predecessor MP had identified the work, but it was not taken up for execution because of reasons other than those mentioned in the preceding sub-para, it can be executed subject to the confirmation of the successor MP.

4.7 The balances of MPLADS funds (funds not committed for the recommended works) left by the predecessor MP in a Lok Sabha constituency would be passed on to the successor MP from that constituency.

4.10 The balance of funds (funds not committed for the recommended works) left by Anglo-Indian nominated Lok Sabha MPs will be transferred to the successor Anglo-Indian nominated Lok Sabha MPs by the Government of India.

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>4.1 Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent).</p>	Deleted	<p>The cost ceiling of Rs. 25.00 lakhs per work should be removed to allow MPs to recommend works of suitable nature to meet the local needs.</p> <p>Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.</p>
<p>4.2 Funds shall be released to the Districts each year immediately after the Vote on Account/Budget is passed. The funds released by the Government of India under the scheme would be non-lapsable. Funds released in a particular year, if they remain unutilised can be carried forward to the subsequent year without detracting from the allocation of rupees two crores per year per constituency. However, release of funds will be made with reference to the actual progress achieved in expenditure and execution of works. In other words, funds would be available in the budget to the extent of rupees two crores per year per MP and works will not suffer for want of provisions. At the same time releases will be</p>	<p>4.1 The annual entitlement of Rs. 2 crore will be released in two instalments of Rs. one crore each by Government of India directly to the District Authority (District Collector/District Magistrate/ Deputy Commissioner or the Chief Executive of the Municipal Corporation, or the District Planning Committee as the case may be), under intimation to the State/UT Nodal Department and to the Member of Parliament concerned.</p> <p>4.2 At the time of the constitution of Lok Sabha, and election of a Rajya Sabha Member, the first instalment will be released to the District Authority without waiting for any report/certificate from the Nodal District Authority of the MP concerned. The subsequent instalments of the continuing Members of Rajys Sabha and Lok Sabha will be released as per the eligibility criteria indicated in Paragraph 4.3. There will be no clubbing of the MPLADS accounts of the previous MP for the purpose of MPLADS fund release. Physical and Financial Progress for each MP (sitting and former), will</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>regulated according to progress. The idea is that at any given time no excessive money should remain outside the Government treasury than is reasonably expected to be spent within a year. For example, if out of Rs. 2 crore allotted for a constituency in a year, Rs. 150 lakhs are spent, the balance of Rs. 50 lakhs can be carried over for the year when this amount together with fresh allocation of Rs. 2 crore (total of Rs. 2.5 crore) would be the entitlement of the year and could be spent. But actual physical release of funds will be with reference to the amount expected to be spent. It should be seen, however, that unspent amounts do not excessively snowball into huge entitlements.</p>	<p>be sent by the District. Authorities separately.</p> <p>4.3 The first instalment will be released in the beginning of the financial year. This is subject to the condition that second instalment of the previous year was released for the MP concerned. However, if any specific condition was imposed at the time of release of the second instalment of the previous year, its compliance will be ensured before the release of the first instalment. The second instalment of the MPLADS funds will be released subject to the fulfillment of the following eligibility criteria:—</p> <p>(i) the unsanctioned balance amount available with the accounts of the District Authority after taking into account the cost of all the works sanctioned is less than Rs. 50 lakh;</p> <p>(ii) the unspent balance of funds of the MP concerned is less than Rs. One crore; and</p> <p>(iii) Utilization Certificate for the previous financial year and the Audit Certificate for the funds released for each MP in the year prior to the previous year have been furnished by District Authority. The Utilisation Certificate and Audit Certificate formats are at Annex VIII and IX respectively.</p>	<p>The next instalment of Rs. 1.00 crore in respect of an MP would be released once the unsanctioned balance amount after taking into account the cost of all the work sanctioned comes to less than Rs. 50.00 lakhs.</p> <p>Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.</p>
<p>4.3 The release of funds by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, will be done two times a year on the basis of the physical and financial progress of the works under implementation and further requirement of funds for works.</p>	<p>The stipulations at (i) and (ii) above will be calculated from the Monthly Progress Report to be sent by the District Authorities for each sitting and former MP term-wise separately Annex-VI is the format in which the Monthly Progress Report is to be sent by the District Authorities.</p>	
<p>4.4 At the time of release of funds, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, in consultation with the Heads of the concerned Districts will make an assesment of the funds required to complete the on-going</p>	<p>4.4 Funds Non-lapsable: Funds released to the District Authority by the Government of India are non-lapsable. Funds left in the district can be carried forward for utilization in the subsequent years. Further, the funds not released by the Government of India in</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>works. Such requirements of funds will be met first and then only the balance allocation will be considered for new works. Instalment of Rs. 1 crore in respect of an MP would be released once the balance amount, after taking into account the cost of all the works sanctioned (unsanctioned balance), comes to less than Rs. 50 lakhs. The eligibility for the release of an instalment in respect of an MP will be decided on the basis of information furnished by the concerned District Heads in the format placed at Appendix-3 and 4 respectively, copies of which will also be sent by the District Heads to the concerned MPs.</p>	<p>a year will be carried forward for making releases in the subsequent years. Subject to the fulfillment of criteria stipulated in Paragraph 4.3 within.</p> <p>4.6 If a Lok Sabha constituency is spread over more than one district, funds for the constituency shall be released to Nodal District Authority, who will be responsible for transfer of funds to the other districts within the constituency as per the requirement of funds in those districts.</p> <p>4.13 The District Authority can sanction works up to the entitlement of the MP for that year without even physical availability of funds. Funds will be released by the Government as per the eligibility stipulated in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3</p>	
<p>4.5 Funds for individual works should be promptly released. 75% of the cost of the works can be released in the first instalment itself, the balance of 25% being released watching progress. To the maximum extent possible, release of funds should be arranged through the administrative authority available nearest to the work spot, like for example a Block Development Officer. The objective should be that release of funds also is made through decentralised administrative mechanisms already available on the ground and that</p>	<p>4.15 The District Authority may release advance up to 50% of the estimated amount of a sanctioned work to an Implementing Agency. On the basis of the physical and financial report furnished by the Implementing Agency, the District Authority can release the remaining funds when 60% of the advance has been utilised.</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
implementing agencies have the quickest feasible access to such decentralised authorities.	4.14 The District Authority and the Implementing Agencies shall deposit the funds in a nationalised bank. Separate account will be opened for each MP for the purpose.	
4.7 Funds released under the scheme shall be deposited in nationalized banks.	4.16 The interest accrued on the funds released under the Scheme, to the District Authority is to be used for permissible works recommended by the MP concerned. The interest accrued on the funds released under the Scheme to the Implementing agencies shall be calculated while arriving at the savings for each work. The savings for each work shall be refunded to the District Authority within 30 days of the completion work.	
5.1 For effective implementation of the works taken up under this scheme, each State Government/UT Administration shall designate one nodal Department for physical monitoring through field inspection and for coordination with the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India. The Heads of District shall visit and inspect at least 10% of these works every year. Similarly, it should be the responsibility of the senior officers of implementing agencies of these works to regularly visit the work spots and ensure that the works are progressing satisfactorily as per the prescribed procedures and	6.1 Role of MPLADS Parliamentary Committees: There are two Committees of Parliament (Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha) on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme which receive representations from MPs and the proposals submitted by the Government of India to advise the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India for appropriate action. The role of the Committees is decided by the Speaker, for Lok Sabha Committee, and Chairman Rajya Sabha for Rajys Sabha Committee on MPLADS.	
	6.2 Role of the Central Government: (i) The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation shall monitor the overall position of funds released, cost of works sanctioned, funds spent. (ii) The Ministry will monitor the receipt of Completion Reports, Utilization Certificates, and Audit Certificate from the District Authorities. (iii) The Ministry will bring	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003.
<p>specifications. Likewise, officers of district at the sub-divisional and block level shall also closely monitor implementation of these works through visits to work sites. The heads of the District should also involve the MPs in such inspections and monitoring to the maximum extent feasible. They should also furnish monitoring reports once in two months to the MPs and the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. A schedule of inspections which prescribes the minimum number of field visits for each supervisory level functionary of the implementing agencies may be drawn up by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.</p>	<p>out Annual Report on the implementation of MPLADS including the facts relating to physical and financial progress (iv) The Ministry will hold meetings in the States and also at the Centre at least once in a year to review the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. (v) The Ministry shall provide training materials for conducting training of district officers, on MPLADS as and when these are organized by the State Governments. (vi) The Ministry has developed the software on monitoring of MPLADS works and will operationalise through State Governments, UT Administrations and District Authorities. (vii) The Ministry will review the utilization of funds by the District Authorities in SC and ST areas. (viii) The Ministry will review the audit objections and issues arising out of the Audit and Utilization Certificates.</p>	
<p>5.2 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, would always have with it a complete and updated picture of the works under implementation.</p>	<p>6.3 Role of the State/UT Government: (i) The Nodal Department will be responsible for coordination with the Ministry and proper and effective supervision of the MPLADS implementation in the State. To this effect a committee under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary/ Development Commissioner/ Additional Chief Secretary should review MPLADS implementation progress with the District Authorities and MPs at least once in a year. The Nodal Department Secretary and other Administrative Department Secretaries should also participate in such meetings. (ii) The States in which Divisional Commissioner arrangements exist, the Divisional Commissioners should be empowered to review the MPLADS</p>	
<p>5.3 Monitoring formats and other issues of details relevant to this scheme would be decided by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, from time to time within the framework of the scheme.</p>		
<p>5.4 The Districts Heads should also communicate information on the</p>		

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003
<p>progress of works under the scheme on the Internet to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. Copies of such reports shall also be forwarded to the MPs. Software required for reporting on the Internet will be furnished by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. This will also facilitate instantaneous monitoring of the progress of the scheme constituency-wise.</p>	<p>implementation progress and guide the District Authorities (III) The State Government will review (a) the utilization of funds by the District Authority in SC and ST areas; and (b) the audit objections and issues arising out of the audit and utilization certificates. (iv) The State Government, by specific order, shall empower the District Authorities and other District functionaries technical and administrative powers for implementation of MPLADS. (v) The State Government may make arrangements for training of district officers concerned with the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. (vi) The State Government may authorize its officers not below the rank of Deputy Secretary/ Executive Engineer to inspect MPLADS works as and when they make official field visits. (vii) The State/UT Government may check and review the number MPLADS works inspected by the District Authorities. (viii) State/UT Government shall, in consultation with Accountant General of the State/UT, engage the Auditor for auditing of MPLADS accounts of each District Authority. (ix) The State/UT Government may hoist data on MPLADS implementation in the State on their web sites.</p>	
	<p>6.4 Role of the District Authority:— The District Authority's role has been outlined in different paragraphs of the Guidelines. Here the District Authority's role on coordination and supervision is being indicated.</p>	
	<p>(i) The District Authority would be responsible for overall coordination and supervision of the works under the scheme at the district level, and inspect at least 10% of the works under implementation every year. The District Authority should involve the MPs in the inspections of projects to the extent feasible.</p>	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003
	(ii) The District Authority will enforce the provisions made in the Paragraph 2.4 on the earmarked per cent of funding for MPLADS works in the SC and ST areas.	
	(iii) The District Authority shall maintain the work-registers indicating the position of each work recommended by the MPs and shall furnish work details to the Ministry in the prescribed format for web hoisting.	
	(iv) The District Authority shall also maintain a register of all the assets created with the Scheme funds and subsequently transferred to the User Agencies.	
	(v) The District Authority will inspect all works executed by/for societies and trusts under MPLADS and ensure that the agreement conditions are being complied with. In case of violation of any of the provisions of the agreement, action as per the agreement shall be taken by the District Authority.	
	(vi) The District Authority shall furnish to the Ministry, to MPs concerned as well as to the State Government monthly reports in the required formats of the Guidelines on or before the 10th of the succeeding month.	
	(vii) The District Authority shall review every month MPLADS works implementation with the Implementing Agencies. The District Authority shall invite the MPs concerned to such review meetings.	All concerned implementing agencies at the District level should be invited to this review meeting.
	(viii) The District Authority shall be responsible to settle audit objections raised in the audits.	Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has not been accepted.
	(ix) The Nodal District Authority shall submit Monthly Progress Report to the Government of India, State/UT Government and the MP concerned for each MP separately in the formats available at Annex-VI	

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003
	<p>6.5 Role of the Implementing Agencies:—It will be the responsibility of the officers of the implementing Agencies to regularly visit the works spots to ensure that the works are progressing satisfactorily as per the prescribed procedure and specifications and the time schedule. (ii) The Implementing Agencies shall furnish physical and financial progress of each work to the District Authority every month with a copy to the concerned State Department. The Implementing Agencies should provide the report also in the soft format. (iii) The Implementing Agencies shall furnish completion report/certificates and utilization certificates to the District Authority within one month of completion of the works. (iv) The Implementing Agencies shall also refund to the District Authority the savings (balance amounts) including interest, if any, at their disposal within one month and close the Bank Account opened for the purpose.</p>	
<p>6.1 In order that local people become aware that particular works have been executed with MPLADS funds, sign boards carrying the inscription "MPLADS WORK" with the name of MP may be permanently and prominently erected at the sites.</p>	<p>3.22 As soon as a work under the Scheme is completed, it should be put to public use. For greater public awareness about execution of works costing Rs. 5 lakh and above, under MPLADS, a plaque (stone/metal) carrying the inscription 'Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme Work' indicating the cost involved, the commencement, completion and inauguration date and the name of the MP sponsoring the project should be permanently erected.</p>	<p>As soon as a work under the Scheme is completed it should be immediately put to public use.</p>
<p>6.3 Works permissible under these Guidelines may also be taken up for certain Registered Societies and Trusts, who fulfil the conditions laid down in Ministry's letter No. C/56/2000-MPLADS dated 23.01.2001 and letter No. C/56/2000-MPLADS</p>	<p>3.21 Community infrastructures and public utility buildings and works are also permissible for registered Societies/ Trusts under the Scheme, provided that the Society/Trust is engaged in the social service/welfare activity and has been in existence for the preceding three years. The existence of the Society/Trust shall be reckoned from the date it started its activities in the field, or the date of</p>	<p>Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.</p> <p>The word "prominently" may be replaced with words "permanently and prominently". The word 'sign board' may be replaced by "plaque" which should be permanent in nature (stone/metal)</p> <p>Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has been accepted.</p> <p>However, word "prominently" has not been used.</p>

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003
dated 20.03.2001 placed at Appendix-5.	<p>registration under the relevant Registration Act, whichever is later. The Implementing Agencies to regularly visit the works spots to ensure that the works are progressing satisfactorily as per the prescribed procedure and specifications and the time schedule. (ii) The Implementing Agencies shall furnish physical and financial progress of each work to the District Authority every month with a copy to the concerned State Department. The Implementing Agencies should provide the report also in the soft format. (iii) The Implementing Agencies shall furnish completion report/certificates and utilization certificates to the District Authority within one month of completion of the works. (iv) The Implementing Agencies shall also refund to the District Authority the savings (balance amounts) including interest and contingency amount, if any, at their disposal and close the Bank Account opened for the purpose. Beneficiary Society/Trust shall be a well established, public spirited, non profit making entity, enjoying a good reputation in the area. Whether such a Society/ Trust is well reputed or not, should be decided by the District Authority concerned on the basis of relevant factors, like performance in the field of social service, welfare activities, non-profit orientation of its activities, transparency of its activities and sound financial position. The ownership of the land may remain with the Society/ Trust, but the structure constructed with MPLADS funds shall be the property of State/UT Government. The Society/ Trust shall undertake to operate maintain and up keep at its cost the asset created under MPLADS. If at any time, it is found that the asset created with MPLADS funds is not being used for the purpose for which the asset was funded, the State/UT Government may take over the asset and proceed to</p>	<p>The infrastructure needs of the Government and the communities are yet to be fulfilled. The funding from MPLADS therefore, should be for bridging the gaps. In this background the Committee discussed in detail whether works pertaining to commercial/ private organizations/ institutions/NGOs/Societies/ Trusts should be supported under the Scheme. Some MPs were in favour of confining the works under MPLADS only to the Government. Programme and institutions. It was also felt that there are some reputed NGOs like Ramakrishna Mission, Red Cross who are doing good jobs for the society in the field of education, health may need financial support. It was accordingly decided to keep the upper limit of Rs.5.00 lakhs only for NGOs/Private Trusts/ Societies/Organisations in place of Rs.25 lakhs.</p> <p>Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has not been accepted.</p>

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003
6.4 MPLADS funds can also be used on the recommendation of the MPs concerned towards contribution of State Government in Centrally Sponsored Scheme, in their constituency as per details communicated under this Ministry's letter No. C/50/2000-MPLADS dated 22.01.2001 Appendix-6.	3.17 MPLAD Scheme can be converged with the Central and State Government Schemes provided such works are eligible under MPLADS. Funds from local bodies can also be pooled for MPLADS works. Wherever such pooling is done, funds from other scheme sources should be used first and the MPLADS funds should be released later, so that MPLADS fund results in completion of the work.	<p>recover from the Society/Trust, the cost incurred from MPLADS for the creation of asset along with penal interest at the rate of 18% per annum calculated with effect from the date of use of MPLADS fund for the works concurred. A formal agreement (a model agreement form is at Annex-V) will be executed by the Society/Trust with the District Authority in favour of the Government in advance for the purpose. This agreement will be registered under the relevant Registration Act on a non-judicial stamp paper of Rs.10 or more, as is applicable in the State/UT. No stamp duty would be required to be paid for registration as there is no formal transfer of assets. Not more than Rs.25 lakh can be spent from MPLADS fund for one or more works of a particular Society/Trust. If a Society has availed of the MPLADS funds up to Rs. 25 lakh, no more work can be recommended for that Society/Trust under the Scheme. The MPLADS funding is not permissible to a Society/Trust, if the recommending MP or any of his/her family members is the President/Chairman or member of the Managing Committee or Trustee of the registered Society/Trust in question. Family members would include MP and MP's spouse which would comprise of their parents, brothers and sisters, children, grandchildren and their spouses and their in-laws.</p>

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003
<p>The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation <i>vide</i> their Circular No. C/39/2000-MPLADS dated 21 February, 2002 allowed the District Collectors to utilise half per cent amount as contingent expenditure out of the annual allocation of each MP per year under MPLADS. This half per cent amount of the value of works sanctioned under MPLADS can be specifically mentioned along with the value of the works sanctioned under MPLADS in the sanction orders to be issued after preparation of estimates etc. as per established procedure of the State Government.</p>	<p>3.18 The MPs concerned can recommend the use of MPLADS funds towards the State Government share in a Centrally Sponsored Scheme being implemented in their constituencies, provided the works under the Centrally Sponsored Scheme are permissible under MPLADS.</p> <p>3.19 Public and community contribution to the works recommended by MPs is permissible. In such cases, MPLADS funds will be limited to the estimated amount minus the public and community contribution.</p> <p>3.20 There are Central and State Government Schemes which provide for the Public and community contribution. MPLADS funds shall not be used to substitute with Public and community contribution in any Central/State Government Programme/Scheme, which includes a component of such contribution.</p> <p>4.17 Contingency Expenses: The District Authority can utilize up to 0.5% of the amount spent on completed projects in a year under MPLADS as 'contingency expenses' on the items like (i) Purchase of Stationery; (ii) Office equipment including computer (excluding laptop); (iii) Telephone/fax charges, postal charges; and (iv) Expenses incurred (a) to make MPLADS works monitoring software operational and (b) to get the audit certificate and audit of the accounts. This amount must not be used for meeting the cost of items like (a) Purchase of any type for office furniture; vehicles; air-conditioners, refrigerators etc. and (b) Renovation and maintenance of office building. A separate account for such expenditure incurred during a year under MPLAD Scheme shall be maintained and MP concerned shall be kept informed besides making available the details for scrutiny by audit.</p>	<p>The suggested provision to earmark office expenses to the extent to 0.1% to be passed on to the States out of 0.5% expenses allowed at the District level should be modified to provide separate funding to the State Government for strengthening the State Government capabilities for supervision and monitoring of MPLADS execution.</p> <p>Comments—Recommendation of the Committee has not been accepted.</p>

Para No. of Existing Guidelines	Corresponding Para No. of Proposed Guidelines	Recommendations of the Committee in their sitting held on 17 September, 2003
Such Contingent expenditure can be allowed to meet the cost of following items:—		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Stationery (ii) Office equipment like typewriter, computer (iii) Payment of honorarium/overtime to the staff put on MPLADS works (iv) Telephone/fax charges, postal charges only. 		
The contingent expenditure must not be used for meeting the cost of following items:—		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Purchase of any kind of furnishing for office (ii) Renovation of office building (iii) Purchase or subscription of mobile phones (iv) Purchase of vehicles (v) Cost of fuel for vehicles (vi) Purchase of air-conditioners, refrigerators etc. 		
It is requested that a separate account for the contingent expenditure incurred during a year under MPLAD Scheme may be maintained and made available for scrutiny by audit.	Item 1 of Appendix II (List of works prohibited under MPLADS) prohibits office and residential buildings belonging to Central, and State Governments, their Departments, Government Agencies/Organisations and Public Sector Undertakings.	With reference to Item No. 1 the Committee deliberated about the need for certain office buildings to be excluded from the prohibition list.
Item 1 of Appendix II (List of works not permissible under MPLADS) prohibits office buildings. Residential buildings and other buildings relating to Central or State Governments, Departments, Agencies or Organisations.		There was a detailed discussion in the Committee to take up setting of office building for MPs in every district for facilitating implementation of MPLADS. It was suggested that Government of India should consider setting up office building for each MP under MPLADS.

