

**COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL
AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (2008-09)**

FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND
PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION**

[Action Taken on the recommendations contained in the Thirteenth
Report of the committee on MPLAD Scheme
(Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]

FOURTEENTH REPORT



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

December, 2008/ Agrahayana, 1930 (Saka)

FOURTEENTH REPORT
COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT LOCAL
AREA DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (2008-09)

(FOURTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME
IMPLEMENTATION

[Action Taken on the recommendations contained in the Thirteenth
Report of the committee on MPLAD Scheme
(Fourteenth Lok Sabha)]

Presented to Lok Sabha on _____



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

December, 2008/ Agrahayana, 1930 (Saka)

C.O. MPLADS No. 14

Price: Rs.

© 2008 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Twelfth Edition) and printed by General Manager, Govt. of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi – 110002

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF MPLADS COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(iv)

PART - I

CHAPTER - I	Report	1
CHAPTER - II	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	16
CHAPTER - III	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	35
CHAPTER - IV	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	36
CHAPTER - V	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	45

APPENDICES

I	Minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 24 October, 2008	46
II	Status of CAG paras	47
III	Analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirteenth Report of the Committee on MPLADS (14th Lok Sabha)	50

COMPOSITION OF THE MPLADS COMMITTEE (2008-09)

Shri Prasanna Acharya -- Chairman

MEMBERS

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

SECRETARIAT

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------|---|------------------|
| 1. | Shri N.K. Sapra | - | Addl. Secretary |
| 2. | Shri Hardev Singh | - | Director |
| 3. | Shri D.S. Malha | - | Deputy Secretary |
| 4. | Dr. Satya Prakash | - | Under Secretary |
-

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) (2008-09) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Fourteenth Report on the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirteenth Report (14th Lok Sabha) of the Committee on MPLADS (2006-07) of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.

2. The Thirteenth Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 7 December, 2006. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 13 February, 2008.

3. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 24 October, 2008.

4. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirteenth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the committee (2006-07) is given in *Appendix III*.

New Delhi
December, 2008
Agrahayana, 1930 (Saka)

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

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS) deals with the action taken by the Government on the Observations/Recommendations contained in their Thirteenth Report on various representations and proposals pertaining to MPLAD Scheme received from Hon'ble Members of Parliament, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India and others including 'proposals to amend Guidelines on MPLADS' in respect of the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. The Thirteenth Report (Fourteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee was presented to Lok Sabha on 7 December, 2006.

2. The Action Taken Notes in respect of all the 39 Observations/Recommendations have been received from the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India and the same have been categorized as under :-

- (i) Observations/Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government :

Para Nos. 1.3, 1.4, 1.8, 1.9, 1.14, 1.18, 1.20, 1.21, 1.22, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 2.18, 4.5, 4.6, 5.4, 6.3, 7.8, 7.9, 8.3, 9.3, 10.2, 12.2, 13.2, 14.5, 15.8, 15.9, 15.10, 16.5, 16.6 and 17.3

- (ii) Observation/Recommendation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the reply received from the Government :
Para No.11.3

- (iii) Observations/Recommendations in respect of which reply of Government have not been accepted by the Committee which require reiteration:

Para Nos. 1.19, 2.7, 2.12, 2.17 and 3.5

- (iv) Observation/Recommendation in respect of which Government have furnished interim reply :

Para No. 14.4

3. The Committee desire that Action Taken Notes on the Observations/Recommendations contained in Chapter-I and final Action Taken Notes in respect of the Observations/Recommendations contained in Chapter-V of the Report may be furnished to the Committee within three months of the presentation of this Report.

4. The relevant extracts of the Action Taken Notes furnished by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation have been reproduced in the subsequent Chapters of this Report. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by the Government on some of their Observations/Recommendations that require reiteration or merit comment.

A. Reconstruction / Rehabilitation works in Tsunami affected areas out of MPLAD funds.

(Recommendation-Para No.1.14)

5. The Committee had expressed their deep concern over the tardy progress of work regarding rehabilitation and reconstruction works in Andaman and Nicobar Islands. They had observed 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 were not finalized. The Committee had, therefore, recommended that 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 generation of employment.