NEW ADDITIONS

1.5 The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation has been responsible for the policy formulation, release of funds and prescribing monitoring mechanism for implementation of the Scheme. A Department in the State or the Union Territory (UT) is designated as the Nodal Department with the overall responsibility of supervision, monitoring and coordination of the MPLADS implementation with the districts and other Line Departments. The Government of India informs the State Nodal Department about the MPLADS funds release to the District Authorities. The District Authorities report the status of MPLADS implementation to the Government of India and State Nodal Department. The District Authority gets the MPLADS implemented through Local Self Governments or through Government Agencies. In some cases, the District Authority engages reputed Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) for execution of MPLADS works.

2.6 Development of Areas inhabited by Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes: There is a greater need to develop areas where Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) population live. It is, necessary that special attention is given for infrastructural development of such areas. The MPs are, therefore, to recommend every year such works costing at least 15% of MPLADS fund for areas where Scheduled Caste Population live and 7.5% for areas where Scheduled Tribe population live. In other words, permissible works costing not less than Rs. 30 lakh out of the annual allocation of Rs. 2 crore per M.P. may be recommended for areas where SC Population live and Rs. 15 lakh for areas where ST Population live. In case, a constituency does not have ST inhabited area, such fund may be utilized in SC inhabited areas and *vice-versa*. It will be the responsibility of the District Authority to enforce this provision of the Guidelines.

2.7 Each MP will recommend works up to the annual entitlement during the financial year preferably within 90 days of the commencement of the financial year in the format at Annex-III to the concerned District Authority. The District Authority will get the eligible sanctioned works executed as per the established procedure laid down by the State Government for implementation of such works subjected to the provision in these Guidelines.

2.10 If a Member of Parliament finds the need to promote education and culture of a State/UT wherefrom the MP is elected or has chosen a nodal District (Nominated MPs only) in a place out side that State/UT, the MP can select works relating to education and cultural development not prohibited under these Guidelines up to maximum of Rs. 10 lakh in a financial year. In such cases, the Nodal District Authority will be fully responsible for coordination and other functions bestowed on him in the Guidelines. The works Completion Report, Utilization Certificate and Audit Certificate for such works and funds will be provided by the District Authority of the district concerned to the respective District Authority from whom the funds were received.

3.1 Each MP shall recommend eligible works on MP's letter head duly signed. A letter format from the MP to the District Authority is at Annex-III. Recommendations by representative(s) of MPs are not admissible.

3.7 The work should be sanctioned and executed only if the MP concerned has allocated the full estimated cost of the work in the year. If the commitment for the full estimated amount is not forthcoming and the amount recommended by the MP is less than the estimates for the work and there are no other sources from which the deficit can be made good, then the work should not be sanctioned, as in such an eventuality, the project will remain incomplete for want of sufficient funds. The shortfall in the estimated cost vis-a-vis the one recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP.

3.8 If the estimated amount for a work is more than the amount indicated by the MP for the same, MP's further consent is necessary before the sanction is accorded.

3.10 In case, more than one list of recommendations is received by the District Authority, the priority will be as per the principle of first received to be first considered.

3.13 The sanction letter/order shall stipulate a time limit for completion of the work to the Implementation Agency. The time limit for the works should generally not exceed one year. In exceptional cases, where the implementation time exceeds one year, specific reasons for the same shall be incorporated in the sanction letter/order. The sanction letter/order may also include a clause for suitable action against the Implementation Agency in the event of their failure to complete the work within the stipulated time as per the State Government Procedure.

3.15 The work, once recommended by the MP and sanctioned by the District Authority may be cancelled if so desired by the MP only, if the execution of the work has not commenced and the cancellation does not lead to any contractual financial liability/cost on the Government and also subject to Paragraph 3.11. If for some compelling reasons, stoppage/abandonment of a work in progress becomes inevitable; the matter should be referred to the State Nodal Department with full justification for a decision under intimation to the Government of India and to the concerned MP.

3.16 On receipt of the recommendation of the works from the MP, and issue of the work sanction order by the District Authority, the District authority should ensure that details of the work sanctioned are entered in the Input Format (Annex-IV A, B, C, D, and E) and transmitted to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for hoisting in its web site. District Authorities will take steps to ensure that all works so sanctioned with effect from 1st April 2005 are entered and transmitted to the Ministry for website hoisting. For the previous years works already executed or under execution need the similar process and all entries are made in a time bound manner. In all cases of doubts, the Software Manual for Monitoring of Works under MPLADS already released and available in the website may be referred to.

3.23 List of all completed and ongoing works with MPLADS funds should also be displayed at the District Authority Office and posted in the website for information of the general public.

3.24 As per the provisions of the right to Information Act, 2004 and the Rules framed thereunder, all citizens have the right to information on any aspect of the MPLAD Scheme and the works recommended/sanctioned/executed under it. This may include any information on works recommended by the MPs, works sanctioned/not

sanctioned, cost of works sanctioned, Implementing Agencies, quality of work completed, User's Agency etc. The District Authorities are responsible to provide such information to the public in the manner as required under the Right to Information Act 2004.

4.17 Contingency Expenses: The District Authority can utilize up to 0.5% of the amount spent on completed projects in a year under MPLADS as 'contingency expenses' on the items like (i) Purchase of Stationery; (ii) Office equipment including computer (excluding laptop); (iii) Telephone/fax charges, postal charges; and (iv) Expenses incurred (a) to make MPLADS works monitoring software operational and (b) to get the audit certificate and audit of the accounts. This amount must not be used for meeting the cost of items like (a) Purchase of any type for office furniture; vehicles; air-conditioners; refrigerators etc., and (b) Renovation and maintenance of office building. A separate account for such expenditure incurred during a year under MPLAD Scheme shall be maintained and MP concerned shall be kept informed besides making available the details for scrutiny by audit.

4.18 Administrative and cent age charges: The District Authority and Implementing Agencies shall not levy any administrative charges, cent age, salary of any person, travel cost etc. for their services in respect of preparatory work, implementation and supervision of projects/works under MPLADS. The District Authority shall not charge any administrative expenses for the MPLADS works.

5.1 The District Authority and Implementing Agencies shall maintain accounts of MPLADS funds, MP-wise. Cash Book and other Books of Accounts shall be maintained as per the State/UT Government procedure. MPLADS funds received by the District Authority from the Government of India and the Implementing Agencies receiving the funds from the District Authority shall be kept only in Savings Bank Account of a nationalized Bank. Only one Account shall be maintained per MP. Deposit of MPLADS funds by the District Authority and Implementing Agencies in the State/UT Government Treasury accounts is prohibited.

5.2 The District Authority shall also maintain different head-wise list of works executed (Head and Code of Works may be seen in Annex IVE) in an Asset Register for all the MPLADS works created in the district and the Constituency for which the MPLADS funds were received.

5.3 On completion of a work, the Implementing Agency shall quickly finalize the accounts for that work and shall furnish a work completion report and utilization certificate and return the un-utilized balance (savings) including contingency charges and interest amount within 30 days to the District Authority concerned. The model work completion report is at **Annex-VII**. The District Authority and the Implementing Agency would arrange to transfer the asset to the User Agency without any delay. The User Agency should take it on its books for normal operation and maintenance.

7.2 Clarification, if any, on the guidelines on the MPLADS or interpretation of any provision of these Guidelines shall be referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and its decision shall be the final.

5. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their proposed new Guidelines on MPLADS has retained some of the provisions of the existing

Guidelines on MPLADS and has also added some new provisions in the proposed new Guidelines on MPLADS. The major amendments/additions proposed in the Guidelines are as follows:—

I. Para 1.3—Existing Guidelines

MPs can also recommend works outside their constituencies/States for construction of assets that are permissible in the guidelines, for rehabilitation measures in the event of "natural calamity of rare severity" in any part of the country for an amount not exceeding Rs. 10 lakh, for each calamity.

Para 2.8 & 2.9—Revised Guidelines

MPLADS works can also be implemented in the areas affected by calamities like floods, cyclone, Tsunami, earthquake, tornado and drought and MPs from the non-affected areas of the State can also recommend permissible works up to a maximum of Rs. 10 lakh per annum in the affected area(s) in that State. However, in the event of "**Calamity of severe nature**" in any part of the country, MPs can recommend works up to a maximum of Rs. 50 lakh for the affected district.

Para 2.8 of the proposed Guidelines allow MPs from the non-affected areas of the State affected by calamities to recommend permissible works to a maximum limit of Rs. 10 lakh per annum in the affected areas in that State. It is proposed that the limit of Rs. 10 lakh be clarified whether it is for particular calamity or the Member can contribute only Rs. 10 lakh in a year for natural calamity.

Further, there should be no upper limit of Rs. 50 lakh for contributions from MPLADS in the event of natural calamity of severe nature as stipulated in Para 2.9.

II. Para 1.2 and 2.1—Existing guidelines

MPs can recommend works permissible under the Guidelines and suggest the same to the Head of the District. There was no time limit in the Guidelines.

Para 2.7—Revised Guidelines

Each MP will recommend works up to the annual entitlement during the financial year preferably within 90 days of the commencement of the financial year.

The condition that MPs should recommend works upto the annual entitlement in a financial year preferably within 90 days may not be feasible or practical sometimes.

III. Para 3.7—Existing Guidelines

The normal financial and audit procedures would apply to all actions taken under this scheme subject to the Guidelines.

Para 5.4, 5.5 & 5.6—Revised Guidelines

The District Authority and Implementing Agencies will properly maintain MPLADS accounts and get them audited by the Chartered Accountants or

the local fund auditors or any statutory auditors as per the State/UT Government procedure. The audited accounts, reports and certificates will be submitted to the State Government and Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The audit fee may be paid for this under contingency expenses.

The proposal to pay the audit fees from the contingency expenses may be considered.

IV. Para 4.1—Existing Guidelines

Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work.

However, in the revised Guidelines the maximum cost of a project has not been mentioned.

The revised Guidelines does not stipulates the maximum cost of a project as stipulated in Para 4.1 of the existing Guidelines. Therefore, clarification in this regard is required.

V. Para 2.6—Additional Guidelines

Development of Areas inhabited by Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes: MPs can now recommend every year works costing at least 15% of MPLADS funds for areas where Scheduled Castes population live and 7.5% for areas where Scheduled Tribes population reside.

May be approved.

VI. Para 6.2—Additional Guidelines

Role of the Central Government—A new role has been assigned to Central Government and the Ministry will bring out Annual Report on the implementation of MPLADS including the facts relating to physical and financial progress.

As per this provision, the Ministry will bring out an annual report on the implementation of MPLADS. It is proposed that the Ministry should also fix accountability for works being delayed/non-implemented in their Report.

VII. Para 2.10—Additional Guidelines

Members of Parliament in order to promote education and culture can select works relating to education and cultural development not prohibited under these guidelines up to maximum of Rs. 10 lakh in a financial year.

May be approved.

VIII. Para 7.2—Additional Guidelines

Clarification, if any, on the Guidelines on the MPLADS or interpretation of any provision of these Guidelines shall be referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and its decision shall be the final.

As per this provision clarifications pertaining to MPLADS are to be referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and their decision shall be final. This aspect needs to be examined.

IX. Para 3.24—Additional Guidelines

As per the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2004, all citizens have the right to information on any aspect of the MPLAD Scheme and the works recommended/sanctioned/executed under it. The District Authorities are responsible to provide such information to the public in the manner as required under the Right to Information Act 2004.

May be approved.

6. The Committee may consider the proposed revised Guidelines on MPLADS.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the.....

APPENDIX XXII

Vide Chapter IV of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 4

Subject: Proposal for funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds.

Hon'ble Speakers of Legislative Assemblies of Meghalaya, Assam, Nagaland, Tripura, Sikkim, Mizoram, Manipur and Arunachal Pradesh addressed a letter dated 30 July, 2005 to Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha regarding funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies, Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. Hon'ble Speakers of Legislative Assemblies of North Eastern States, in their letter dated July 30, 2005 stated as follows:—

"We take this privilege to apprise you that the 8 North Eastern States including Sikkim established an unique Regional Institute under the nomenclature of "North East Regional" Institute of Parliamentary Studies, Training and Research" (NERIPSTR) in 1997 at Guwahati with the guidance and inspiration of the then Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri P.A. Sangma, MP.

As you are aware, Sir, the North East Region is comparatively fresher, with 75 per cent population of the region belonging to tribal communities of different ethnic groups is comparatively fresher in the art of parliamentary democracy.

The primary objective of the Institute, *inter alia*, is to promote parliamentary democratic polity and also to address various socio-economic and political problems confronting the region collectively in an integrated manner.

For construction of the complex, a project report was prepared with an estimated cost of about Rs. 14 crores. For mobilization of this princely amount, sources like (1) contribution from 8 members states (2) contribution from 39 MPs of the region at the rate of Rs. 2 lakhs each (3) Grant-in-aid from Speaker, Lok Sabha among others were identified.

However, Sir, so far except the contribution from the 8 members States, response from other sources have not at all been partonizing. As a result, the construction work of the project presently stands still. Pertinent here to mention that the contribution by the 39 MPs were affirmed by a resolution dated 26th February, 1997. The MPs of the region, however, expressed their

inability later to redeem their commitment on the ground that the guidelines for spending their "MPs Local Area Development Fund" does not permit such contribution.

Under the circumstances we would fervently request your goodself kindly to relax the ibid Guidelines for the 39 MPs of the North East Region as a very special case enabling them to contribute this committed amount and thereby help to complete the project without further delay as otherwise the escalated cost of the project would prove as prohibitive for us defeating the very objective of the Institute for which it was established.

We hope, Sir, you would bestow due importance on the prayer and do the needful at the earliest as beseeched."

3. The proposal for funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds had already been considered by the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha in their sitting held on 7 August, 2001 and it was decided to reject the proposal as the extant Guidelines on MPLADS prohibits any work relating to office building as well as allocation of MPLADS funds by Members of Parliament outside their constituency. The proposal considered by the Committee on MPLADS and the recommendation are given as under:—

"Suggestion regarding funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds.

The Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a letter dated 21 May, 2001 to the Secretary General, Lok Sabha regarding a suggestion for funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds, for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

In his letter, the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as under:—

"I am writing this in connection with establishment of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) proposed to be constructed at Guwahati at an estimated cost of Rs. 13.61 crores. Initially, it was envisaged to partly fund this project to the tune of Rs. 78 lakhs through allocation of Rs. 2.00 lakhs out of the MPLADS funds of each MP from the North Eastern States. During 1998 a proposal in this regard was received in this Ministry from Hon'ble Speaker of Assam Legislative Assembly. The Ministry clarified that the proposal could not be covered under MPLADS, as the extant Guidelines prohibited any work relating to office building as well as allocation of funds by the MPs outside their constituency. Subsequently, the matter was under consideration of the Planning Commission for allocation of additional funds for the purpose. The Planning Commission has referred the case back to this Ministry with the

following remarks of the Deputy Chairman:—

"The Speaker of Assam Assembly has written to say that MPs are willing to contribute to the project. Is there any difficulty?"

The proposal to contribute MPLADS by MPs of Rajya Sabha as well as Lok Sabha from the North Eastern States may kindly be placed before the Rajya Sabha/ Lok Sabha Committee on MPLADS, for their consideration in the light of the following facts:—

- (a) Lok Sabha MPs can allocate funds within their constituencies. Hence, Lok Sabha MPs from North Eastern States, except the MP of Lok Sabha from Assam in whose constituency the said Institute falls cannot allocate funds for the said Institute under the present Guidelines.
- (b) Elected Rajya Sabha MPs can allocate funds in one or more districts in the State from which they have been elected. Hence, only Rajya Sabha MPs elected from Assam can allocate funds for taking up works permissible in the Guidelines, in the State of Assam.
- (c) There is a specific restriction on construction of office buildings, residential buildings and other buildings relating to Central or State Government Departments, Agencies or Organisations.

If the proposal is to be allowed under MPLADS, relaxations with regard to above points would be necessary."

Recommendation

The Committee note the proposal regarding funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds and reject it as the extant Guidelines on MPLADS prohibit any work relating to construction of office building as well as allocation of funds by the Members of Parliament outside their constituency except in the case of natural calamity of rare severity."

4. Hon'ble Speakers of Legislative Assemblies of North-Eastern States in their letter dated July 30, 2005 have stated that the North-Eastern States had established a unique regional institute under the nomenclature of "North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR)" in 1997 at Guwahati. The primary objective of the institute is to promote parliamentary democratic polity and to address socio-economic and political problems of the region. The Project Report prepared for the construction of the complex for NERIPSTR had estimated that Rs. 14 crore would be required for the project and the main sources for funding the project would be (i) contribution from 8 member states of North Eastern Region; (ii) contribution from 39 MPs of the region at the rate of Rs. 2 lakhs each; and (iii) Grant-in-aid from Speaker, Lok Sabha. However, the funds from 8 member States are only coming and, therefore, the construction work of the project has come to a standstill. The 39 Hon'ble Members of Parliament of the region who are willing to contribute for this project had expressed their inability to contribute from their MPLADS funds as the Guidelines on MPLADS prohibits any such contribution.

5. In this regard, the Guidelines on MPLADS prohibits any Member of Parliament to allocate MPLADS funds outside their constituency except in case of natural calamity of rare severity. Para 1.3 of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulates as follows:—

"MPs can also recommend works outside their Constituencies/States for construction of assets that are permissible in the Guidelines, for rehabilitation measures in the event of "natural calamity of rare severity" in any part of the country for an amount not exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs, for each calamity."

In his letter, the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as under:—

"I am writing this in connection with establishment of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) proposed to be constructed at Guwahati at an estimated cost of Rs. 13.61 crores. Initially, it was envisaged to partly fund this project to the tune of Rs. 78 lakhs through allocation of Rs. 2.00 lakhs out of the MPLADS funds of each MP from the North Eastern States. During 1998 a proposal in this regard was received in this Ministry from Hon'ble Speaker of Assam Legislative Assembly. The Ministry clarified that the proposal could not be covered under MPLADS, as the extant Guidelines prohibited any work relating to office building as well as allocation of funds by the MPs outside their constituency. Subsequently, the matter was under consideration of the Planning Commission for allocation of additional funds for the purpose." The Planning Commission has referred the case back to this Ministry with the following remarks of the Deputy Chairman:—

"The Speaker of Assam Assembly has written to say that MPs are willing to contribute to the project. Is there any difficulty?"

The proposal to contribute MPLADS by MPs of Rajya Sabha as well as Lok Sabha from the North Eastern States may kindly be placed before the Rajya Sabha/Lok Sabha Committee on MPLADS, for their consideration in the light of the following facts:—

- (a) Lok Sabha MPs can allocate funds within their constituencies. Hence, Lok Sabha MPs from North Eastern States, except the MP of Lok Sabha from Assam in whose constituency the said Institute falls cannot allocate funds for the said Institute under the present Guidelines.**
- (b) Elected Rajya Sabha MPs can allocate funds in one or more districts in the State from which they have been elected. Hence, only Rajya Sabha MPs elected from Assam can allocate funds for taking up works permissible in the Guidelines, in the State of Assam.**
- (c) There is a specific restriction on construction of office buildings, residential buildings and other buildings relating to Central or State Government Departments, Agencies or Organisations.**

6. The Guidelines on MPLADS also prohibits construction of any kind of office building related to Central or State Governments, Departments, Agencies or Organisations. The Item 1 of the List of works not permissible under the MPLADS

(Appendix-II) envisages as follows:—

"Office building, residential buildings and other buildings relating to Central or State Governments, Departments, Agencies or Organisations."

7. However, as the project is a unique one and located in North-Eastern State which had been declared by the Government of India as 'Special Category States' and is beset with unique and complex problems of the region, the aforesaid proposal may be considered in positive light and relaxation be given in the Guidelines on MPLADS as a special case.

8. The Committee may consider the proposal for funding of North East Regional Institute of Parliamentary Studies Training and Research (NERIPSTR) to be constructed at Guwahati from MPLADS funds as a special case.

NEW DELHI;

Dated the 2nd Sept., 2005

APPENDIX XXIII

Vide Chapter V of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 17

Subject: Construction of fish landing center with RCC Jetty at Enayamputhenthurai in Kanyakumari District at an estimated cost of Rs. 150 lakh from the contributions made by Members of Parliament, Lok Sabha from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 2 September, 2005 pertaining to the proposal for construction of fish landing center with RCC Jetty at Enayamputhenthurai in Kanyakumari District at an estimated cost of Rs. 150 lakh from the contributions made by Members of Parliament, Lok Sabha from MPLADS funds for rehabilitation and reconstruction works in the tsunami affected areas for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 2 September, 2005 stated as follows:—

I. "The following two works were identified and authorized, in consultation with the State Government of Tamil Nadu and the Lok Sabha Committee on MPLADS to be undertaken in Kanyakumari, Tamil Nadu for Tsunami rehabilitation from MPLADS funds of Lok Sabha MPs:

- (i) **Dredging of Chinnamuttom Fishing Harbour and restoring of infrastructure facilities like generator room, water supply arrangements, auction hall, etc., with an approximate cost of Rs. 120 lakh.**
- (ii) **Desalination plants for water supply at Simon Colony (two numbers of 50,000 litrs. per day capacity each) with an approximate cost of Rs. 150 lakh.**

II. DC, Kanyakumari has informed that the work shown at Sl. No. (i) has been taken up for execution and Administrative Sanction was accorded by DC on 11.8.2005.

III. However, as regards the work at Sl. No. 2, DC, Kanyakumari has stated that in view of urgency for providing water supply, the water supply to Simon Colony had already been partially resumed by bringing water supply through "Muzhithuraiyar CWSS Scheme' by TWAD Board. Further, to augment the water supply to Simon Colony, an NGO, CARE INDIA proposed a Scheme for an amount of Rs. 15 lakh to supplement the TWAD Board Scheme. On completion of the above work Simon Colony Panchayat would not have any problem for water supply and hence the desalination plant at this location as originally proposed at a cost of Rs. 150 lakh for taking up with MPLADS funds is no longer needed.

IV. Alternatively, he has proposed to take up "Construction of fish landing center with RCC Jetty at Enayamputhenthurai" in Kanyakumari District for Rs. 150 lakh. Following works have been incorporated in the proposal:—

- (i) Construction of auction hall
- (ii) Construction of office building
- (iii) Construction of toilet block
- (iv) Water supply arrangements
- (v) Electrification arrangements
- (vi) Soil investigation and bathometric survey
- (vii) Labour Welfare Fund
- (viii) Unforeseen item
- (ix) PS & Contingencies

V. However, construction of Office Building and Labour Welfare Fund are not allowed under MPLADS Guidelines. The District Collector, Kanyakumari will be advised to ensure that only permissible items are sanctioned.

VI. It is, therefore, requested that the proposal received from DC, Kanyakumari for change in the works as has been brought out in Para (III) and Para (IV) may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for consideration and views."

3. The District Collector and Chairman, DRDA, Nagercoil in his letter dated 12 July, 2005 has stated as under:—

"I invite your kind attention to the reference Ist cited above. In the letter it is stated that MPs have consented to allot Rs. 270.00 lakhs for taking up rehabilitation works in Tsunami affected areas of Kanyakumari District.

It is also indicated that the amount released is for two rehabilitation works costing Rs. 270.00 lakhs as detailed below with the MPLADS fund and have been identified in consultation with the MPLADS Committee of Lok Sabha and State Government;

Dredging of Chinnamuttom, fishing harbour and restoring of infrastructure facilities like generator room, water supply arrangements, auction hall etc.	Rs.120.00 lakhs
Desalination, plants for water supply at Simon Colony (two numbers of 50000/- per day capacity each)	Rs. 150.00 lakhs

In this connection, it is brought to the kind notice that the AEE, Chinnamuttom harbour has furnished a project proposal to an amount of Rs. 120.00 lakhs for the restoration of infrastrucures facilities of Chinnamuttom fishing harbour in Kanyakumari District duly incorporating the following provisions for the first work

specified in the above letter.

1. Net mending shed in Fishing harbour	Rs. 17.70 lakhs
2. Fisherman Rest shed in Fishing harbour	Rs. 25.00 lakhs
3. Strengthening the existing Break water in Chinnamutton fishing Harbour with Grouting	Rs. 16.40 lakhs
4. Auction Hall	Rs. 61.00 lakhs
Total	Rs. 120.00 lakhs

For the second work "Desalination plants for water supply at Simon Colony (two numbers of 50000 ltrs per day capacity each)" it is submitted that water supply to Simon Colony has already been partially resumed by bringing water supply through "Kuzhithuraiyar CWSS Scheme" by TWAD Board. Further to augment the water supply to Simon Colony an NGO, CARE INDIA has proposed a scheme for an amount of Rs.15.00 lakhs to supplement the TWAD Board Scheme. On completion of the above work Simon Colony Panchayat would not have any problem for water supply. Hence, it is necessary to take up an alternative work.

Alternatively the proposal for "construction of fish landing center at Enayamputhenturai" in Kanyakumari District for Rs. 150.00 lakhs is proposed.

Enayamputhenturai is an important fishing center situated in Vilavancode Taluk of Kanyakumari District and is one of the affected places due to tsunami. Now due to various relief and rehabilitation works normalcy is slowly being restored. As there is no fish landing center they have to go to Kerala State for fishing. Hence the need of fish landing center in their village is their dream. This village is comprising of traditional fisherman. At present there is no fish landing facilities. Hence it is proposed to construct a fish landing center at a cost of Rs. 1.50 crores with minimum terminal facilities. This will increase the fishing activities of this village and there by improve the socio-economic status of the fisherman.

Following arrangements are incorporated in the fish landing centre proposal:

1. Providing fish landing center with required landing jetty berthing jetty and approach jetty.
2. Construction of auction hall.
3. Construction of office building.
4. Construction of toilet block.
5. Provision for water supply.
6. Provision for electricity.

I request that revised sanction may kindly be accorded to execute the work, so as to improve the socio-economic status of the tsunami affected fishermen of Enayamputhenturai village."

3A. The aforesaid proposal was referred to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for furnishing certain clarifications related to the proposal of construction of Fish Landing Centre. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation *vide* their O.M. dated 29 September, 2005 has stated as under:—

- Construction of buildings including auction hall are permissible. But labour welfare fund is not admissible under MPLADS Guidelines.
- Soil investigation and bathometric survey may be necessary to choose the type of foundation of the structure, hence should be allowed.
- Contingency expenses is not permissible as per Para 1.3 of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation Orders Nos. C/22/2004-MPLADS dated 1 June, 2005.

4. In this regard, the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha in their sitting held on 18 March, 2005 deliberated over the priority list of works forwarded by Government of Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Andhra Pradesh & Kerala to be undertaken from MPLADS and decided as follows:—

- (a) MPLADS funds contributed for tsunami affected areas be released and utilised in the ratio proposed by the Ministry *i.e.* 40% to Tamil Nadu, 40% to Andaman and Nicobar Islands and 20% to Pondicherry, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala.
- (b) Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should monitor and coordinate the release and utilization of funds in consultation with the authorities of concerned State Governments.
- (c) Funds should be utilised only for works permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS.
- (d) The nodal District Collector of the affected area should ensure execution of work in a time frame.
- (e) Details of each MP's contribution *i.e.* release of amount from each MP's fund to District Collector, place of work, nature of the project etc., be furnished to each MP and the Committee.
- (f) Each Hon'ble Member who has contributed from MPLADS funds should be regularly informed about the progress of works undertaken from the amount contributed by him.
- (g) The details of the utilization of the funds of each MP should be regularly furnished to the MP and the Committee on monthly basis.

5. In view of the aforesaid decision of the Committee, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in consultation with the State Government of Tamil Nadu had decided that following works be undertaken in Kanyakumari:—

- (i) Dredging of Chinnamuttom Fishing Harbour and restoring of infrastructure facilities like generator room, water supply arrangements, auction hall, etc., with an approximate cost of Rs. 120 lakh.

- (ii) Desalination plants for water supply at Simon Colony (two numbers of 50,000 ltrs. per day capacity each) with an approximate cost of Rs. 150 lakh.

The work at Sl. No. (i) had already been accorded administrative sanction by the District Collector, Kanyakumari. However, the District Collector Kanyakumari has stated that the work at Sl.No. (ii) for construction of desalination plants is no longer required as the requirement of water has been met from other source. The District Collector has, therefore, proposed construction of fish landing center with RCC Jetty at Enayamputhenthurai in Kanyakumari at an estimated cost of Rs. 150 lakh instead of the desalination plant for water supply to Simon Colony.

6. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation *vide* their letter No.C/71/2004-MPLADS (Part) dated 18 October, 2005 have stated that the construction of proposed fish landing center is a new work. It can be treated as reconstruction work to be undertaken in tsunami affected areas as it seeks to rehabilitate the tsunami affected people of Kanyakumari District. The estimated cost of the project is Rs. 150 lakh and involves construction of auction hall, office building, toilet block, water supply arrangements, electrification arrangements, soil investigation and bathometric survey, labour Welfare Fund, unforeseen item and PS & contingencies. However, the construction of office building, labour welfare fund, and contingency expenses are not admissible under MPLADS Guidelines. Soil investigation and bathometric survey would be required to select the type of foundation of the structure and hence the expenditure incurred on this account should be allowed.

Therefore, the aforesaid work requires the approval of the Committee with the instruction to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation that the funds be utilised only for works permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS.

7. The proposal to construct fish landing center with RCC Jetty at Enayamputhenthurai in Kanyakumari District at an estimated cost of Rs. 150 lakh received from District Collector, Kanyakumari instead of the proposed desalination plants for water supply to Simon Colony may be approved. The inadmissible works such as construction of office building, labour welfare fund, contingency expenses are not admissible, in terms of MPLADS Guidelines. Such works or items may not be approved.

8. The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;

Dated the 19th October, 2005.

APPENDIX XXIV

(Vide Chapter VI of the Report)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 13

Subject: Proposal from Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP (LS) for waiving of condition that the benefits of MPLAD Scheme would not be given to a registered Society/trust, if the Member who has forwarded the proposal was himself the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee etc., or Trustee of Registered Society/Trust in question.

Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP (LS) addressed a letter to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS regarding waiving of condition that the benefits of MPLAD Scheme would not be given to a registered society/trust, if the Member who has forwarded the proposal was himself the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee etc., or Trustee of Registered Society/Trust in question for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Hon'ble Member, in his letter, stated as follows:—

"Due to some urgent work in my constituency i.e. Kolhapur. I was unable to attend the meeting of Members of MPLADS Committee held on 18th July, 2005.

As such I would like to contribute my views/suggestions regarding the financial assistance to be given to the Public Trusts headed or represented by the Member of Parliament.

We all are aware that such public trusts are formed mainly due to the initiative taken by the MPs and if these trusts cannot be covered for the financial assistance to be given from the MPLAD Scheme, there is every possibility of general resentment amongst office bearers as well as people at large.

Further the trusts are providing most useful services by undertaking installation of Sports Club, Gymnastic Centre, Cultural Houses, Physical Education, Educational institutions including Technical Trades activities for the benefit of the local people. In view of the above, I am of the strong view that the trusts having MP's as their Chairman and trustees may not be deprived from obtaining Financial Assistance under the MPLAD Scheme.

At the most I would suggest that some financial limit for works belonging to trusts may be fixed and the line that the trusts managed by the Member of Parliament, Spouse, Children and other relatives are not permissible for financial assistance under the Scheme may be deleted.

I shall be grateful if you kindly consider my suggestions favourably and have this incorporated in the minutes of the meeting held on 18 July, 2005 proposed to be submitted for approval to the Central Government."

3. The Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha in their Tenth Report presented to Lok Sabha on 21 November, 2002 *vide* Para 10.6 recommended *inter alia* as follows:—

"The Committee considered the proposal of Dr. Akhtar Hasan Rizvi, and Shri Vijay Darda, MPs (RS) regarding clarification sought by them on limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work under MPLADS. In this regard, the Committee decided as follows:—

- (1) the cost limit of Rs. 25 lakh stipulated in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines of MPLADS is to be made applicable to each work/project of an institution under the Scheme;
- (2) the works relating to the genuine cases of trusts/societies would be considered by the Committee after having got them verified from the Ministry/State Governments under the MPLAD Scheme;
- (3) the benefits of MPLAD Scheme would not be given to a registered society/trust, if the Member who has forwarded such proposal was the President/Chairman or member of the Managing Committee etc., or trustee of the registered society/trust in question; and
- (4) each case costing more than Rs. 25 lakh would be examined by the Committee on MPLADS."

4. Hon'ble Member in his letter has stated that the condition in the Guidelines that MPs cannot allocate MPLADS funds to a registered society/trust where they themselves are the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee etc., or trustee of the registered society/trust in question be waived as it deprives them to provide any kind of financial assistance to the trust.

5. In this regard, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation *vide* their circular No.R/24/33/98-MPLADS dated 24 April, 2005 has clarified that (a) the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs stipulated in para 4.1 is to be made applicable to a trust society as a whole if a particular society/trust has more than one institution or more than one work for that institution *i.e.*, from MPLADS not more than Rs.25 lakhs for a particular society trust: can be spent and (b) the benefits of MPLAD Scheme would not be given to a registered society/trust if the MP giving the proposal is himself the President/Chairman or member of the Managing Committee etc. or trustee of the registered society/trust in question.

6. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Sadashivrao D. Mandlik, MP (LS) for waiving of condition that the benefits of MPLAD Scheme would not be given to a registered society/trust, if the Member who has forwarded the proposal was himself the President/Chairman or Member of the Managing Committee etc., or Trustee of Registered Society/Trust in question.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 19th October, 2005.

APPENDIX XXV

(Vide Chapter VII of the Report)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 3

Subject: Proposal from Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, MP (LS) for contributing Rs. 5 lakh from MPLADS funds for construction of building of Chandigarh War Memorial.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, MP (LS) addressed a letter dated 4 July, 2005 to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS for contributing Rs. 5 lakh from MPLADS funds for construction of building of Chandigarh War Memorial for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Hon'ble Member, in his letter, stated as follows:—

"My recommendation for contribution of Rs. 5 lakh under MPLADS towards building of Chandigarh War Memorial at the site selected by Chandigarh Administration has not been cleared on the ground that construction of Memorials or Memorial Buildings is not permissible under the Guidelines.

The relevant provision in the Guidelines is designed to bar Memorials or Memorial Buildings dedicated to any individual. The case of Chandigarh War Memorial is a unique nature by itself as it is meant for 9000 martyrs of the region who had, in the past, laid down their lives for the sake of the country. The memorial is not to be named after any individual but as Chandigarh War Memorial. It is being raised on the land belonging to the Chandigarh Administration and would be strictly a public property. It is also intended to be a unique land mark to add to the tourist attraction of Chandigarh. This fact amounts to developmental work as regards the 'modern city of Chandigarh'.

In response to an appeal by the Indian Express, a large number of people have come forward to make donations for this project and the students of Chandigarh College of Architecture have designed the structure.

Accordingly, I write this to request that the Committee on MPLADS may review the decision of the Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh and sanction the execution of the work as recommended by me."

3. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 18 July, 2005 stated as under:—

"The undersigned is directed to refer to the letter of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, MP (LS) received through Fax, addressed to Shri Prasanna Acharya,

Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS (Lok Sabha) on the above subject and to state as under:—

Under MPLADS, addressing the locally felt developmental needs through creation of fixed assets is envisaged. "Memorials or memorial buildings" is not permissible as per Item No. 5 in Appendix-2 of the Guidelines."

4. Hon'ble Member, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal in his letter has stated that he has sanctioned Rs. 5 lakh from his MPLADS funds for construction of building of Chandigarh War Memorial. However, the proposal was not sanctioned by Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh as the construction of memorials or memorial buildings are prohibited items under the Guidelines on MPLADS. The proposed construction of War Memorial is a unique project as it is meant for 9000 martyrs of the region who laid down their lives for the sake of the country and the memorial is not to be named after any individual but will be named as Chandigarh War Memorial. Land for this project belongs to Chandigarh Administration and would also be a tourist attraction. Large number of people are also making contributions for the project and the students of Chandigarh College of Architecture have designed the structure. It would amount to the developmental work to the modern city of Chandigarh.

5. As regards, whether the work is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS, the Ministry have stated that under MPLADS locally felt developmental needs which leads to creation of fixed assets are taken up. However, memorials or memorial buildings are not permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS. Item 5 of List of works not permissible under MPLADS (Appendix-2) prohibits any kind of 'memorials or memorial buildings'.

6. However, the proposal of Hon'ble Member is a unique one and is not in the memory of an individual. It is meant for 9000 martyrs of the region who laid down their lives for the sake of the country and would be named as Chandigarh War Memorial. Chandigarh Administration is providing land for the project.

7. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, MP (LS) for contributing Rs. 5 lakh from MPLADS funds for construction of building for Chandigarh War Memorial.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 2nd Sept., 2005

APPENDIX XXVI

Vide Chapter VIII of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 7

Subject: Proposal for providing MPLADS funds for higher education.

Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Governor, Uttaranchal addressed a letter dated 16 August, 2004 to Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha for providing MPLADS funds for higher education for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Hon'ble Governor, Uttaranchal in his letter stated as follows:—

"I am highlighting the following vital issue for your kind consideration.

Each year 790 Members of both Houses of Parliament receive Rs. 1580 crores under the MPLAD Scheme for development works in their constituencies. The Guidelines *inter alia* provide that this Fund be utilised for creation of "durable assets". As we all know that some of these "durable assets" like constructing culverts, school boundaries walls and even the boundary wall at the District Magistrate's residence, improving village roads, ponds, providing pavements on city roads get washed away with the first showers of monsoon. Some of these durable assets are not even visible to the naked eye. Having lived in Delhi for over 40 years, I know that each year over 100 crores is spent under MP/MLA Area Development Fund. I have not seen any perceptible improvement in the quality of roads in Delhi (leaving aside the NDMC area) or any investment out of this Fund for any institution of which Delhi can be proud. Without going into many details of how these funds are misutilised for sub-standard works with sarkari babu and the unscrupulous contractor siphoning off substantial part of the fund, I have the following suggestion for your kind consideration.

I cannot think of any assets more durable than investing precious resources in the young ignited minds. I am referring to bright children from the economically weaker sections of society who are denied the gift of higher education for want of financial resources to support higher professional studies. I would, therefore, sincerely request you to consider the allocation of at least 50 per cent of this annually disbursed amount of two crores for providing scholarships of Rs. 50,000/- each per year to children from the disadvantaged sections of society for pursuing professional courses of study. With Rs. one crore available for scholarships each year from MPLAD Scheme, 200 bright children can benefit and pursue a 4-5 year course of study in one constituency with annual support during the Members' 5/6

years term. If this scheme comes into operation, nearly 16,000 students all over the country would receive the gift of higher education. Once this proposal is accepted in principle other details can be worked out by the HRD and Programme Implementation Ministries. This scheme can also be adopted by the states where Assembly Members receive similar funds for development schemes.