6. The Ministry, in their Action Taken Notes, have stated that suggestions had been forwarded to the Andaman and Nicobar Administration for necessary action.

7. **The Committee had adversely commented upon the slow and tardy progress of rehabilitation and reconstruction works, lack of proper planning, initiative and poor administrative decisions and heavy dependence on Central Government for decision making causing all round dissatisfaction in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. They had thus recommended that 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 generation of employment. The Committee are disappointed to note that action taken reply submitted by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation merely states that the suggestions have been forwarded to the Andaman and Nicobar Administration for necessary action. The Committee express their unhappiness at the casual approach adopted by the Ministry in the matter since they do not appear to have followed up at all with the Andaman and Nicobar Administration. The Committee now expect the Ministry to submit the status report in respect of action taken in this regard by Andaman and Nicobar Administration immediately.**

(Recommendation-Para No.1.19)

8. The Committee had also recommended in their Original Report (Para No.1.19) that funds were needed to be transferred directly by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration so as to hasten the process of disbursement of MPLADS funds. The Committee had expected that the Andaman and Nicobar Administration would expedite the reconstruction and rehabilitation works and furnish a utilization / completion report to the Committee within six months.

9. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, in their Action Taken Notes, have stated as under :-

“The normal procedure is to release the annual allocation of Rs. 2 crore of the Constituency to the DCs/DMs of the Nodal Districts. Hence the concerned DCs / DMs had been requested to transfer the funds consented by the respective Members of Parliament to the Tsunami affected Districts”.

10. The Committee are constrained to observe that the Ministry has taken the recommendation of the Committee in a routine and casual manner as due importance has not been given to the urgency of the rehabilitation / reconstruction work. The very purpose of the recommendation to expedite the rehabilitation work by easing out the cumbersome fund release process for a special cause of coping up with devastations caused by a natural calamity of severe nature, was defeated by the Ministry by quoting the normal procedure of fund release. It was in the light of the need to provide quick relief to the affected people that special provision was recommended by the Committee to make arrangements for direct release of funds to the affected districts. That this

was not done is regrettable. The Committee had also expected that Andaman and Nicobar Administration would expedite the reconstruction and rehabilitation works and furnish a utilisation / completion report to the Committee within six months. The Ministry in their Action Taken Notes is silent on the issue of furnishing utilization / completion report to the Committee. The Committee are of the opinion that the Ministry are not taking timely action in the implementation of their recommendations as the details of the funds actually transferred along with utilization / completion reports (work-wise / MP-wise) in respect of tsunami rehabilitation works at Andaman & Nicobar Islands out of MPLAD funds have not been provided to the Committee so far. The Committee desire the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to take up the matter with the concerned authorities expeditiously and furnish the requisite information pertaining to all the tsunami rehabilitation works to the Committee without any further delay.

(Recommendation-Para No.1.21)

11. The Committee in their Original Report (Para No.1.21), were not satisfied with tardy progress of rehabilitation works in the Andaman & Nicobar Islands viz. delay in floating tenders, frequent revision of estimates, etc. The Committee had observed that the site selected for construction of Community Hall at Joginder Nagar, Campbell Bay, Nicobar District was not yet accessible. The Committee had desired that the funds should not have been blocked for such a project but utilized for some other project. The Committee had also observed that the Nodal Districts had failed to transfer the funds to the Andaman & Nicobar Administration.

12. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, in their Action Taken Note, have intimated as under :-

“As per the report received from DC, Andamans as on 28-02-2007, construction of community halls at Joginder Nagar, Campbell Bay, Nicobar District are in progress”.

13. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their Action Taken Note, have further informed as under :-

“Out of total amount of Rs. 854.81 lakh, an amount of Rs. 67 lakh is yet to be transferred to Andaman and Nicobar Islands by the respective Nodal District Authorities. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation have requested the DCs/DMs and the Chief Secretaries of the concerned States for immediate transfer of the funds to enable timely completion of the rehabilitation works”.