I shall be grateful if you can bestow your kind attention to this proposal. This may have to be discussed under your guidance by the Lok Sabha Committee on M.P. Local Area Development Fund."

3. The matter was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation and the Ministry in their communication dated 16 December, 2004 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to refer to Lok Sabha Secretariat's O.M. No. 13/01/2004-MPLADS dated 25 August, 2004 on the subject mentioned above and to say that the proposal of His Excellency Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Governor, Uttaranchal has been thoroughly examined in the Ministry.

The main aim of MPLADS Scheme is to create durable assets. Grant and loan is not permissible under MPLADS."

4. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Governor, Uttaranchal for providing MPLADS funds for higher education.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 3rd February, 2005.

APPENDIX XXVII

Vide Chapter IX of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 5

Subject: Suggestion from Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, MP (LS) regarding utilisation of funds under MPLAD Scheme for procurement of sports items and sports infrastructure in the country to the tune of Rs. 20 lakh per annum.

The Committee on MPLADS at their sitting held on 7 May, 2003 considered the (i) Suggestion from Shri Vikram Verma, Hon'ble Minister of Youth Affairs and Sports for providing MPLADS funds for works related to sports—sports infrastructure, non-consumable and consumable sports items under MPLADS and (ii) Suggestion from Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, MP (LS) and President of All India Council of Sports regarding utilisation of funds under MPLAD Scheme for procurement of sports and infrastructure in the country and decided as follows:—

"The Committee considered the proposals of (i) Shri Vikram Verma, Hon'ble Minister of Youth Affairs and Sports and (ii) Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, MP (LS) and President of All India Council of Sports and approved for providing MPLADS funds for works related to sports-sports infrastructure, non-consumable and consumable sports items (amounting to Rs. 2/- lakh per year) under MPLADS."

2. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their action taken comments dated 24 June, 2003 stated as under:—

"Lok Sabha Secretariat may kindly refer to item 2(iv) of the minutes of the Third Sitting of the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha held on 7th May, 2003.

The Guidelines on MPLADS permit construction of buildings and creation of durable assets for sports activities, such as stadia, play fields, football/volley ball/basket ball/tennis courts, gymnasium buildings, swimming pools etc.

In the proposed revision of the Guidelines which was referred to the Lok Sabha Secretariat in March, 2003 fixed (immovable) sports equipments have also been included in the list of works permissible under MPLADS.

In view of the fact that the accountability of public funds would become difficult if moveable and consumable sports items are allowed to be purchased under the Scheme, the Government is of the opinion that only sports infrastructure

and fixed (immovable) sports equipments should be allowed under the Scheme."

3. The Hon'ble Member in his subsequent letter addressed to then Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS dated 14 May, 2003 stated as under:—

"Kindly refer to my letter dated 8 April, 2003. Thank you for accepting our suggestions to suitably amend the rules governing the use of MPLADS funds so as to include creation of sports infrastructure and procurement of consumable and non-consumable sports goods as suggested in my letter.

However, the amount of Rs. 2 lakh will be too meagre to provide any sports facilities. You will agree that setting up a gymnasium with various gymnasium equipment costs approx. Rs. 2 lakh. Hence, restricting the funds to Rs. 2 lakh per annum will not help in spreading sports in the constituency.

I, therefore, once again suggest that the upper limit may be enhanced to a maximum of Rs. 20 lakh per annum. However, the equipment may be supplied to the following agencies:—

- (i) Registered Sports Club.**
- (ii) Schools run by State and Central Government, Registered Societies, Trusts, Government Aided Schools and NGOs.**
- (iii) Other registered NGOs working for promotion of sports.**
- (iv) NYKs for providing assistance to sports clubs both in rural and urban area/DC/SP/SAI.**

The non-consumable and consumable sports goods may be procured for the above-mentioned agencies through District Collector as Chairman of the Monitoring Committee with representative of the above user agencies as members to ensure proper upkeep and utilisation of sports facilities.

Further, utilisation of MPLAD funds for creation of sports facilities be monitored by District Collector, Superintendent of Police and District Sports Officer representing State Sports Directorate, Officer of SAI Centres where SAI Centre is situated.

You are requested to kindly incorporate the above suggestions in the circular to be issued to all Hon'ble MPs so that massive sports awareness drive may be taken up throughout the country with the active assistance of all Members of Parliament."

4. The suggestion of the hon'ble Member to enhance the limit of Rs. 2 lakh to Rs. 20 lakh per annum was referred to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for their factual comments. The Ministry in their O.M. dated 7 July, 2003 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to refer to the Lok Sabha Secretariat letter No. 9/3/26/MPLADSC/2003 dated 26 May, 2003 on the above subject and to say that Prof. V.K. Malhotra, MP (LS) has made a request to the Chairman, Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha, to enhance the amount of Rs. 2 lakh

per year recommended by the Committee to Rs. 20 lakh per year for purchase of sports items.

The recommendation of the Lok Sabha Committee on MPLADS for providing MPLADS funds relating to sports items amounting to Rs. 2 lakh per year was considered by the Ministry and views of the Ministry have been conveyed to Lok Sabha Secretariat *vide* our O.M. of even number dated 24 June, 2003. Since the Ministry does not support the recommendation for making a provision in the Guidelines for allowing Rs. 2 lakh per year for sports items, the question of enhancing the limit of Rs. 2 lakh to Rs. 20 lakh would not arise."

5. The Hon'ble Member in his letter dated 1 October, 2004 has now stated as under:—

"I am enclosing a set of copies of earlier correspondence made by me as President, All India Council of Sports, for creation of sports infrastructure and other sports facilities under MPLAD Scheme.

The proposals received wide acceptance at all levels and the same were discussed and finalised in the third sitting of Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme held on 7 May, 2003 under the Chairmanship of Shri P.H.Pandian.

However, the Committee recorded as setting aside Rs. 2.00 lakhs per annum instead of Rs. 20.00 lakhs per annum for creation of sports facilities under MPLAD Scheme. I had taken up with the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to approve the recommendations of the Committee on MPLAD and also to enhance the limit for spending of creation of sports facilities under MPLAD Scheme from Rs. 2.00 lakhs to Rs. 20.00 lakh per annum.

You are requested to take up the proposals once again and recommend for the implementaion of the same."

6. The matter was again referred to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation for their factual comments and the Ministry *vide* their O.M. dated 16 November, 2004 has stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to refer to Lok Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. L/4/536/2004-MPLADSC dated 21 October, 2004 on the above subject and to say that Prof. V.K. Malhotra, MP(LS) has suggested that Rs. 20 lakh may be set aside for creation of sports facilities under MPLAD Scheme.

The views of this Ministry are given below:

- (i) The Guidelines on MPLADS already permit the construction of buildings and creation of durable assets for sports activities, such as stadia, play fields, football/volleyball/basketball/tennis courts, gymnasium buildings, swimming pools etc. Members of parliament can allocate funds under MPLADS for these items. MPs may recommend the spending of any amount on these, from their MPLADS funds provided each work does not cost more than Rs. 25 lakh.

- (ii) **Earlier the MPLADS Committee, Lok Sabha in its meeting held on 7 May, 2003 considered the proposal as memorandum No. 13 and had recommended for earmarking and providing MPLADS funds for works related to sports—sports infrastructure, non-consumable and consumable sports items (amounting to Rs.2 lakh per year) under MPLADS. The recommendation of the Committee was examined and the decision taken by the Government was not to accept the same, the decision was communicated to the Lok Sabha Secretariat vide this Ministry's OM No. C/42/2000-MPLADS dated 24 June, 2003.**
- (iii) **It may be noted that the MPLAD Scheme Guidelines provide that MPs can recommend sports related works in their constituencies based on the felt needs of the localities. In this context, it would not be desirable to make any mandatory earmarked provision per annum from MPLADS funds for spending on sports related works."**

7. The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI:
Dated the 13th December, 2004.

APPENDIX XXVIII

Vide Chapter X of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 8

Subject: Proposal of Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha for providing salaries to teachers of schools in rural areas from MPLADS funds.

Shri Charanjit Singh Atwal, Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha *vide* his letter dated 31 January, 2005 addressed to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS has stated that the schools in rural villages of the country and in particular Punjab are not functioning due to non-availability of teachers who are not paid their salaries and has requested that the matter for providing salaries to teachers of schools in rural areas from MPLADS funds may be placed for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha in his letter dated 31 January, 2005 stated as follows:—

"I am writing to apprise you of a major crisis in regard to education in primary school run by the State Governments in rural areas confronting not only Punjab but a number of States in the country.

In Punjab, I have personally witnessed that the State-run primary school in villages do not have teachers. Given a dilapidated school building without even the boundary walls, toilets or drinking water facilities, schools in rural areas already record high drop out rate. But one of the major factors which adds to the woes is non-availability of teachers without which a school cannot function at all.

I appreciate the Government's view to empower PRIs (Panchayati Raj institutions) who have been conferred with the powers to run the primary schools in villages as well, but absence of teachers is a factor which needs to be addressed. Over the years, the State Governments have not been able to even partially address the issue barring a few.

In order to address the issue, I would appreciate if the Members of Parliament could be allowed to recommend funds to the registered PTA or similar bodies in villages for paying salaries to teachers in schools in the rural areas.

I shall be grateful if the proposal in this regard could be decided in the forthcoming meeting of the MPLADS Committee in order that the problem could be addressed to an extent."

3. In this regard, the Item 4 Appendix-II of the Illustrative List of works not permissible under the Guidelines of MPLAD Scheme prohibits any grant and loans.

4. The Committee may consider the proposal of the Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha for allowing the Members of Parliament to recommend funds from MPLAD Scheme to the registered PTA or similar bodies in villages for paying salaries to teachers of schools in rural areas.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 3rd February, 2005.

APPENDIX XXIX

Vide Chapter XI of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 17

Subject: Proposal of Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan, MP(LS) for providing grant from MPLADS funds for solar energy projects,

Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan, MP (LS) addressed a letter dated 22 March, 2005 to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS for providing grant from MPLADS funds for solar energy projects for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Hon'ble Member, in his letter dated 22 March, 2005 has stated as follows:—

"As you know people of my constituency, especially in villages are facing a great problem in Haryana regarding electricity. To solve this problem Solar Energy is used to form the electricity and is also utilised in various forms of energy. For the upliftment of this project I want to give the Grant from my quota. Please direct me whether I can give Grant, if not, please allow me to give Grant for this project which is very essential and for the progress in the field of electricity, so that a great problem can be solved with the help of Solar Energy.

I shall be highly obliged if you look into the matter and do the needful."

3. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their O.M. dated 5 May, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to refer to Lok Sabha Secretariat's O.M. No. 9/4/141/2004 MPLADSC dated 23 March, 2005 on the above noted subject.

As per Item 10 of Appendix-I of the MPLAD Scheme the construction of common gobar gas plants, non-conventional energy systems/devices for community use and related activities are permissible. However, no expenditure on items of inventory nature may be incurred and the benefit should accrue to the general public and not for individuals."

4. Hon'ble Member, Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan in his letter has stated that the people of his Sonapat Parliamentary constituency especially in villages are facing lot of problems due to scarcity of electricity and has desired to provide grant from his MPLADS funds for solar energy projects in order to overcome scarcity of electricity.

The Item 4 of Appendix-2 of the Illustrative List of works not permissible under MPLADS prohibits any kind of grant and loans. However, the Ministry in their communication has stated that as per Item 10 of Appendix-I of the Illustrative List of works that can be taken up under MPLADS, the construction of common gohar gas plants, non-conventional energy systems/devices for community use and related activities are permissible items. Expenditure on items of inventory nature are not permissible. The benefit of the project should accrue to the general public and not for individual benefits.

5. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan, MP (LS) for providing grant from MPLADS funds for solar energy projects.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 1st July, 2005.

APPENDIX XXX

Vide Chapter XII of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 11

Subject: Proposal for purchase of land for construction of building of Hindi High School, Dalkhola, West Bengal under MPLADS in Raiganj Parliamentary constituency of West Bengal.

Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources addressed a letter dated 8 April, 2005 to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS regarding purchase of land for construction of building of Hindi High School, Dalkhola, West Bengal under MPLADS in Raiganj Parliamentary constituency of West Bengal for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources in his letter dated 8 April, 2005 stated as follows:—

" In my constituency, 5, Raiganj District Uttar Dinajpur, West Bengal, there is an Assembly Segment known as Karandihi having a municipal town block known as Dalkhola. There are substantial number of Hindi speaking population who deserve to have Hindi education. There is already a recognized Hindi High School in Dalkhola but they have to use the building of other school for the said purpose for a long time. Due to students' strength and other activities, they are now compelled to have their own institution building at a land which they will own. The School Committee leadership, Shri Dungarmal Agarwal and Shri Mahender Shah approached me to contribute from MPLADS fund to buy land for their institution which will be a long term immovable asset for this school to facilitate the construction of the building. I promised them that if MPLAD Committee accepts this proposal, I shall contribute from my MPLAD fund. During my last tour in the constituency in the second week of March, 2005. I had a detailed meeting with Shri Agarwal and Shri Mahender Shah in this regard. Hence, this proposal is placed before you.

I shall be glad if you put it in your next agenda of your Committee meeting and convey me the decision of the meeting so that I can participate in this noble cause for the Hindi Speaking students."

3. In this regard, the Item 7 (Appendix-II) of the Illustrative List of works not permissible under the Guidelines of MPLAD Scheme prohibits any acquisition of land or any compensation for land acquired.

4. The Committee may consider the proposal of the Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources for purchase of land for construction of building of Hindi High School, Dalkhola, West Bengal under MPLADS in Raiganj Parliamentary constituency of West Bengal as a special case.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 8th April, 2005.

APPENDIX XXXI

Vide Chapter XIII of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 5

Subject: Proposal for contributing Rs. 20 lakh from MPLADS funds for reconstruction of Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School, Kaliyaganj, Uttar Dinajpur outside the Parliamentary constituency of Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources.

Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources addressed a letter dated 26 July, 2005 to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS regarding proposal for contributing Rs. 20 lakh from MPLADS funds for reconstruction of Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School, Kaliyaganj, Uttar Dinajpur which is located outside the Parliamentary constituency of Hon'ble Minister for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Hon'ble Minister of Water resources in his letter dated 26 July, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The Head Master, Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School has requested me for allotment of Rs. 35 lakh for the reconstruction of the old and dilapidated Infrastructure in the school. Though this school is within my home district, but it is 16 kms. away from the limits of my parliamentary constituency. I had been a student of this school and the Teachers, Head Master and students have very high hopes on me to provide some funds out of my MPLADS allotments for this school. The class rooms where I used to attend classes, when I was a student, have been more or less fully damaged and require urgent repairs and renovation. The 75th year celebrations of the school are due in the near future. I would be very grateful if as a very special case under exceptional circumstances, I am allowed to contribute Rs. 20 lakh from my MPLADS allotments for the reconstruction and improvement of this school. I would be grateful for an early and positive consideration of the case."

3. Head Master, Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School in his letter dated 4 July, 2005 addressed to Hon'ble Minister stated as under:

"With due regard I do hereby submit a copy of plan and estimate bearing an amount to Rs. 35,44,393.00 (Rs. Thirty five lakhs forty four thousand three hundred ninety three only) for the construction of our old damaged classrooms. If we are allotted the amount sought for the construction of our

old dilapidated classrooms, our present problem of classrooms for the incoming rush of students can be coped with."

Hence, furnishing above in resume I request your honour to oblige me sanctioning Rs. 35,44,393.00 (Rs. Thirty five lakhs forty four thousand three hundred ninety three only) so that we can give our plan a concrete form."

4. Hon'ble Minister in his letter has desired to contribute Rs. 20 lakh from his quota of MPLADS funds for the reconstruction of Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School, Kaliyaganj, Uttar Dinajpur which is in a very bad shape. The school is located 16 kms. away from the limits of the Hon'ble Minister's Raiganj Parliamentary constituency of West Bengal. The Hon'ble Minister had been a student of this school and Head Master of Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School had requested him to contribute Rs. 35 lakh for the reconstruction of old infrastructure of the school.

5. In this regard, the Guidelines on MPLADS does not permit Members of Parliament to contribute MPLADS funds outside their Parliamentary constituency from where they have been elected. Members of Parliament can recommend works outside their constituencies/States only to undertake rehabilitation measures in the event of "natural calamity of rare severity" in any part of the country as per para 1.3 of the Guidelines of the MPLAD Scheme.

However, the Guidelines on MPLADS permits construction of buildings for schools belonging to Government or local bodies. Item 1 of the Illustrative List of works permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS (Appendix-I) envisages as follows:

"Construction of buildings for schools, hostels, libraries and other buildings of educational institutions belonging to Government or local bodies. Such buildings belonging to aided Institutions and unaided but recognised Institutions can also be constructed provided, however, that the Institution be in existence for not less than two years."

6. The Committee may consider the proposal of the Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources for contributing Rs. 20 lakh from MPLADS funds for reconstruction of Kaliyaganj Parbati Sundari High School, Kaliyaganj, Uttar Dinajpur which is located outside the Raiganj Parliamentary constituency of West Bengal as a special case.

NEW DELHI;

Dated : the 2nd September, 2005

APPENDIX XXXII

Vide Chapter XIV of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 20

Subject: Proposal from Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh, former Governor and Union Minister for (i) enhancement in the allocation of MPLADS funds; (ii) constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS; and (iii) submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee.

Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh, former Governor and Union Minister addressed a letter dated 3 January, 2006 to Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha regarding (i) enhancement in the allocation of MPLADS funds; (ii) constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS and (iii) submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee.

2. The forwarding Letter dated 3 January, 2006 addressed to Hon'ble Speaker reads as follows:—

"I am enclosing herewith a copy of my letter which I have addressed to Hon'ble Prime Minister regarding implementation of the MPLAD Scheme. I shall be grateful if the views expressed by me are given a serious thought."

In his Letter dated 3 January, 2006 addressed to Hon'ble Prime Minister, Shri Singh *inter-alia* stated as under:—

"Recently I watched with close interest the comments and views appearing in the media, print and electronic, both, as well as by various sections of Parliament regarding a very innocuous scheme, the MPLAD Scheme which was introduced nearly fifteen years ago to ensure that some of the local needs of the area represented by our chosen MPs are taken care of without going into the rigmarole of administrative delays and ensuring their expeditious implementation by the Executive Agencies. It is really sad to hear some of the adverse comments of various sections of society as well casting aspersions on the MPs, who have no role but to suggest certain schemes for the development of the area they represent as well as on the executive agencies. I applied my mind and there are certain thoughts which occurred to me and which I wanted to share with you so as to redeem the tarnished image of the supreme Legislative Body of the country, that is Parliament and its Members.

As far as I remember, the scheme was introduced in 1991-92 which does not give any money to a Member of Parliament as such, but permits them to

make suggestions for various schemes for implementation in his constituency. Total strength of the Parliament being 790 Members, the total amount thus earmarked, comes to Rs. 1,580 crores. Assuming that the Lok Sabha completes its tenure, the total amount thus earmarked would come to nearly Rs. 8,000 crores. I have made an in-depth study of the pros and cons of the implementation of this scheme and my proposal is that this amount should be increased to Rs. 5 crores per annum for every Member of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. Having earmarked the amount a Joint Committee consisting of Members of both the Houses should be constituted to whom all the Members of both the Houses submit their proposals for their respective constituencies for development works. The Joint Committee should examine all these proposals and they should decide the *inter-se* priority of the schemes suggested by the MPs for implementation by the executive agencies. Meetings of this Joint Committee should be held at frequent intervals, if possible monthly, which should take stock from the implementing agencies the progress of the work done in each and every case. In case the scheme is not being implemented as per the desire of the Parliamentary Committee, those accountable, either the Government authority or the agency involved, should be properly penalized. This process, if agreed, would save the individual Members of Parliament unnecessary embarrassment of adverse comments in the media and general public and would also render the delinquent officials as well as agencies accountable to the highest body."

3. Hon'ble former Union Minister and Governor in his letter has made three suggestions : (i) enhancement in the allocation of MPLADS funds; (ii) constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS; and (iii) submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee.

4. The suggestion (i) relates to enhancement in the allocation of MPLADS funds. In this regard, the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha in their First & Fourth Report presented to Lok Sabha on 12 May, 2000 and 23 March, 2001 *vide* Paras 5.8 and 5.3 respectively recommended *inter-alia* as follows :—

Para 5.8

"The Committee further note that MPLADS allocation per year per MP was doubled on 23rd December, 1998. Funds amounting to Rs. 2 crore are being released for each MP from the year 1998-99. The Committee feel that the increased amount of Rs. 2 crore per year is just not sufficient to implement developmental schemes based on the locally felt needs of the constituents. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the present allocation of Rs. 2 crore may be enhanced to Rs. 4 crore."

Para 5.3

"The Committee note the deliberations of the meeting of Hon'ble Speaker with Minister of Finance, Minister of Rural Development, Minister of Statistics and Programme Implementation and Leaders of Parties in Lok Sabha regarding enhancement in the quota of MPLADS funds for MPs. The Committee, in view of the increasing demands received by MPs from

their constituents for development works recommend that the quota of MPLADS funds should be enhanced from the present Rs. 2 crore to Rs. 4 crore per annum. The Committee hope that the Government would take positive decision at least during the financial year 2001-2002 in meeting the long awaited demands of the Hon'ble Members of Parliament."

5. As the Committee has already recommended for enhancement in the quota of MPLADS funds for Members of Parliament, now it for the Government of India to take decision for enhancement in the allocation under MPLADS.

6. The suggestion (ii) is regarding constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS. In this connection, the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha in their seventh Report presented to Lok Sabha on 31 August, 2001 *vide* Para 6.4 recommended *inter-alia* as follows:

"The Committee note the proposal of Hon'ble Member of Rajya Sabha regarding review of functioning of MPLAD Scheme particularly in the light of observations made by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in their Report No. 3A (civil), Union Government, for the year ending 31 March, 2000. The Committee are of the view that as both the Committees of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha on the MPLAD Scheme, are already in existence, therefore, there appears no need to constitute a Joint Parliamentary Committee to look into the functioning of the Scheme."

7. In so far as suggestion for constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee on MPLADS is concerned it may be stated that, as of now whenever, any matter of policy, matter of public importance or change in procedure are brought before the consideration or the Committee of one House, the Ministry sends it to the Committee of the other House for their consideration. And only thereafter the Government takes a final view on the subject. This entails considerable delay in disposal of cases. There are occasions where stalemate have arisen on account of difference of opinion between the two Committees.

8. Accordingly, notwithstanding the fact that the proposal for constitution of Joint Parliamentary Committee has already been not favoured by the MPLADS Committee in the past, there is perhaps some scope for revisiting the decision in the wake of the recent developments, specially in the context of the difficulties being faced as stated above and the proposal of Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh.

9. The suggestion (iii) pertains to submission of proposals on MPLADS by Hon'ble Members to Joint Parliamentary Committee for necessary approval. As per the Guidelines on MPLADS an MP recommends works in his constituency and submits the list of proposals to the concerned District Collector. The District Authority verifies the eligibility and technical feasibility of the each recommended work and then issues sanction letter/order for the implementing agency. Under the extant Guidelines, the suggestion cannot be accommodated. Therefore, if the suggestion is to be implemented, amendment in the Guidelines on MPLADS are required. In this regard, one suggestion could be that, as soon as the Hon'ble Member recommends eligible works, the District Collector should verify the eligibility and technical feasibility of the work and also identify the Implementing agency capable of executing the proposed work, timely and

satisfactorily and thereafter, the proposals be placed before the Parliamentary Committee for examining and necessary approval based on the priority/locally felt needs.

10. The other side of the suggestion is that, although the spirit behind the suggestions of Shri Bhanu Prakash Singh is well understood in the background of the recent developments concerning the MPLAD Scheme, referring all the projects recommended by the individual MPs for Parliament scrutiny may give rise to few administrative difficulties and implementation of the projects may get delayed in the process, it is felt. Moreover it is apprehended that, the Joint Parliamentary Committee may not be in a position to assess the locally felt needs of the various constituencies, in the right perspective.

11. The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated : 06th February, 2006

APPENDIX XXXIII

Vide Chapter XV of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 21

Subject : Selection of subject(s) for examination by Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS).

The Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme, Lok Sabha is an ad-hoc Committee of Parliament and was first constituted on 22 February, 1999. Thereafter, the Committee is constituted every year. The present Committee was constituted on 7 August, 2005 and consists of 24 Members drawn from Lok Sabha. Initially, the Committee consisted of 20 Members. Later on more Members were nominated by Hon'ble Speaker to serve on the Committee.

2. The Committee on MPLADS have been vested with the powers to monitor and review periodically the performance and problems in implementation of MPLAD Scheme (Lok Sabha); consider complaints of Members of Lok Sabha in regard to the Scheme and perform such other functions in respect of MPLAD Scheme as may be assigned to it by the Speaker from time to time. The other Parliamentary Committees of Lok Sabha have been barred to consider matters which are exclusively assigned to Committee on MPLADS.

3. Since inception of the MPLADS Committee, the Committee have presented 12 Reports (10 Original and 2 Action Taken Reports). The details of reports presented so far is given in Annexure.

4. An analysis of the Reports presented so far reveals that the Committee on MPLADS so far has approved amendments to the MPLAD Scheme Guidelines; considered proposals received from Hon'ble Members and Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MS&PI) for according permission to fund projects/works costing more than Rs. 25 lakhs by relaxing Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS. Individual representations of Members of Parliament (Lok Sabha) on problems of their constituencies/complaints/suggestions have also been considered by the Committee and taken up with the Ministry for redressal and corrective action.

5. It may be pertinent to mention that the paramount function of the Committee to monitor and review periodically the performance and problems in the implementation of the scheme, has not been undertaken in the right earnest so far. As such the actual benefits of the scheme realized, the deficiencies and pitfalls encountered in the implementation of the scheme and the corrective measures which can be taken for the smooth implementation of the scheme have not been addressed by the Committee so

far. There is thus a need to undertake a horizontal study of the scheme covering all the aspects in totality.

6. In view of above, it is suggested that the following subject may be taken for examination in detail by the Committee on MPLADS;

'Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme — A Review'

7. It is also suggested that a Press note may also be inserted in print and electronic media, inviting the views of public at large about the perception of the scheme, the achievements obtained and suggestions for improvement, if any, in the working/implementation of the scheme. It is also proposed to have the feed back from Members of Parliament, general masses, implementing agencies, State Governments and the Central Ministry on the suggestions for improvement in the Scheme so that the objective for which the Scheme was conceptualized is achieved. In order to broaden the scope for utilisation of funds under MPLADS, suggestions/views from various Central Ministry, Government of India be obtained.

8. There are more than 540 Parliamentary Constituencies spread over 602 Districts where funds from MPLAD Scheme are utilised. It would be a herculean task for a Parliamentary Committee to effectively monitor and review the implementation of the scheme, judiciously unless and until the work of implementation and review is assigned to sub-Committees. Even the sub-Committees would not be able to cover all the Districts/Parliamentary Constituencies. Only selected and few Districts can be taken up to study the implementation of the scheme. It is, therefore, suggested that in order to have an effective monitoring and reviewing mechanism for the implementation of the MPLAD Scheme, five sub-Committees, one for each Region and one for North-east Region, consisting of 3-4 Members be constituted. Such sub-Committees be assigned the task of interacting with the officials of State Governments and the implementing agencies at Delhi and outside to identify the bottlenecks in the implementation of the scheme and suggest corrective action that can be taken. The sub-Committee report to the main Committee the outcome of the interactions undertaken for the purpose. As such the provision of undertaking one tour per Committee may be waived for the Committee on MPLAD Scheme as a special case. Only then the effective monitoring and supervision of MPLAD Scheme would be possible.

9. The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI

Dated : the 6 February, 2006

ANNEXURE

Report No.	Subject	Original/Action Taken Report	Date of presentation to the Lok Sabha
1.	Proposals to amend Guidelines on MPLADS	Original	12.5.2000
2.	-do-	Original	22.8.2000
3.	-do-	Original	21.12.2000
4.	-do-	Original	23.3.2001
5.	-do-	Original	24.4.2001
6.	Action Taken on the recommendations contained in the First Report	Action Taken	31.7.2001
7.	Proposals to amend Guidelines on MPLADS	Original	31.8.2001
8.	-do-	Original	20.3.2002
9.	Action Taken on the recommendations contained in the Second Report	Action Taken	20.3.2002
10.	Proposals to amend Guidelines on MPLADS	Original	21.11.2002
11.	-do-	Original	9.4.2003
12.	-do-	Original	4.5.2005

APPENDIX XXXIV

Vide Chapter XVI of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 24

Subject : Proposal for allocating more than Rs. 25 Lakh from MPLADS for various works for Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust, Surat.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation had addressed a communication dated 10 July, 2006 and stated that District Collector, Surat had forwarded a proposal for allocation of more than Rs. 25 lakh from MPLADS funds to Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust, Surat, a trust involved in social service for last seven years. The following eight Hon'ble Members of Parliament both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha had recommended Rs. 114 lakh from MPLADS funds for various works for the Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust:

1. Smt. Savita Sharda, ex-MP (RS)	Rs. 29 lakh
2. Shri Lalitbhai Mehta, ex-MP (RS)	Rs. 29 lakh
3. Dr. A.K. Patel, MP(RS)	Rs. 10 lakh
4. Shri Lekhraj Bachani, MP (RS)	Rs. 10 lakh
5. Shri K. Jankrishnamurthy, MP (RS)	Rs. 10 lakh
6. Shri Jayantilal Bharot, MP (RS)	Rs. 10 lakh
7. Shri Keshubhai Patel, MP (RS)	Rs. 10 lakh
8. Shri Kashiram Rana, MP (LS)	Rs. 10 lakh

2. The new Guidelines on MPLADS which had come into force from 16 November, 2005 prohibits a registered society/trust from availing more than Rs. 25 lakh if it had already availed Rs. 25 lakh from MPLADS funds. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal were not considered by the Government. However, requests have been pouring from the District Authorities of various States/UTs and Members of Parliament that the proposals costing more than Rs.25 Lakh recommended prior to the issue of new guidelines might be considered by the Government. Accordingly, the Government of India *i.e.* Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation had decided to consider such proposals costing more than Rs. 25 Lakh for a particular registered society/trust received by the respective District Authority before the issue of the revised Guidelines, *i.e.* 16 November, 2005 and also consult the Committee on MPLADS, both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha for their views. Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust is eligible to receive MPLADS funds and the Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha had already *suo-moto* recommended the proposal. As the Hon'ble Member Shri Kashiram Rana, MP (LS) had recommended Rs. 10 lakh from MPLADS for the trust, the proposal might be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for the consideration.

3. In this regard, Para 3.21 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS envisages as follows:—

".....Not more than Rs. 25 lakh can be spent from MPLADS funds for one or more works of a particular Society/Trust. If a Society has availed of the MPLADS funds up to Rs. 25 lakh, no more work can be recommended for that Society/Trust under the Scheme....."

4. The provision of the Para 3.21 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS, prohibits a registered Society/Trust from availing more than Rs. 25 Lakh. However, as the proposal was received by the District Authority prior to the issue of the revised Guidelines *i.e.* 16 November, 2005 the proposal needs relaxation by the Committee on MPLADS. The Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha earlier had been relaxing the provisions of Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS and allowing works in relaxation to the cost limit of Rs. 25 Lakhs per work. Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. However, the limit of Rs.25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs.25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or sports stadium may cost more than Rs.25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent.)"

5. The Committee may consider the proposal for allocating more than Rs. 25 lakh from MPLADS funds for various works for Jaideep Memorial Public Charitable Trust, Surat.

NEW DELHI;
Dated : the 31st July, 2006

APPENDIX XXXV

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 25

Subject: Proposal for allocating more than Rs. 25 lakh from MPLADS funds for construction of Human Resource Development and Cultural Centre, Convention Hall at Vyavasayi Vidya Pratisthan, Virda-Vajdi, Taluka Rajkot.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation had addressed a communication dated 10 July, 2006 and had forwarded a proposal for construction of Human Resource Development and Cultural Centre, Convention Hall at Vyavasayi Vidya Pratisthan, Virda-Vajdi, Taluka Rajkot from MPLADS funds costing more than Rs.25 lakh. The proposal was submitted by Shri Lalitbhai Mehta, ex-MP (RS) and following four Members of Parliament of both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha are contributing a total of Rs. 50 lakh for the project:—

1. Dr V.R. Kathiria, MP (LS)	Rs. 15 lakh
2. Smt. Savitaben Sharda, MP (RS)	Rs. 10 lakh
3. Shri Keshubhai Patel, MP (RS)	Rs. 15 lakh
4. Dr. A.K. Patel, MP (RS)	Rs. 10 lakh

Total Rs. 50 lakh

2. The total cost of the project is Rs. 75 lakh out of which Rs. 50 lakh had been pledged by Hon'ble members from MPLADS funds. The remaining funds *i.e.* Rs. 25 lakh would be borne by the Trust, Vyavasayi Vidya Pratisthan from its own funds. The new Guidelines on MPLADS which had come into force from 16 November, 2005 prohibits a registered Society/Trust from availing more than Rs. 25 lakh if it had already availed Rs. 25 lakh from MPLADS funds. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal were not considered by the Government. However, requests have been pouring from the District Authorities of various States/UTs and Members of Parliament that the proposals costing more than Rs. 25 lakh recommended prior to the issue of new Guidelines might be considered by the Government. Accordingly, the Government of India *i.e.* Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation had decided to consider such proposals costing more than Rs. 25 lakh for a particular registered Society/Trust received by the respective District Authority before the issue of the revised Guidelines *i.e.* 16 November, 2005 and also consult the Committee on MPLADS, both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha for their views. The proposal for construction of Human Resource Development and Cultural Centre. Convention Hall at Vyavasayi Vidya Pratisthan, Virda-Vajdi, Taluka Rajkot is eligible to receive MPLADS funds and the Committee on MPLADS Rajya Sabha had already *suo-moto* recommended the proposal. As the Hon'ble Members of Lok Sabha, Dr. V.R. Kathiria had also recommended Rs. 15 lakh from MPLADS funds, towards the project, the

Ministry had requested that the proposal might be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for their consideration.

3. In this regard, Para 3.21 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS envisages as follows:—

".....Not more than Rs. 25 lakh can be spent from MPLADS funds for one or more works of a particular Society/Trust. If a Society has availed of the MPLADS funds up to Rs. 25 lakh, no more work can be recommended for that Society/Trust under the Scheme....."

4. The provision of the Para 3.21 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS, prohibits a registered Society/Trust from availing more than Rs. 25 Lakh. However, as the proposal was received by the District Authority prior to the issue of the revised Guidelines *i.e.* 16 November, 2005, the proposal needs relaxation by the Committee on MPLADS. The Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha earlier had been relaxing the provisions of Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS and allowing works in relaxation to the cost limit of Rs. 25 Lakhs per work. Para 4.1 of the then Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 Lakh per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or sports stadium may cost more than Rs.25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)".

5. The Committee may consider the proposal for allocating more than Rs. 25 lakh from MPLADS funds for construction of Human Resource Development and Cultural Centre, Convention Hall at Vyavasayi Vidya Pratisthan, Virda-Vajdi, Taluka Rajkot.

NEW DELHI

Dated the 31st July, 2006

APPENDIX XXXV

Vide Chapter XVII of the Report

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)

COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 2

Subject: Construction of a Bridge across the River Kaksha under Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs. 63.78 lakh under MPLADS on the recommendation of Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP (13th Lok Sabha).

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 13 May, 2004 pertaining to the proposal of Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP (13th Lok Sabha) regarding construction of a Bridge across the River Kaksha under Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs. 63.78 lakh under MPLAD Scheme for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 13 May, 2004 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a copy of the letter No.96/Dev., dated 22 January, 2004 received from the District Magistrate, Murshidabad, West Bengal on the above subject.

It is stated that construction of a bridge is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS. But, it is observed that an amount of Rs. 38 lakh had already been incurred towards the project. The concerned DM is approaching the Ministry to obtain Government's approval as the total cost of the project exceeded the cost ceiling of Rs. 25 lakh per individual work stipulated in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS. As the MPLADS funds had already been invested in a permissible project which should not go waste and need to be properly utilised, it is requested that the matter may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for their views."

3. The District Magistrate, Murshidabad in his letter dated 22 January, 2004 stated as follows:

" In reference to the subject as mentioned above, this is to inform you that as per recommendation of the Hon'ble MP (LS), Mr. Abul Hasnat Khan, financial sanction for the above noted work were communicated in phases vide this office Order No.19/AHK/02-03 (MPLADS 98-99), 1/AHK/01-02 (MPLADS 2000-2001), 7/AHK/01-02 (MPLADS 2000-2001), 4/AHK/02-03 (MPLADS 01-02) to Block Development Officer, Suti-II.

A sum of Rs. 38,00,000.00 (Rupees Thirty Eight lakh) only as already been allotted and the scheme has been taken up for execution much before the

guideline regarding the upper ceiling of Rs. 25 lakh was communicated vide his No. C/41/2000-MPLADS dated 11 November, 2002. Thus there was no question of obtaining prior approval at the time of taking up the project. Now, the construction of the bridge is in progress and the total vetted amount is Rs. 63,78,000/- and Hon'ble MP as already accorded his sanction for the entire amount.

In this regard, you are requested to refer to your letter vide No. L/25/026/94-MPLADS dated 8 December, 2003 wherein a similar approval was accorded and to kindly accord sanction for taking up the work at the earliest for the interest of execution of the work as before since 11 November, 2002. Guidelines are being strictly followed. An early reply is solicited."

4. Financial sanction for the construction of a Bridge across the Kaksha river under Suti-II block on the recommendation of Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP (13th Lok Sabha) was communicated by District Magistrate, Murshidabad to Block Development Officer, Suti-II from time to time starting from the year 1998-99. A sum of Rs. 38,00,000.00 has already been allotted. The upper ceiling of Rs. 25 lakh came in the existence w.e.f. 11.11.2002. The construction of the bridge is in progress. The total vetted amount is Rs. 63,78,000.00. The Hon'ble ex-MP, Shri Abul Hasant Khan has already accorded his sanction for the entire amount. The District Magistrate, Murshidabad have sought approval for taking up the work.

5. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP (13th Lok Sabha) for seeking approval for giving relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh under MPLADS for construction of bridge across the river Kaksha under Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs. 63.78 lakh under MPLAD Scheme.

NEW DELHI

Dated the 29th September, 2004.

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 3

Subject: Construction of a Bridge across the River Kaksha under Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs. 63.78 lakh under MPLADS on the recommendation of Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP (13th Lok Sabha).

Memorandum regarding construction of a Bridge across the River Kaksha under Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs. 63.78 lakh under MPLADS on the recommendation of Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, Ex-MP (13th Lok Sabha) was considered by the Committee at their sitting held on 30th September, 2004. The Committee found some serious lapses *i.e.* steep price escalation of the cost of the Bridge and change in the name of the Bridge/river etc. The Committee has directed the Ministry to have a factual report from the State Government in this regard within one month and report back to the Committee.

2. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation has written to the Chief Secretary, Government of West Bengal to find out the reasons for the frequent increase in the cost of the Bridge etc.

3. The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI
Dated the 27th October, 2004

APPENDIX XXXVI

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME**

MEMORANDUM NO. 4

Subject : Proposal of Shri Hannan Mollah, M.P. (LS) regarding construction of an auditorium at Uluberia Parliamentary Constituency of West Bengal under MPLADS.

Shri Hannam Mollah, M.P. (LS) addressed a letter dated 27 August, 2004 to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS regarding construction of an auditorium at Uluberia Parliamentary Constituency of West Bengal under MPLADS.

2. Hon'ble Member Shri Hannan Mollah *vide* his letter dated 12 August, 2003 addressed to the ADM (Development) Howrah has stated as follows:—

"I have submitted the proposal for development works under MPLADS for the year 2003-04. One of the major schemes is the construction of Rabindra Bhawan auditorium at Uluberia at the cost of Rs. 1.67 crores out of that one crore will be from the MPLAD fund."