14. The Committee are surprised to note that the Ministry have not been able to provide current status of the construction work of the Community Hall at Joginder Nagar. Expressing their concern over the inordinate delay in the said construction work, the completion of which is not certain even after the lapse of more than three years of the tragedy, the Committee feel that the Ministry should have pursued the matter with the Andaman & Nicobar Administration for timely completion of the work. The Committee desire that the completion report of the said work should be furnished to the Committee without any further delay.

15. The Committee find that Government have failed to state whether the balance amount of Rs. 67 lakh has actually been transferred to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands or not. The Committee take strong

exception to the lackadaisical approach of the Government and desire that status report regarding transfer of balance funds to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands should be communicated to the Committee at once.

B. Reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India on MPLAD Scheme

(Para No.2.7)

16. The Committee had noted that the replies of the audit paras relating to State Governments / UT Administrations were to 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 of C&AG would have been submitted to the Public Accounts Committee.

17. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their Action Taken Reply, have stated as under :-

“In response to our letter, C&AG has desired complete reply of the Audit Paras with remedial measures taken by the States to avoid recurrence of such lapses. Despite repeated requests to District Authorities, complete replies have not been received. Rigorous efforts are being made to obtain the complete information by personal liaison with the State Governments and the District Authorities”.

18. When asked for the updated information about the replies received from the States, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, in a written note, replied as under :-

“Immediately on receipt of the C&AG reports, a copy of each of the two C&AG reports was forwarded to the Chief Secretaries of all States/UT Administrations requesting for Action Taken Notes on the audit paras

pertaining to them. Regular reminders are sent at different levels, including Chief Secretaries level for addressing the audit paras. Information in respect of certain audit paras received from State Government/UT Administration have been incorporated but the complete information has not so far been received for finalizing the Action Taken Notes for onward submission to the Director General of Audit.

However, complete reply of State/UT's C&AG para for the year 1997 in respect of Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Uttarakhand, Daman & Diu, Chandigarh, Dadar & Nagar Haveli, Delhi, Pondicherry and Tamil Nadu have been received. Similarly, Audit para for the year 2000, complete reply in respect of State/UTs Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Gujarat, Haryana, Uttarakhand and Daman & Diu has been received. The matter was also discussed in the review meeting with the nodal Secretaries of States/UTs held on 10-04-2008."

19. States/UTs wise status of C&AG Paras, as furnished by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, has been shown at Appendix.

20. The Committee find that in the C&AG's Report for the year ended March 1997 (No. 3 of 1998), out of the 32 States/UTs for which Audit paras were prepared, complete replies from ten States/UTs only have been received whereas partial replies have been received from 22 States. Similarly, for the C&AG's report for the year ended March 2000 (No. 3 A of 2001), out of 33 States/UTs, complete replies have been received from six States/UTs only whereas partial replies have been received from the remaining 27 States/UTs. The Committee are dismayed to observe that even after a decade, the Action Taken Notes on the audit paras have not been submitted to the Director General of Audit. The Committee strongly

recommend that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation should take up the matter vigorously with the concerned authorities and ensure that complete replies to the audit paras with remedial measures taken by the States to avoid recurrence of such lapses, are settled as per procedure without further delay. The Committee may invariably be apprised of the progress made in this regard at periodic intervals.

(Recommendation – Para No. 2.12)

21. The Committee had earlier expressed their serious concern over the lacunae pointed out in the C&AG Reports, like sanctioning of works by District Collectors without recommendations of the MPs, huge unspent balances with implementing agencies, non-submission of utilization certificates, etc. The Committee had recommended that the Central Ministry and State Agencies should find out the reasons for poor implementation of the Scheme and strengthen their monitoring apparatus and thereafter furnish a report to the Committee. The Committee also recommended that strict action should be taken against the errant officials who had disregarded the MPLAD Scheme Guidelines while approving / executing projects / works.

22. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, in their Action Taken reply, have stated as under :-

“Necessary action has been taken over the lacunae pointed in the Comptroller and Auditor General Reports at the time of revision of MPLADS Guidelines in November, 2005. Whenever any instance of poor implementation of the Scheme is brought to the notice of the Ministry, the concerned State Government were asked to take necessary action. So far as monitoring aspects of the Scheme is concerned, recently the

Ministry have entrusted the work to NABARD Consultancy Service (NABCONS).“

23. The Committee feel that the reply given by the Ministry is too general in nature and does not reflect the efforts made by the Ministry to identify the reasons for poor implementation of the Scheme. The Committee are of the opinion that the Ministry should have furnished a factual and analytical report on poor implementation of the Scheme after compiling information from all the States. Regarding monitoring also, the Committee observe that the Ministry have simply stated that monitoring of the Scheme has recently been entrusted to NABCONS without giving the details of terms of reference including powers, functions, scope for scrutiny, etc. Further, the findings, if any, of the Agency entrusted with the job of monitoring have also not been provided to the Committee. The Committee desire that the detailed report covering the implementation and monitoring aspects of the Scheme should be furnished to the Committee within three months of presentation of this Report to the Parliament.

(Recommendation – Para No. 2.17)

24. The Committee had 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. They had thus recommended that efforts should be made to plug all loopholes and rectify the errors in the implementation of the Scheme.

25. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their Action Taken Note, have stated as under :-

“...Initiatives have been taken towards promoting citizen awareness, to provide for an institutional mechanism for greater transparency and

accountability at the implementation level, and to improve the implementation and delivery of the intended benefits to the people. These are enumerated below:-

- (a) The MPLADS Guidelines, revised recently in November 2005, stipulate time periods for examining and sanctioning proposals by the district administration, for implementation of the scheme, for furnishing Utilization and Audit Certificates, for furnishing of work completion reports by the implementing agencies etc. and also clearly demarcate the functions of the State Government, district administration, the implementing agencies, etc.
- (b) The implementation of the scheme at the ground level has been brought under the purview of the Right to Information Act, 2005.
- (c) A software for monitoring MPLADS works which enables universal online access of details of works which are uploaded, has been launched from November 2004.
- (d) To enable proper application and scrupulous adherence to the Guidelines, assistance is being provided to States to conduct training of district officials in MPLADS...”

26. The Committee take note of the efforts made by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation to plug loopholes and rectify the errors in the implementation of the Scheme by introducing financial discipline by way of stipulating time period for examining and sanctioning proposals by the district administration, furnishing Utilization and Audit Certificates by the District Authorities, furnishing of work completion reports by the implementing agencies, bringing the implementation of this scheme under the purview of the Right to Information Act, 2005 and launching a software for monitoring MPLADS works which enables universal online access to details of works under this Scheme. While the Committee appreciate the efforts made by the Ministry in connection with improving the implementation as well as monitoring of the scheme, it is felt that there is still a wide scope for further improvement. The Committee feel

that the Ministry should undertake a comprehensive study for finding the loopholes and errors in implementation of the scheme on the basis of feedback from the States/Union Territories and carry out necessary amendments in the Guidelines on MPLADS and the action taken report in this regard may be submitted to the Committee at the earliest.

C. Revision of Guidelines on MPLAD Scheme

(Para No.3.4)

27. Regarding definition of 'family' in para 3.21 of Guidelines on MPLADS, the Committee, in their Original Report, were of the opinion that it was too broad and no Indian Statute encompassed such a wide definition of a family. The Committee had recommended that the meaning of the word 'family', for MPLADS purpose, should be restricted to blood relatives only.

28. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their Action Taken Note, have stated as under :-

“In view of the criticism in the media and elsewhere on the scheme, a broad definition of family has been adopted. This ensures transparency and accountability of the scheme. In discussions with the Ministry of Law and Justice, it was found that different laws have adopted different definitions of family depending on the context of the statute. Consultations with the Ministry of Law & Justice are still going on”.

29. When asked about the opinion of the Ministry of Law and Justice with regard to the definition of family for the purpose of MPLAD Scheme, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, in a written note, stated as under :-

“The Ministry of Law & Justice, Department of Legal Affairs has examined the definition adopted in the Guidelines of MPLADS. That Department is

of the considered view that there may not be any legal objection to continue with the definition of 'family' given in the MPLADS Guidelines".