3. The Hon'ble Member in his subsequent letter dated 27 August, 2004 addressed to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS stated as follows:—

"I draw your kind attention to the problem of implementation of a scheme under MPLAD in my constituency. During the 13th Lok Sabha, I proposed to construct an Auditorium in my constituency at Uluberia under the MPLAD Scheme and allotted Rupees one crore for the purpose. As the amount crossed the usual limit of 25 lakhs, it needs the approval of the MPLAD Committee.

The Government of West Bengal sent that proposal for approval to the Ministry of Programme Implementation in 2003. The Ministry asked for several clarifications which were provided by the State Government in time but Ministry could not clear the project due to announcement of the 14th Lok Sabha Elections. So that the project is pending with the Ministry till date.

In the meantime the guidelines of the MPLAD were changed. Now the unspent amount should be less than one crore for the release of the next instalment. As my earlier project amounts Rs. One crore, I cannot reduce the amount till it is implemented. This may create a problem for release of next allotment for my MPLAD Scheme and future projects will be affected in my constituency.

On enquiry I found that such large schemes over Rs. 25 lakhs, requires clearance from MPLAD Committee. As the new MPLAD Committee has not yet met this scheme is pending without any progress.

Under the circumstances, I request you to kindly consider this scheme in the first meeting of the MPLAD Committee as early as possible and clear it so that implementation for MPLAD Scheme in my constituency does not suffer further."

4. The matter was referred to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation of obtaining their factual comments thereon. The Ministry in their O.M. dated 29 September, 2004 have stated as under:—

"The undersigned is directed to refer to Lok Sabha Secretariat O.M. No. 9/4/513/2004/ MPLADS dated 15.9.04 on the above subject and to say that the proposal of Hon'ble Shri Hannan Mollah, MP(LS) is for upgradation and improvement of Rabindra Bhawan Complex at Uluberia, a sub-divisional town of Howrah. The total cost of the project is Rs. 1,50,05,000 of which Rs. 50,05,000 will be provided by the Uluberia Municipality in Phase I and the balance of Rs. 1 crore by the Hon'ble MP. Shri Hannan Mollah from his MPLADS fund.

Special repairs for restoration / upgradation of any durable asset is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS vide Item No. 3 of Appendix 2 of the guidelines. In accordance with para 4.1 of the guidelines on MPLADS, MPs can suggest individual work costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. It has also been provided therein that the works amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakh per work can be recommended by the MPs depending on the nature of the work. In a letter dated 26.11.2001, as modified by subsequent letter dated 11.11.2002, this Ministry clarified to all the district authorities that the limit of Rs. 25 Lakh can marginally be exceeded but projects with substantially higher cost require the approval of this Ministry.

It is in pursuance of this letter, the Government of West Bengal has sent the proposal to us as the cost of the project is substantially higher than Rs. 25 lakhs.

This Ministry had requested the District Magistrate, Howrah to send his considered views by 28.9.2004. But the DM's views are awaited."

5. The Ministry again in their O.M. dated 14 October, 2004 have stated as follows:

"In continuation of this Ministry's O.M. of even number dated 29.9.04, it is stated that District Magistrate & Collector, Howrah has informed through his letter dated 22.9.2004 that since the items shown in the proposal meet the Guidelines on MPLADS, immediate sanction of rupees one crore may be granted."

6. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation has stated that special repairs for restoration/upgradation of any durable asset is permissible under

the Guidelines on MPLADS *vide* Item No. 3 of Appendix 2 of the Guidelines which is as follows:—

"List of works not permissible under MPLADS—repair and maintenance works of any type other than special repairs for restoration/upgradation of any durable asset".

Ministry has also stated that in accordance with Para 4.1 of the guidelines of MPLADS, MPs can suggest individual work costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. The limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work.

7. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Hannan Mollah, MP(LS) for providing Rs. 1 crore out of his MPLADS funds (2003-2004) for upgradation/developmental works/construction of an auditorium, Rabindra Bhavan at Uluberia in the Parliamentary Constituency of Shri Hannan Mollah, MP (LS), West Bengal under MPLADS Scheme which has to be built of an estimated cost of Rs. 1,50,05,000 crores.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 27th October, 2004

APPENDIX XXXVII

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 6

Subject : Reformation of Road from Yelahanka — Vijayapura road to join Budigere Cross *via* Sathanur, Bagalur, Gopalapura, Yediyur, M. Hosahalli on to Budigere Cross in Jala Hobli, Bangalore North Taluk, Bangalore Urban District on the recommendation of Dr. H.T. Sangliana, MP (LS) costing Rs. 125 lakh in Bangalore North Parliamentary constituency.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 13 December, 2004 pertaining to the proposal of Dr. H.T. Sangliana, MP (LS) regarding improvements and asphaltting to the Roads from Yelahanka — Vijayapura road to connect Budigere Cross *via* Sathanur, Bagalur, Gopalapura, Yediyur, M. Hosahalli onto Budigere Cross in Jala Hobli, Bangalore North Taluk, Bangalore Urban District costing Rs. 125 lakh in Bangalore North Parliamentary Constituency under MPLAD Scheme for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 13 December, 2004 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a proposal for 'Reformation of Road from Yelahanka—Vijayapura Road Join Budigere Cross *via* Sathanur, Bagalur, Gopalapura, Yediyur, M. Hosahalli onto Budigere Cross in Jala Hobli, Bangalore North Taluk, Bangalore Urban District' by Hon'ble Member of Parliament of Bangalore North constituency, Dr. H.T. Sangliana, IPS (Retd.)

Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District has stated that the reformation of the road is utmost necessary in view of the following issues and has requested for the approval of Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation:—

- (i) The condition of the road is very bad and it is an important link between the two areas, and it will be helpful to large section of the people.
- (ii) Unless the entire amount of Rs. 125/- lakh spent, this work cannot be completed.
- (iii) There are no any other budgetary grants spent, this work cannot be completed.

In view of the above, as the expenditure of the above work is more than Rs. 25 lakh, it is requested that the proposal may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for consideration for views on the relaxation of Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

3. Hon'ble Member in his letter dated 22 December, 2004 addressed to Hon'ble Chairamn, Committee on MPLADS stated as follows:—

"In response to a popular request from the people of my constituency namely Bangalore North Constituency for reconstruction of an important link road called "Bagalur road", in all 11.5 Km, which serves the travelling public from 3 out of 8 Assembly Constituencies, I have approved the estimate for the reconstruction at the cost of Rs. 1.25 crore. The expenditure will spread over two financial years namely 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. It is intended to render the said road as a model road in terms of durability and high quality execution. This important link road has remained without maintenance by the State Government for nearly two decades and it is in a very bad shape. This reconstruct in plan will promote the road under reference as an important infrastructure for the future development of the surrounding areas.

The file related to this proposal has already been submitted to the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementations about three weeks ago. As it requires formal approval of the Consultative Committee on MP's LADS, I request you to kindly call for an urgent meeting for according requisite approval so as to enable this important project to get started immediately."

4. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per works is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

5. The implementing agency for the above project is Zilla Panchayat Engineering Division, Bangalore Urban, Bangalore and the entire project will be funded out of MPLADS funds.

6. The Committee may consider the proposal of Dr. H.T. Sangliana, MP (LS) for seeking approval for giving relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh under MPLADS for reformation of Road from Yelahanka—Vijayapura road to join Budigere Cross via Sathanur, Bagalur, Gopalapura, Yediyur, M. Hosahalli onto Budigere Cross in Jala Hobli, Bangalore North Taluk, Bangalore Urban District costing Rs. 125 lakh in Bangalore North Parliamentary constituency.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 3rd February, 2005.

APPENDIX XXXVIII
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME
MEMORANDUM NO. 12

Subject : Construction of RCC retaining wall of existing play ground at Namunaghar, Andaman and Nicobar Islands on the recommendation of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 37,68,468/- under MPLADS.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 19 April, 2005 pertaining to the proposal of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) for construction of RCC retaining wall of existing play ground at Namunaghar, Andaman and Nicobar Islands costing Rs. 37,68,468/- under MPLAD Scheme for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 19 April, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a proposal for construction of RCC Retaining Wall of existing play ground at Namunaghar, A&N Islands recommended by Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), A&N Island with a total estimated cost of Rs. 37,68,468/-.

The Deputy Commissioner, District of Andamans while forwarding the proposal has stated that the main objective of the proposed retaining wall is to stop sliding of existing play ground in Namunaghar, Ward No. 1 Andaman & Nicobar Islands. The land is a government land which has been allotted in favour of Education Department for play ground. The Education Department is taking care of the playground.

Construction of buildings for schools, hostels, libraries and other buildings of educational Institutions belonging to Government or local bodies are permissible under MPLAD Scheme. Retaining wall for the playground of an existing Government educational Institute may also be allowed under the Scheme. This will be a durable asset and will be beneficial for the children who study in the school.

As the expenditure of the above work is more than Rs. 25 lakhs, it is requested that the proposal may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for views on the relaxation of Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS.

3. Hon'ble Member Shri Manoranjan Bhakta in his letter dated 9 September, 2004 addressed to Deputy Commissioner, Andaman District stated as follows:—

"I hereby request you to release MPLAD fund for the construction of retaining wall to stop the sliding of existing play ground in Namunaghar Ward No. 1

which was prepared from MPLAD fund. Inform the action taken in this regard at the earliest."

4. The Deputy Commissioner, Andaman District in his letter dated 16 December, 2004 addressed to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as under:—

"I am to inform that Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), Andaman and Nicobar Islands Parliamentary constituency, Port Blair has proposed to construct one RCC retaining wall of existing playground at Namunaghar village in South Andaman under MPLADS.

The Hon'ble Member of Parliament has desired to entrust the work to Andaman Public Works Department which is a Government organisation. Accordingly, estimate of the work has been obtained from the A.P.W.D. Estimated cost of the work is Rs. 37,68,468/- including Rs. 1,79,451/- being contingency which is not admissible as per your letter No. L/26/001/94-MPLADS dated 1 April, 2002.

Since the expenditure involved for the work is more than Rs. 25.00 lakhs, it is requested that approval of the Committee on MPLADS of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha may kindly be accorded for relaxation in the limit of Rs. 25.00 lakhs as stipulated in Para 4.1 of MPLADS Guidelines and entrusting the execution of the work to Andaman Public Works Department at an early date."

5. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

6. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) for seeking approval for giving relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs under MPLADS for construction of RCC retaining wall of existing play ground at Namunaghar, Andaman and Nicobar Islands at an estimated cost of Rs. 37,68,468/- under MPLADS.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 18th May, 2005.

APPENDIX XXXIX

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 13

Subject: Proposal of Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya, MP (LS) regarding contribution of Rs. 25 lakh for the construction of a shed in 'Block Parisar' of Saifayee in Etawah Parliamentary Constituency of Uttar Pradesh to be constructed at an estimated cost of Rs. 433.75 lakhs from MPLADS funds.

Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya, MP (LS) addressed a letter dated 26 April, 2005 to Hon'ble Chairman, Committee on MPLADS for contribution of Rs. 25 lakh for the construction of a shed in 'Block Parisar' of Saifayee in Etawah Parliamentary Constituency of Uttar Pradesh to be constructed at an estimated cost of Rs. 433.75 lakhs from MPLADS funds for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Hon'ble Member, in his letter stated as follows:—

"Saifayee Mahotsav is celebrated every year in the month of December/ January during autumn season in Etawah district with objective of protecting and encouraging our cultural heritage. In this Mahotsav besides folk singing, 'Faag Gayan, Quawali, Kavi Sammelan, Wrestling, Magic Shows', various cultural programmes are also organized. There is a proposal to construct a shed here and Rs. 433.75 lakhs are estimated to be required. Hon'ble Membrs from Rajya Sabha have given funds for this purpose. This Saifayee Mahotsav is organized in my Parliamentary constituency i.e., Etawah. I have also offered Rs. 25 lakhs from my MPLADS fund. Although Rajya Sabha MPLADS Parliamentary Committee has already accorded its approval but the Lok Sabha MPLADS Parliamentary Committee has not yet, sanctioned this amount of Rs. 25 lakhs and as a result there of there has been delay in the construction of the said shed.

It is, therefore, requested to kindly oblige me by sanctioning this amount so that the work pertaining to public welfare can be completed at the earliest."

3. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 19 March, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a proposal regarding the construction of a steel shed and providing electricity in the shed at Safai Block, District Etawah, Uttar Pradesh under MPLADS. The proposal has been recommended by Nine (9) Rajya Sabha/Lok Sabha MPs of Uttar Pradesh. The total estimated cost of the work is Rs. 433.645 lakh. The Rajkiya Nirman

Nigam, Uttar Pradesh, which is the executing agency, has estimated the work as follows:—

- (i) Construction of shed at Safai Block = Rs. 372.66 lakh
- (ii) Provision for electricity in the shed = Rs. 61.085 lakh

The construction of the shed is in the Safai pinhead/courtyard of the office of the Block Development Department, Safai Block, Etawah District and Uttar Pradesh. The construction work is being done on Government land, which is registered in the name of Safai Block.

Nine (9) Rajya Sabha/Lok Sabha MPs of Uttar Pradesh have recommended Rs. 25 lakh each for the work under MPLADS i.e., Rs. 225 lakh is being contributed under MPLADS. The Cultural Department, Government of Uttar Pradesh will arrange the remaining amount for the work. The construction work of the shed will be completed in two months and maintenance of the assets would be done by the Safai Pinhead. Extra expenditure, if any, for the work will be borne by the Cultural Department, Government of Uttar Pradesh. The construction of shed at Safai Block, District Etawah is to be utilised for organizing cultural events in the Safai Festival. The same appears to be permissible under item 6 of Appendix-I of the Guidelines on MPLADS. Copies of detailed report/cost estimate of the aforesaid proposal are placed below:

The above proposal has already been considered by the Rajya Sabha Committee on MPLADS in its meeting held on 21 February, 2005 and approved the same subject to the conditions that the MPLADS fund should be released only after the balance amount is initially released by Culture Department of Uttar Pradesh and utilised and the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should ensure that the proposal meets the requirement of item 6 of Appendix-I of the MPLADS Guidelines.

Since Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya, MP (LS) has also contributed Rs. 25 lakh out of its MPLADS fund for the above project, the proposal may kindly be placed before the MPLADS Committee (Lok Sabha) for their views on the relaxation sought in the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work stipulated in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines."

4. The Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha in their sitting held on 21 February, 2005 considered the aforesaid proposal and approved the same with the following conditions:—

- (i) The MPLADS funds should be released only after the balance amount is initially released by Culture Department of Uttar Pradesh and utilised; and
- (ii) The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should ensure that the proposal meets the requirement of Item 6 of Appendix-I of the MPLADS Guidelines.

5. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs

per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

6. Hon'ble Member Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya in his letter dated 26 April, 2005 has stated that Saifayee Mahotsav is celebrated every year in the month of December/January with the aim to protect and encourage cultural heritage and has desired to contribute Rs. 25 lakh from his MPLADS funds for construction of steel shed in "Block Parisar" of safai in Etawah Parliamentary Constituency, Utter Pradesh which is to be constructed at an estimated cost of Rs. 433.75 lakh. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their communication dated 19 March, 2005 has stated that eight other Hon'ble Members of Parliament, Rajya Sabha are also contributing Rs. 25 lakh each from their MPLADS funds. Extra expenditure (Rs. 208 lakh) for the work will be borne by the Cultural Department, Government of Utter Pradesh. The Committee on MPLADS, Rajya Sabha had already given its approval on certain conditions for the aforesaid project in their sitting held on 21 February, 2005.

As regards whether the work is permissible under the Guidelines the Ministry has stated that the proposal appears to be permissible under Item 6 of Appendix-I of the Guidelines on MPLADS. Item 6 of Appendix-I of the Guidelines stipulates as follows:—

"Construction of buildings for local bodies for recognized District or State Sports Associations and for cultural and sports activities or for hospitals. Provision of multi-gym facilities in gymnastic centres, sports associations, physical education training institutions etc. is also permissible."

Thus the construction of shed in 'Block Parisar' of safai is for organising cultural activities and construction of buildings for cultural sports activities is permissible as per Guidelines *ibid*. The construction work is being done on Government land, which is registered in the name of Safai Block and maintenance of the assets would be done by Safai Pinhead.

Construction site falls in Etawah Parliamentary constituency which is the Parliamentary constituency of Hon'ble Member Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya. As per para 4.1 of Guidelines, Members can recommend individual works in their Parliamentary constituency costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. However, if the work is costing more than Rs. 25 lakh, the same needs the approval of the Committee on MPLADS.

7. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya, MP (LS) for seeking approval for relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh in order to contribute Rs. 25 lakh for the construction of steel shed in 'Block Parisar' of safai in Etawah Parliamentary constituency of Utter Pradesh to be constructed at an estimated cost of Rs. 433.75 lakhs from MPLADS funds.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 18th May, 2005.

APPENDIX XL
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME
MEMORANDUM NO. 14

Subject: Proposal for the construction of Library and Class Rooms for the Government Polytechnic at Purasawakkam, Chennai recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunication and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 2.50 crore under MPLADS.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation have addressed a communication dated 4 May, 2005 regarding proposal for construction of Library and Class Rooms for the Government Polytechnic at Purasawakkam, Chennai recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 2.50 crore under MPLADS for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 4 May, 2005 have stated as follows:—

“The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a project proposal for construction of (a) Library and Classrooms building with Ground Floor, First Floor and Second Floor; and (b) Classrooms in Second Floor of Administrative and Academic Block for the Government Polytechnic College at Purasawakkam, Chennai, recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology with a total estimated cost of Rs. 2.50 crore.

The Superintending Engineer, Corporation of Chennai has informed that the Master Plan for the construction and the estimates for the above proposals were approved by Government of Tamil Nadu on 23.6.2000. The entire project was ordered to be taken up in three phases. The total cost of the project envisaged in the year 2000 was Rs. 7.30 crore. But during execution the Plan of activity got altered and the details as per the execution till now is as follows:—

Phase I (cost of the project Rs. 197.30 lakh)

- (a) Construction of Academic and Administrative Building on Ground Floor; and**
- (b) Construction of workshop building with AC sheet roof.**

Both the above works have already been completed with the funds sanctioned by Government of Tamil Nadu on 23.6.2000.

Phase II (cost of the project Rs. 175.00 lakh)

- (a) Construction of Academic and Administrative Building in First Floor.
- (b) Construction of workshops (2 Nos., Class Room, Co-operative Store and Canteen Block).

Work at (a) above has been completed with the total cost of Rs. 75 lakh sanctioned by the then Hon'ble Union Minister Shri Murasoli Maran from MPLADS funds in 2001.

Work at (b) above is under completion with the funds amounting to Rs. 100 lakh sanctioned by Government of Tamil Nadu on 9.8.2004.

Phase III (cost of the project Rs. 250.00 lakh)

- (a) Class room in the Second Floor of Administrative and Academic Block; and
- (b) Library and Classroom building on Ground Floor, First Floor and Second Floor.

For these works Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister of Telecommunications and IT has recommended Rs. 250 lakh from his MPLADS funds.

Phase III works costing Rs. 2.50 crore is proposed to be completed from MPLADS funds. P.W.D., Government of Tamil Nadu will be the Implementing Agency.

At present, the Polytechnic is functioning in a temporary premises, Commissioner of Technical Education, Chennai has informed that the buildings proposed to be built under Phase III are to be utilized fully for educational purpose only which will serve the cause of education of the backward section of the society of the Central Chennai Parliamentary Constituency and also other people of the State".

3. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

4. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation *vide* their communication dated 4 May, 2005 has forwarded a proposal for construction of (a) Library and Classrooms building with Ground Floor, First Floor and Second Floor; and (b) Classrooms in Second Floor of Administrative and Academic Block for the Government Polytechnic College at Purasawakkam, Chennai, recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology with a total estimated cost of Rs. 2.50 crore. Hon'ble Minister in his letter dated 6 July, 2004 has desired to allocate Rs.2.50 crore from his MPLADS funds so as

to complete the remaining blocks of the building (Government Polytechnic College). The PWD, Government of Tamil Nadu would be the Implementing Agency. Commissioner of Technical Education, Chennai has stated that the constructed building would be utilised only for educational purpose.

The Superintending Engineer, Corporation of Chennai has informed that Master Plan for the construction and estimates for the project had already been approved by Government of Tamil Nadu and the entire project is in three phases. The total cost of the project is Rs. 7.30 crore. Phase I of the project costing Rs. 197.30 lakh includes construction of Academic and Administrative Building on Ground Floor; and Construction of workshop building with AC sheet roof which had already been completed phase II of the project costing Rs. 175.00 lakh includes Construction of Academic and Administrative Building in First Floor which has already been completed and Construction of workshops (2 Nos. Class Room, Co-operative Store and Canteen Block) is under completion. Phase III of the project costing Rs. 2.50 crores includes class room in the Second Floor of Administrative and Academic Block; and Library and Class Room building on Ground Floor, First Floor and Second Floor for which Hon'ble Minister has contributed Rs. 2.50 crore from his MPLADS funds.

As regards, whether the work is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS the Ministry has stated that construction of building for schools, hostels, libraries and other buildings of educational institutions belonging to Government or local bodies are permissible under the MPLADS Guidelines Item 1 of Appendix-I of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulates as follows:—

"Construction of building for schools, hostels, libraries and other buildings of educational institutions belonging to Government or local bodies. Such buildings belonging to aided institutions and unaided but recognized institutions can also be constructed provided, however, that the institution be in existence for not less than two years."

As per para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS, Members can recommend individual works in their parliamentary constituency costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal needs approval of the Committee on MPLADS.

The project lies in the Chennai Central Parliamentary Constituency represented by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology. Earlier the constituency was represented by former Union Minister late Shri Murasoli Maran, who had also contributed Rs. 75 lakh for the Phase II of the project for construction of academic and administrative building in First Floor which has already been completed. In this regard, Para 3.8 of the Guidelines on MPLADS states as follows and also stress on the need to maintain continuity of action in implementing works:

"Allocation per year under the scheme is for the constituency. Though there may be change in the MP representing a constituency, whatever may be the reason for such change, the allocation being for the constituency, continuity of action in implementing works under the scheme should be maintained."

The Head of the District should play a coordinating role in this regard between the past and the present MP and the implementing agencies concerned.”

However, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation be asked to clarify whether utilization and audit certificates had been submitted for the Projects/ Phases already completed from MPLADS funds.

5. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Dayanidh Maran, Hon'ble Minister of Telecommunications and Information Technology for seeking approval for giving relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh under MPLADS for construction of Library and Class Rooms for the Government Polytechnic at Purasawakkam, Chennai at an estimated cost of Rs. 2.50 crore under MPLADS.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 18th May, 2005.

APPENDIX XLI

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME**

MEMORANDUM NO. 15

***Subject:* Proposal for construction of five class rooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78-Zone-V recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 27.50 lakh under MPLADS.**

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation have addressed a communication dated 20 May, 2005 regarding proposal for construction of five class rooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78-zone-V recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 27.50 lakh under MPLADS for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 20 May, 2005 have stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a project proposal received from the Commissioner, Corporation of Chennai, for the construction of classrooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology. He has allocated Rs. 32 lakh for the same. The Executive Engineer, Building Construction Division-3, PWD has, however, prepared an estimates of Rs. 27.50 lakh for the said work.

Commissioner, Chennai has reported that the works will be executed by the Executive Engineer, Building Construction Division-3, Public Works Department, Chepauk, Chennai-5. The approval of Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation has been sought to sanction (i) the work and (ii) the release a sum of Rs. 27.50 lakh to EE, Building Construction Division-3, PWD, Chennai.

Construction of buildings for schools, hostels libraries and other buildings of educational Institutions belonging to Government or local boodies are permissible under the MPLADS Guidelines. The school belongs to Government. Since, the total estimated cost of the proposed projects indicated in Para 3 above, is more than the permissible limit of Rs. 25 lakh prescribed under Para 4.1 of the Guidelines for recommending individual works, the above proposal may be placed before the Committee on MPLAD, Lok Sabha for considering relaxation of Para 4.1 of the MPLADS Guidelines."

3. The Commissioner, Corporation of Chennai in his communication dated 4 April, 2005 stated as under:—

"Central Chennai Constituency MP and Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology Thiru, Dayanidhi Maran in his letter Ist cited has allocated a sum of Rs. 32.00 lakhs towards the construction of 5 classrooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78, Zone-V, Chennai District under MPLAD Scheme combined with another work. These works have to be executed by the Executive Engineer Building Construction Division-3, Public Works Department, Chepauk, Chennai-5.

In their reference 2nd cited, it was requested to send the estimate for the said works. Accordingly, Executive Engineer, Building Construction Division-3, Public Works Department has sent the estimate for Rs. 27.50 lakhs for the construction of 5 classrooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78, Zone-V, Chennai District.

Approval of Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation MPLAD Scheme are, therefore, requested for the following:—

- (i) **To sanction the work for the construction of 5 classrooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78, zone-V, Chennai District.**
- (ii) **To release a sum of Rs. 27.50 lakhs towards the said work in favour of Executive Engineer, Building Construction Division-3, Public Works Department, Chepauk, Chennai-5,"**

4. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (for example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

5. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme and Implementation *vide* their communication dated 20 May, 2005 has forwarded a proposal for construction of five classrooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78, Zone-V recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 27.50 lakh under MPLADS. Hon'ble Minister in his letter dated 1 November, 2004 has desired to allocate Rs. 32 lakhs from his MPLADS funds for the aforesaid project. The Executive Engineer Building, Construction Division-3, PWD has prepared an estimate of Rs. 27.50 lakh for the same work. Commissioner, Chennai has stated that the works will be executed by the Executive Engineer, Building Corporation Division-3, Public Works Department, Chepauk, Chennai-5.

As regards, whether the work is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS, the Ministry has stated that construction of buildings for schools, hostels, libraries and other buildings of educational Institutions belonging to Government or local bodies are permissible under the MPLADS Guidelines. The school belongs to Government. Item 1 of appendix I (List of works that can be taken up) of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulates as follows:—

"Construction of buildings for schools, hostels, libraries and other buildings of Educational Institutions belonging to Government or local bodies. Such buildings belonging to aided institutions and unaided but recognized Institutions can also be constructed provided, however, that the Institution be in existence for not less than two years."

As per para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS, Members can recommend individual works in their parliamentary constituency costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal needs approval of the Committee on MPLADS.

6. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Dayanidhi Maran, MP and Hon'ble Minister of Telecommunications and Information Technology for seeking approval for giving relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh under as stipulate in Para 4.1 of the MPLADS Guideines for construction of five class rooms at Jaigopal Garodia Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Choolaimedu, Dn-78-Zone-v at an estimated cost of Rs. 27.50 lakh under MPLADS.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 1st July, 2005

APPENDIX XLII

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT (MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH) COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 16

Subject: Construction of compound wall around graveyard at Stertwart Gunj, Andaman and Nicobar Islands on the recommendation of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 28,89,474/- under MPLADS.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 3 June, 2005 pertaining to the proposal of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) for construction of compound wall around graveyard at Stertwart Gunj, Andaman and Nicobar Islands at an estimated cost of Rs. 28,89, 474/- under MPLAD Scheme for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 3 June, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith project proposal received from the Deputy Commissioner, Andaman District, Andaman and Nicobar Islands for construction of compound wall around graveyard at Stertwart Gunj, Andaman and Nicobar Islands recommended by Shri Manoranjan Bhakta Member of Parliament, Lok Sabha. The work is proposed to be entrusted to APWD for execution. As per the estimates prepared by APWD the project cost of the proposed boundary wall is Rs. 28,89,474/-. Since, the expenditure involved is more than Rs. 25 lakh, DC, Andaman has sought relaxation of the limit of Rs. 25 lakh as stipulated in Para 4.1 of the MPLADS Guidelines.

As per the representation from the Pradhan, Gram Panchayat, Stewart Gunj, the village covers more than five thousand population. The said village is allotted with land for graveyard for Muslim community measuring an areas of 2.5 hectare in the year 1999. The said land is, however, being used by the Muslim community as graveyard since the establishment of the village. Some land is also allotted to private parties in the nearby area of graveyard. Hence, without a proper fencing of the graveyard, there is possibility of encroachment of surrounding area of graveyard by private parties and to avoid such kind of illegal encorachment the proposed boundary wall is necessary. Copy of the letter from the Hon'ble MP recommending the proposal, detailed project report alongwith plan and estimates are enclosed. The work is proposed to be completed within six month with a total cost of Rs. 28,89, 474/-. Due to paucity of funds the village panchayat is not in a position to execute such a big project. Hence, on their request

Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) has recommended to meet the said expenditure out of his MPLADS funds.

The construction of crematorium and structures on burial/cremation grounds is permissible under the MPLAD Scheme. Further, construction of boundary wall for the works permissible under MPLAD Scheme is also permissible. Since the total estimated cost of the proposed projects indicated in Para 2 above, is more than the permissible limit of Rs. 25 lakh prescribed under Para 4.1 of the MPLADS guidelines for recommending individual works, the above proposal may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for considering relaxation of Para 4.1 of the MPLADS Guidelines."

3. Hon'ble Member, Shri Manoranjan Bhakta in his letter dated 9 September, 2004 addressed to Deputy Commissioner, Andaman District stated as follows:—

"I hereby request you to released MPLADS fund for the construction of compound wall for the graveyard at Stewart Gunj village from MPLADS fund. Inform the action taken in this regards at the earliest."

4. The Deputy Commissioner, Andaman District in his letter dated 12 May, 2005 addressed to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as under:—

"I am to inform that Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha), vide letter dated 9 September, 2004 has forwarded a proposal for construction of a compound wall around graveyard at Stewart Gunj out of his MPLADS fund. Copy of Hon'ble Member of Parliament's letter is enclosed herewith. The work is proposed to be entrusted to APWD for execution and as per the estimate framed by APWD the project cost is Rs. 28,89,474/-.

Since the expenditure involved for the project is more than Rs. 25.00 lakhs, it is requested that approval of the Committee on MPLADS of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha may kindly be accorded for relaxation in the limit of Rs. 25.00 lakhs as stipulated in Para 4.1 of MPLADS Guidelines as well as to entrust the execution of the work to APWD and communicate to this Office at the earliest for further necessary action."

5. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

6. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation vide their communication dated 3 June, 2005 has forwarded a proposal for construction of compound wall around graveyard at Stertwart Gunj, Andaman and Nicobar Islands on

the recommendation of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 28,89,474/- under MPLADS. Hon'ble Member in his letter dated 9 September, 2004 has desired to allocate MPLADS funds for the aforesaid project. The work is proposed to be entrusted to Andaman Public Works Department (APWD) for execution. The APWD has prepared an estimate of Rs. 28,89,474/- for the project and the project is likely to be completed within six months.

As regards, whether the work is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS, the Ministry has stated that construction of crematorium and structures on burial/cremation grounds are permissible under the MPLADS Guidelines. Construction of boundary wall are also permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS. Item 15 of Appendix I of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulate as follows:—

"Construction of crematoriums and structures on burial/cremation grounds."

As per para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS, Members can recommend individual works in their parliamentary constituency costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal needs approval of the Committee on MPLADS.

7. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) for seeking relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh as stipulated in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS for construction of compound wall around graveyard at Stertwart Gunj, Andaman and Nicobar Islands at an estimated cost of Rs. 28, 89, 474/-.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 1st July, 2005.

APPENDIX XLIII
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME
MEMORANDUM NO.2

Subject: Construction of road from main road (ATR) to house site colony Kadamtala village of Andaman and Nicobar Islands on the recommendation of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 29,83,284/- under MPLADS.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 28 June, 2005 pertaining to the proposal of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) for construction of road from main road (ATR) to house site colony Kadamtala village of Andaman and Nicobar Islands at an estimated cost of Rs. 29,83,284/- under MPLAD Scheme for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 28 June, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a proposal received from the Deputy Commissioner, Andaman District, Andaman and Nicobar Islands for construction of road from main road (ATR) to house site colony Kadamtala village of Andaman and Nicobar Islands recommended by Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, Hon'ble Member of Parliament, Lok Sabha, Andaman and Nicobar Islands. The work is proposed to be entrusted to Andaman Public Works Department for execution. As per the estimates prepared by APWD the project cost of the proposed project is Rs. 31,32,448/- lakh, (including the contingency expenditure of Rs. 1,49,164/-) out of which Rs. 29,83,284/- lakh is to be met by MPLADS funds.

The Deputy Commissioner, while forwarding the proposal, has stated that the total length of the proposed road is 686 metres and the road will be constructed on Government Revenue Land. He has further stated that about 200 hundred families will be benefited by the construction of the proposed road as this would be the only approach to the village from the main road.

Construction of roads including part roads, approach road, link road, etc., in villages, town and cities, are permissible according to MPLADS Guidelines. This construction will be a durable asset and be beneficial for the people of the village. Adequate funds are available with the MPLADS fund of the Hon'ble MP to met the expenses.

As the expenditure of the above work is more than Rs. 25 lakh, it is requested that the proposal may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for considering relaxation of Para 4.1 of the MPLADS Guidelines.

However, in view of the ecologically sensitive nature of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, the clearance for the above proposal would be subject to concurrence of the Environment and Forest authorities of Andaman and Nicobar Islands and granting of the requisite No Objection Certificate by them to the District Authorities."

3. Hon'ble Member, Shri Manoranjan Bhakta in his letter dated 10 September, 2004 addressed to Deputy Commissioner, Andaman District stated as under:—

"Please find enclosed petition signed by 143 families resident of Kadamtala village for construction of road from main road to house site colony (700 mtrs.) out of MPLADS fund earmarked against my name. Kindly confirm action taken in the matter and acknowledge the receipt."

4. The Deputy Commissioner, Andaman District in his letter dated 17 June, 2005 addressed to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as follows:—

"I am to refer to your letter No. L/26/01/2004-MPLADS/2257 dated 5 May, 2005 on the subject mentioned above and to furnish below the requisite details *ad-seriatim*:—

- (i) The proposal is to construct a rural road connecting the house site colony at Kadamtala to Andaman Trunk Road. The total length of the proposed road is 686.00 mtrs. With the completion of the road the villagers at large will be benefited as this is the only approach to the village from main road.
- (ii) The road will be constructed on Government revenue land.
- (iii) The estimated cost of the project is Rs. 31,32,448/- including Rs. 1,49,164/- being contingency which is not eligible to the executing agency. Therefore, the estimated cost of Rs. 29,83,284/- could be met out of the MPLADS funds.
- (iv) Since this is the only approach to the village (house site colony) from main road and on construction of the rural road about 200 families will be benefited, it is recommended that approval of the Ministry for undertaking the work may kindly be accorded at an early date.
- (v) The Hon'ble Member of Parliament is pressing hard for early completion of the above rural road for the betterment of the villagers of the area, it is requested that the matter may kindly be expedited at the earliest."

5. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakh per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example, a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

6. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation *vide* their communication dated 28 June, 2005 have forwarded a proposal for construction of road from main road (ATR) to house site colony Kadamtala village of Andaman and Nicobar Islands of the recommendation of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 31,32,448/- lakh (including the contingency expenditure of Rs. 1,49,164/-) out of which Rs. 29,83,284/- lakh is to met by MPLADS funds. The work is to be executed by Andaman Public Works Department (APWD) and an estimate of Rs. 31,32,448/- for the project has been prepared. The project is likely to be completed within eight months.

7. As regards, whether the work is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS, the Ministry have stated that construction of roads including part roads, approach road, link road etc., in villages, town and cities are permissible under the Guidelines of MPLADS. Item 3 of the Illustrative List of works that can be taken up under MPLADS (Appendix-I) of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulates as follows:—

"Construction of roads including part roads, approach roads, link roads etc. in villages and towns and cities. Very selectively kutchha roads can also be constructed where the MP concerned and the District Head agree to meet the locally felt need."

8. As per Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS, Members can recommend individual works in their parliamentary constituency costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal needs approval of the Committee. However, Rs. 1,49,164 being contingency which cannot be met from MPLADS funds, the approval of the Committee is required for only Rs. 29,83,284/-.

9. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP (LS) for seeking relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh as stipulated in para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS for construction of road from main road (ATR) to house site colony Kadamtala village of Andaman and Nicobar Islands at an estimated cost of Rs. 29,83,284/- subject to the concurrence of the Environment and Forest authorities of Andaman and Nicobar Islands and granting of the requisite No Objection Certificate by them to the District authorities.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 2nd September, 2005

APPENDIX XLIV
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME
MEMORANDUM NO. 7

Subject: Proposal for construction of Hingota Anicut for providing irrigation & drinking water facility In Dausa Parliamentary Constituency of Rajasthan at an estimated cost of Rs. 40.62 lakh out of which Rs. 32.44 lakh is being contributed from MPLADS funds.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation have addressed a communication dated 17 August, 2005 regarding proposal for construction of Hingota Anicut for providing irrigation & drinking water facility in Dausa Parliamentary Constituency of Rajasthan at an estimated cost of Rs. 40.62 lakh, out of which Rs. 32.44 lakh is being contributed from MPLADS funds for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 17 August, 2005 have stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a proposal received from the District Collector, Dausa for construction of Hingota Anicut for providing Irrigation and drinking water facility in Dausa Constituency, recommended by Shri Sachin Pilot, Member of Parliament (LS) from Dausa Constituency, former Members of Parliament, late Shri Rajesh Pilot and Smt. Rama Pilot, for Rs. 32.44 lakh, out of project cost of Rs. 40.62 lakh.

As per the information furnished by the District Administration, the total project cost is Rs. 40.62 lakh, (out of which the contribution of MPLADS funds is Rs. 32.44 lakh), is proposed to be financed as under:—

(i) MPLADS funds —		
(a) Late Shri Rajesh Pilot	-	Rs. 9.02 lakh
(b) Smt. Rama Pilot	-	Rs. 10.00 lakh
(c) Shri Sachin Pilot	-	Rs. 13.42 lakh
Total	-	Rs. 32.44 lakh
(ii) MLALADS fund from Bandikui	-	Rs. 4.94 lakh
(iii) Famine Relief Fund	-	Rs. 3.24 lakh
Total	-	Rs. 40.62 lakh

So far, Rs. 17.20 lakh has been spent, including the MPLADS funds of former MP, late Shri Rajesh Pilot. Rs. 23.42 lakh, pertaining to the contributions of former MP, Smt. Rama Pilot and Shri Sachin Pilot, remain to be spent. The implementing agency is the Irrigation Department, Government of Rajasthan. Technical Report is received. Techno-economic clearance has been obtained. Duration of completion of the project is one year from the date of resumption of work. Funds are available in the MPLADS account of the MPs. Architectural and structural plans have been approved by the competent authority.

As per item 9 of Appendix I of the MPLADS Guidelines, the work is permissible. As the expenditure of the work is more than Rs. 25 lakh, it is requested that the proposal may be placed for the consideration of Committee on MPLADS (Lok Sabha) for relaxation of para 4.1 of the Guidelines.

3. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual work costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly constructed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor Irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

4. As per para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS, Member can recommend individual works in the Parliamentary constituency costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal needs approval of the Committee on MPLADS.

5. The proposed work for construction of Hingota Anicut for providing Irrigation and drinking water facility in Dausa Parliamentary Constituency of Rajasthan is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS. Item No. 9 of the Illustrative List of works that can be taken up under MPLADS (Appendix I) permit construction of public irrigation & public drainage facilities.

6. The Committee may consider the proposal for relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh as stipulated in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS for construction of Hingota Anicut for providing Irrigation and drinking water facility in Dausa Parliamentary Constituency of Rajasthan.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 2nd September, 2005

APPENDIX XLV
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME
MEMORANDUM NO. 11

Subject: Proposal for construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road in Narela Zone on the recommendation of Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 35,00,400/- under MPLADS.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation have addressed a communication dated 5 September, 2005 regarding proposal for construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road in Narela Zone on the recommendation of Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 35,00,400/- under MPLADS for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 5 September, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a proposal of construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road in Narela Zone under MPLADS. Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP (LS) has recommended Rs. 35,00,400/- MPLADS funds on 29 April 2005 for the work of construction of the aforesaid road and drain.