30. The Committee feel that the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation are taking too rigid a stand over a simple but important recommendation of the Committee that the definition of family should be restricted to blood relations only. The Committee are of the opinion that it is not fair to stretch the limit of the family to such an extent to cover MP, MP's spouse and their parents, brothers, sisters, children, grandchildren and their spouses and their in-laws, in the name of transparency, accountability and criticism in media and elsewhere. The Committee are of the opinion that Societies, Trusts, NGOs are also engaged in developmental works and public welfare activities and broadening the definition of the family only puts unnecessary constraints in the smooth functioning of the Scheme, thus defeating its laudable objectives. The Committee further note that the Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice have given their considered view that there may not be any legal objection to continuing with the definition of the word 'family' as given in the MPLADS Guidelines and infer that while giving their views, the Ministry of Law and Justice have not given any comments on the legality and appropriateness of scope of definition of the family and have never raised any legal objection in changing the definition of the family. The Committee, therefore, strongly reiterate their recommendation that the family, for MPLADS purpose, should be restricted and urge the Government to reconsider their decision in the matter.

(Recommendation- Para No 3.5)

31. The Committee, in their Original Report, had expressed their displeasure over non-acceptance of eight Observations / Recommendations out of thirteen made by them and had desired that Government should reconsider their decision in the matter.

32. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their Action Taken Note, have stated as under :-

“where feasible, guidelines have been changed incorporating the proposals / suggestions of the Committee”.

33. The Committee observe that no specific and convincing reasons have been given by the Ministry for non-acceptance of most of the recommendations of the Committee. The Committee recommend that the non accepted observations / recommendations of the Committee regarding Guidelines on MPLAD Scheme should be reconsidered by the Government while amending the existing Guidelines.

D. Increase of Allocation of MPLADS Funds for each MP

(Recommendation - Para No. 14.4)

34. The Committee in their Original Report, had recommended that the allocation per MP per year be increased to Rs. 5 crore so that Members of Parliament could fulfill the basic requirements of the constituencies in a more effective manner.

35. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation in their Action Taken Note have submitted as under :-

“The proposal to enhance the allocation of MPLAD funds from Rs. 2 crore to 5 crore is under examination of the Government”.

36. The Committee are of the opinion that the Ministry should take action on the long pending recommendation of the Committee on increasing the allocation by giving it top priority especially in view of the cost escalation of works and keep the Committee apprised of the action taken in this regard.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS/WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation (Sl. No. 1, Para No. 1.3)

2.1 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.

Reply of the Government

2.2 Reconstruction/rehabilitation works to the tune of Rs.2187.81 lakh has so far been authorized in Tamil Nadu, Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Pondicherry, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala, as indicated below:-

Tamil Nadu	Rs.886.00 lakh
A & N Islands	Rs.854.81 lakh

Pondicherry	Rs.225.00 lakh
Andhra Pradesh	Rs.104.00 lakh
Kerala	Rs.118.00 lakh

Total Rs.2187.81 lakh

In the Second Sitting of the Committee on MPLADS, Lok Sabha (2007-08) held on 14th December, 2007 it was, inter alia, decided that the works that are yet to start should not be allowed to be taken up at this late stage and the contributions should be returned back to the respective MPs.

Accordingly, DC, Cuddalore was informed that the fresh list of works to the tune of Rs.31 lakh recommended by them may not be taken up.

Similarly, Director (Planning & MPLADS), Planning (VI) Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh has been requested to return the funds back to the Nodal District of Shri G. Venkat Swamy, Hon'ble Member of Parliament.

As such the total cost of the works at Andhra Pradesh would be reduced to Rs.94 lakh and the total cost of works authorized would be **Rs.2177.81 lakh**.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 2, Para No. 1.4)

2.3 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.

Reply of the Government

2.4 (a) Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel, Hon'ble M.P. (Lok Sabha) had desired to utilize the amount of Rs.20 lakh consented by him in A&N Islands. Accordingly, the fund has been authorized in A&N Islands.