As per the guidelines on MPLADS, construction of road and community drainage facilities is permissible. Hence, the construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road is permissible under the Guidelines. The implementing agency for the work is Municipal Corporation of Delhi. The entire cost of the work is being met by from MPLADS fund of Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP (LS).

Copies of detailed report, cost estimate of the proposal and copy of recommendation of Hon'ble MP is enclosed. As the expenditure involved in the work is more than Rs. 25 lakhs, views of MPLADS Committee, Lok Sabha for relaxation in the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work stipulated in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines is sought."

3. The Hon'ble Member, Shri Sandeep Dikshit in his letter dated 29 April, 2005 addressed to the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Delhi stated as under:—

"I am enclosing proforma estimate for construction of road and drain from village Bakner Main Road to Narela Bawana Road, estimated at Rs. 35,00,400. The work may be executed out of my MPLADS Fund."

4. The Executive Engineer, Municipal Corporation of Delhi in his letter dated 18 August, 2005 addressed to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as follows:—

"Please refer to your letter No. L/30/02/2004-MPLADS dated 27 July, 2005 on the subject mentioned above. As per the checklist, sent with the above mentioned work is given below:—

1. The total cost of the work is Rs. 34,49,000/- (Rs. Thirty four lacs and fortynine thousand only) which will be met out of MPLADS funds.
2. The details estimate of the work and the copy of the project report are enclosed herewith.
3. The work recommended by Hon'ble MP is permissible under Guidelines on MPLADS and has been approved by the Chief Engineer, MCD.
4. MCD itself will implement the work recommended by Hon'ble MP.
5. MPLADS funds will be utilised for the whole project.
6. The project is recommended by Hon'ble MP Shri Sandeep Dikshit (MP East Delhi) as the site of work falls in his constituency. No other MP (Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha) has recommended any amount for the work mentioned by Hon'ble MP Shri Sandeep Dikshit.

In view of the above, you are requested to kindly sanction/accord the approval for above mentioned work at the earliest."

5. Para 4.1 of the guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

6. As per Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS, Members can recommend individual works in the Parliamentary constituency costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh. Therefore, the aforesaid project needs approval of the Committee on MPLADS.

7. The proposed work for construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road in Narela Zone on the recommendation of Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 35,00,400/- under MPLADS is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS. Item Nos. 3 and 17 of the Illustrative List of works that can be taken up under MPLADS (Appendix-I) stipulates as follows:—

"Item No. 3. Construction of roads including part roads, approach roads, link roads etc. in villages and towns and cites. Very selectively kutchra roads can also be constructed where the MP concerned and the District Head agree to meet the locally felt need.

Item No. 17. Construction of drains and gutters."

8. The Committee may consider the relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh as stipulated in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS for construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road in Narela Zone on the recommendation of Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP (LS) at an estimated cost of Rs. 35,00,400/- under MPLADS.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 29th September, 2005.

APPENDIX XLVI
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME
MEMORANDUM NO. 15

***Subject:* Proposal for construction of RCC retaining wall, formation of bus bay with shelter and footpath in Dn-82, Zone-VI recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 118.60 lakh out of which Rs. 1,15,70,010.76 is to be met from MPLADS funds.**

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation have addressed a communication dated 13 October, 2005 regarding proposal for construction of RCC retaining wall, formation of bus bay with shelter and footpath in Dn-82, Zone-VI recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology at an estimated cost of Rs. 118.60 lakh out of which Rs. 1,15,70,010.76 is to be met from MPLADS funds for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 13 October, 2005 have stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a project proposal received from the Commissioner, Corporation of Chennai, for widening of Dams Road including construction of RCC retaining wall, formation of bus bay with shelter and footpath in Division-82, Zone-VI recommended by Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology. He has allocated Rs. 140 lakh for the same. The Bus Route Roads (BRR) Department, Corporation of Chennai has prepared an estimated cost of Rs. 118.60 lakh for the said work.

Commissioner, Chennai has reported that the works will be executed by the Bus Route Roads Department, Corporation of Chennai. This work includes widening of Dams Road including construction of RCC retaining wall, formation of Bus Bay with shelter and footpath in Division-82, Zone-VI. The estimated cost of the work proposed by the Corporation, works out to Rs. 118.60 lakh. But the supervision and contingency charges to the tune of Rs. 2,89,989.24 are not admissible under MPLADS. The work estimate of Rs. 1,15,70,010.76 are admissible under the Scheme.

Construction of road, retaining wall, bus shelter, footpath etc., is permissible under MPLADS. Widening of road is also permissible, since it is a durable asset and can be considered as a part of construction of road. Special repairs for restoration/upgradation of any durable asset are also permissible.

As per Para 11 of the latest instructions for release of funds under MPLADS, issued vide this Ministry's Circular No. C/22/2004-MPLADS dated 1 June, 2005, the District Authority can only release upto 50% of the estimated amount of a sanctioned work to an Implementing agency. On the basis of the physical and financial report furnished by the implementing agency, the District Authority can release the remaining funds when 60% of the advance has been utilised. The Chennai Corporation is the District Authority in case of Shri Dayanidhi Maran's MPLADS, and entire fund in this account is released to Corporation of Chennai. As on 1 September, 2005, Rs. 383.32 lakh are available with the Corporation on this account. As and when the Corporation is eligible, MPLADS Instalment on this account will be released. There is adequate fund in Shri Dayanidhi Maran's MPLADS account to meet the cost of this work.

3. The Commissioner, Corporation of Chennai in his communication dated 20 September, 2005 dated as under:—

The work has to be executed by the Bus Route Roads Department, Corporation of Chennai.

Accordingly, an estimate had been prepared for Rs. 118.60 lakhs and the same was approved by the Commissioner, Corporation of Chennai, Chennai-3.

Approval of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation MPLAD Scheme are therefore requested for the following:—

4. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spend)."

5. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation vide their communication dated 13 October, 2005 has stated that Hon'ble Minister has allocated Rs. 140 lakh from his MPLADS fund for this project. Works are to be executed by Bus Route Roads Department, Corporation of Chennai and an estimate of Rs. 118.60 lakh has been prepared for the aforesaid work. However, the supervision and contingency charges amounting to Rs. 2,89,989.24 are not admissible from MPLADS funds, therefore, an amount of Rs. 1,15,70,010.76 is to be incurred from MPLADS funds.

As regard, whether the work is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS, the Ministry expressed their views that construction of road, retaining wall, bus shelter, footpath etc., are permissible under the MPLADS Guidelines. Widening of road is also permissible as it is a durable asset and can be classified as a part of construction of road. Special repairs for restoration/upgradation of any durable asset are also permissible. In this regard, Items No. 3,18 and 21 of Appendix I (Illustrative List of works that can be taken up under MPLADS) of the Guidelines on MPLADS stipulates as follows:—

6. The Committee may consider the proposal of Shri Dayanidhi Maran, MP and Hon'ble Minister of Telecommunications and Information Technology for seeking approval for giving relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh as stipulated in Para 4.1 of the MPLADS Guidelines for construction of RCC retaining wall, formation of bus bay with shelter and footpath at an estimated cost of Rs. 118.60 lakh out of which Rs. 1,15,70,010.76 is to be met from MPLADS funds.

NEW DELHI.

Dated the 19th October, 2005.

APPENDIX XLVII

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME

MEMORANDUM NO. 16

Subject: Relaxation in the upper limit of Rs. 25 lakh for construction of Blood Bank Building for the Indian Medical Blood Bank Society of Uttranchal, Dehradun on the recommendation of Shri Francis Fanthome, MP (LS) and Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Shri Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri, MP (LS) from MPLADS funds.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 18 October, 2005 for relaxation in the upper limit of Rs. 25 lakh for construction of Blood Bank Building for the Indian Medical Blood Bank Society of Uttranchal, Dehradun on the recommendation of Shri Francis Fanthome, MP (LS) and Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Shri Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri, MP (LS) from MPLADS funds for consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 18 October, 2005 stated as follows:—

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a proposal received from the District Magistrate, Dehradun for Construction of Blood Bank Building for the Indian Medical Blood Bank Society of Uttranchal, Dehradun recommended by Shri Francis Fanthome, MP (LS) and Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Shri Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri, MP (LS).

The Indian Medical Blood Bank Society, Uttranchal is engaged in social service/welfare activities since January, 2001. Shri Sudharshan Agarwal, His Excellency Governor of Uttranchal is Chief Patron of the Society. The total estimated cost of the project is Rs. 1,05,82,957/-. The following Members of Parliament (RS) had already made contribution out of their MPLADS account for the above project:—

(a) Smt. Sushma Swaraj, MP (RS)	Rs. 25 lakh
(b) Shri Sanghpriya Gautam, ex-MP	Rs. 15 lakh
(c) Shri Harish Rawat, MP (RS)	Rs. 10 lakh

Total Rs. 50 lakh

DC, Dehradun had earlier released the initial amount of Rs. 25 lakh recommended by Smt. Sushma Swaraj, MP (RS). Contribution of the other Rajya Sabha Members amounting to Rs. 25 lakh was placed before the MPLADS Committee (Rajya Sabha) for relaxation of upper limit of Rs. 25 lakh stipulated under 4.1 of MPLADS Guidelines. The Committee considered the proposal on 2nd November, 2004 and recommended relaxation of Para 4.1 of MPLADS Guidelines to allow Shri Sanghpriya Gautam, ex-MP (RS) and

Shri Harish Rawat, MP (RS) to contribute Rs. 15 lakh and Rs. 10 lakh respectively, for construction of Blood Bank Building of Indian Medical Blood Bank Society of Uttranchal, Dehradun. Accordingly, the authorization has been conveyed to the DM, Dehradun on 13 December, 2004.

DM, Dehradun has also reported that balance funds (Rs. 25.82 lakh) required for the work will be met from MPLADS and the State Government.

As per the present proposal, the following Members of Parliament (LS) also proposed to contribute funds out of their MPLADS fund for the above work.

(a) Shri Francis Fanthome, MP (LS) (Nominated) — Rs. 25 lakh.

(b) Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri, MP (LS) — Rs. 5 lakh.

Since the total estimated cost of the work is more than the permissible limit of Rs. 25 lakh as per 4.1 of the MPLADS Guidelines for recommending individual work under MPLADS Scheme, the above proposal may be placed before the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha for considering the request for relaxation of Para 4.1 of the MPLADS Guidelines subject to the following conditions:—

- (a) Such part cost should be for a clearly identifiable part of the work.
- (b) To ensure that the use of MPLADS funds results in completion of the work, the funds from MPLADS to be released towards the end of the project and funds from other sources should proceed."

3. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work should not be too rigidly construed, amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor Irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

4. The Ministry have stated that the estimated cost of the proposed work pertaining to the construction of blood bank buildings for the Indian Medical Blood Bank Society is Rs. 1,05,82,957/- and Hon'ble Members S/Shri Francis Fanthome and Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri had desired to contribute Rs. 25 lakh and 5 lakh respectively from MPLADS fund. The Indian Medical Blood Bank Society, Uttranchal is engaged in social activities since January, 2001. The project is being funded from MPLADS fund of some Rajya Sabha MPs and the balance is being met from MLALADS and State Government funds.

As per para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS, works recommended from MPLADS funds should not cost more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal needs approval of the Committee on MPLADS.

5. The proposal needs relaxation beyond the limit of Rs. 25 lakh as stipulated in Para 4.1 of the MPLADS Guidelines for construction of Blood Bank Building for the

Indian Medical Blood Bank Society of Uttaranchal, Dehradun on the recommendation of Shri Francis Fanthome, MP (LS) and Maj.Gen. (Retd.) Shri Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri, MP (LS) who are contributing Rs. 25 lakh and Rs. 5 lakh respectively from MPLADS funds subject to the fulfillment of the following conditions:—

- (a) Such part cost should be for a clearly identifiable part of the work.
 - (b) To ensure that the use of MPLADS funds results in completion of the work, the funds from MPLADS to be released towards the end of the project and funds from other sources should proceed.
6. The Committee may consider.

NEW DELHI;
Dated the 19th October, 2005.

APPENDIX XLVIII
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
(MPLADS COMMITTEE BRANCH)
COMMITTEE ON MPLAD SCHEME
MEMORANDUM NO. 19

Subject: Proposal for construction of Community Hall-cum Market at Asaf Ali Road on the recommendation of Shri Kapil Sibal, Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology) at an estimated cost of Rs. 89.50 lakh under MPLADS.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation addressed a communication dated 30 June, 2005 pertaining to the proposal of Shri Kapil Sibal, Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology) for construction of Community Hall-cum-Market at Asaf Ali Road at an estimated cost of Rs. 89.50 lakh under MPLAD Scheme for the consideration of the Committee on MPLADS.

2. The Ministry in their communication dated 30 June, 2005 stated as follows:-

"The undersigned is directed to forward herewith a proposal regarding construction of Community Hall-cum-Market at Asaf Ali Road under MPLADS recommended by Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology) Shri Kapil Sibal. The total estimated cost of the work is Rs. 89.50 lakh under MPLADS. The entire cost of the work is being met from MPLADS fund of Hon'ble Minister of State (Science & Technology) Shri Kapil Sibal. The implementing agency for the work is Municipal Corporation of Delhi.

As per the Guidelines on MPLADS, construction of Community Hall is permissible under MPLADS (Item 6 of Appendix-I). Works relating to construction of shopping complex/markets yards by and for local bodies (Panchayats/Municipality) is also permissible under the Guidelines (as per item 32 of Appendix-I). Hence, the aforesaid work of construction of Community Hall-cum-Market is permissible under the Guidelines. Funds are available with the Nodal District, MCD in respect of Chandni Chowk Lok Sabha constituency represented by the Hon'ble Minister.

As the expenditure involved in the work is more than Rs. 25 lakh, the views of the MPLADS Committee (Lok Sabha) is solicited for relaxation in the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work stipulated in Para 4.1 of the Guidelines subject to fulfillment of the following conditions:—

- (i) The operation and maintenance of the said Community Hall will be the responsibility of MCD.
- (ii) Before the sanction is accorded, the Commissioner, MCD will ensure that environmental and statutory clearance of the authorities concerned have been received.

(iii) The Community Hall is available for the public in general."

3. Hon'ble Minister, Shri Kapil Sibal in his letter dated 5 May, 2005 addressed to the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Delhi stated as under:—

"Kindly refer to your D.O. No. PSC/CO 191/2005 of 3rd May, 2005 regarding proposed Community Hall for the residents of Jama Masjid to be built above the MCD's office, Asaf Ali Road Car Parking Delhi.

I sincerely appreciate efforts being taken by you for implementation of the projects recommended by us. I feel that this project will go a long way in meeting demand of my constituency for establishment of a Community Hall for social events.

As desired by you, I sanction Rs. 90 lakhs for the above project from my MPLADS fund.

Kindly release the above amount for implementation of this project at the earliest.

Looking forward to your continuous cooperation in future also."

4. The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Delhi in his letter dated 27 June, 2005 addressed to the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated as follows:—

"The Hon'ble Member of Parliament and Minister of State for Science and Technology, Shri Kapil Sibal had conducted a site inspection in May, 2005 of his Parliamentary constituency and identified a site of building of the Engineering Department for construction of a Community Hall-cum-exclusive Women's Market on Asaf Ali Road. The Community Hall is required for the use of the Muslim community, because they do not have any place to perform marriage/social functions and there have been persistent demand for the same. The exclusive Women's market has to come up, as a result of the request from the Sewa Bharat Organisation, which proposed to hold Sunday markets in the area for women and has plans to sell hand woven products etc., to people which will also encourage women in their self empowerment.

Accordingly, based on the request from the Hon'ble Minister, a scheme for construction of a Community Hall-cum-exclusive Women's market has been prepared, whose cost is estimated to be Rs. 90.00 lacs. The Hon'ble Minister has sanctioned the funds from his MPLAD Scheme. Since, there is a limitation of Rs. 25.00 lacs for any project, you are requested to kindly relax this condition and allow the construction of the integrated scheme for the construction of a Community Hall and Women's Market, on the rooftop of MCD's Car Parking at Asaf Ali Road. This is a unique structure, which will meet the long standing demand of the communities living in the area, in view of the dense population in the area and the need for creating an environment, which is breezy and properly ventilated. The project has been conceived taking into account the needs of the community of the area.

Since the Hon'ble Minister has been pressing hard for the early start of the work, you are requested to kindly relax the condition so that funds to the tune of Rs. 90 lacs could be released for the above mentioned project."

5. Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS which stipulates the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work is as follows:—

"Ideally it would be desirable that the MPs suggest individual works costing not more than Rs. 25 lakhs per work. However, the limit of Rs. 25 lakh per work should not be too rigidly construed. Amounts higher than Rs. 25 lakhs per work can be spent depending upon the nature of the work. (For example a single check dam to provide minor irrigation or water supply or a sports stadium may cost more than Rs. 25 lakhs. In the case of such works higher amount can be legitimately spent)."

6. The aforesaid proposal was placed before the consideration of the Committee on MPLADS, LS at their sitting held on 6 September, 2005. The Committee *inter alia* observed as follows:

".....Since the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Delhi in his letter dated 27 June, addressed to the Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation stated that "the community hall is required for use of the Muslim community", the Committee recommended that a clarification be obtained from the Ministry in this regard, as the Guidelines on MPLADS do not permit utilization of funds for religious purposes, (Item No. 9 of the List of works not permissible under MPLADS)."

7. Accordingly, the matter was referred to Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation on 16 September, 2005 for clarification. The Ministry in their reply dated 3rd November, 2005 stated under:—

".....MCD has informed that the word 'Muslim community' had been inadvertently used in the letter and that the proposed community hall is not meant for any religious group and is to be used by the general public.

It is requested that the proposal may be placed before the MPLADS Committee (Lok Sabha) for relaxation in the limit of Rs. 25 lakhs per work stipulated in para 4.1 of the guidelines".

8. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation have forwarded a proposal for construction of Community Hall-cum-Market at Asaf Ali Road on the recommendation of Shri Kapil Sibal, Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology) at an estimated cost of Rs. 89.50 lakh under MPLADS. The implementing agency for the work is Municipal Corporation of Delhi and the Municipal Corporation has proposed an estimate of Rs. 89.50 lakh for the project. The project is likely to be completed within six months. The Ministry has also obtained a clarification from the Municipal Corporation of Delhi as desired by Committee on MPLADS and has stated that the word 'Muslim Community' had been inadvertently used and the proposed community hall is not meant for any religious group and is to be used for the general public.

9. As regards, whether the work is permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS, the Ministry have stated that construction of Community Hall and works relating to construction of shopping complex/markets yards by and for local bodies (Panchayats/Municipality) are permissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS. Therefore, the aforesaid work of construction of Community Hall-cum-market is also permissible under the Guidelines. Item 6 and 32 of the Illustrative List of works that can be taken up under MPLADS (Appendix-I) stipulates as follows:—

"Item 6. Construction of buildings for local bodies for recognised District or State Sports Associations and for cultural and sports activities or for hospitals. Provision of multi-gym facilities in gymnastic centres, sports associations, physical education training institutions etc. is also permissible.

Item 32. Works relating to the construction of shopping complex/market complex/market yards by and for Local Bodies (Panchayats/Municipality)."

10. As per Para 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS, Member can recommend individual works in their parliamentary constituency costing not more than Rs. 25 lakh per work. Therefore, the aforesaid proposal needs approval of the Committee on MPLADS.

11. The proposal of Shri Kapil Sibal, Hon'ble Minister of State (Science and Technology) for construction of Community Hall-cum Market at Asaf Ali Road at an estimated cost of Rs. 89.50 lakh from MPLADS is permissible under the guidelines, subject to the condition that the limit beyond Rs. 25 lakh, as stipulated in paragraph 4.1 of the Guidelines on MPLADS is relaxed.

12. The Committee may consider the above proposal.

NEW DELHI;
Dated 6th February, 2006