(b) Shri B.C. Khanduri, Hon'ble M.P. (Lok Sabha) had desired to utilize the amount of Rs.10 lakh consented by him in A&N Islands. Accordingly, the fund has been authorized in A&N Islands.

(c) Shri Swadesh Chakraborty, Hon'ble M.P. (Lok Sabha) had desired to utilize the amount of Rs.12 lakh consented by him in A&N Islands. Accordingly, the fund has been authorized in A&N Islands.

(d) Shri Sukhdev Singh Libra, Hon'ble M.P. (Lok Sabha) had consented an amount of Rs.11 lakh for utilizing the same in reconstruction works in Govindnagar and Jogindernagar near Campbell Bay on Great Nicobar Islands.

Accordingly, the fund has been authorized in Govindnagar, Campbell Bay, A&N Islands.

(e) Ms. Paramjit Kaur Gulshan, Hon'ble M.P. (Lok Sabha) had consented an amount of Rs.11 lakh for utilizing the same in reconstruction works in Govindnagar and Jogindernagar near Campbell Bay on Great Nicobar Islands. Accordingly, the fund has been authorized in Govindnagar, Campbell Bay, A&N Islands.

(f) Shri Zora Singh Mann, Hon'ble MP (LS) had consented an amount of Rs.11 lakh for utilizing the same in reconstruction works in Govindnagar and Jogindernagar near Campbell Bay on Great Nicobar Islands. Accordingly, the fund has been authorized in Govindnagar, Campbell Bay, A&N Islands.

(g) Shri Basudeb Barman, Hon'ble MP(LS) had desired to utilize the amount of Rs.10 lakh consented by him in A&N Islands. Accordingly, the fund has been authorized in A&N Islands.

(h) Shri P.R. Dasmunsi, Hon'ble MP (LS) had desired to utilize the amount of Rs.10 lakh consented by him in A&N Islands. Accordingly, the fund has been authorized in A&N Islands.

(j) Shri Rahul Gandhi had consented an amount of Rs.10 lakh for the construction of orphanage in the costal district of Nagapattinam. This has been earmarked for the construction of orphanage building and shelter home for old age persons at Nagapattinam with a total cost of Rs.50 lakh.

(k) Shri P.S. Gadhavi, MP (LS) and Shri Bhupendra Singh Solanki had consented an amount of Rs.10 lakh each and had recommended to utilize the same for construction of Community Hall and Library Hall at Rameswaram. According the funds have been authorized for the works recommended by the Hon'ble MPs.

(l) Shri P.R. Dasmunsi consented an amount of Rs.10 for rehabilitation works in Car Nicobar Islands. The fund has been earmarked for the construction of Community Hall at Nicobar Islands with a total cost of Rs.67.82 lakh.

(m) Shri R. Velu, MP (LS) had consented Rs.11 lakh for taking up works in Cuddalore/ Nagapattinam district of T.N. The fund has been authorized for Restoration and improvement at Chitteripettai-Rasapettai road at Chetteripettai, Cuddalore.

(n) Shri Hansaraj Ahir, MP(LS) desired to utilize his consented amount of Rs.11 lakh in the sunami affected area of Enjambakam, District Kanchipuram, Tamil Nadu. As no work was identified in the said area, the fund has been authorized for rehabilitation works in Pondicherry.

(o) Shri Sathya Narayan Jatia, MP (LS) has consented an amount of Rs.10 lakh for construction of School building/Community hall in A&N Islands.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 3&4 Para No. 1.8 & 1.9)

2.5 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.

Accordingly, the Committee decided that the proposal to have a 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.

Reply of the Government

2.6 No action is pending on the part of the Ministry.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 5, Para No. 1.14)

2.7 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 region and involving local people for rehabilitation and generate employment.

Reply of the Government

2.8 The Ministry has forwarded the suggestion to the A&N Administration for necessary action.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 6, Para No. 1.18)

2.9 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.

Reply of the Government

2.10 The para pertains to review of status and appreciation given to the State of Tamil Nadu for the reconstruction/ rehabilitation works by the MPLADS Committee during the visit to the State. Therefore no comments are offered. No action is pending on the part of the Ministry.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 8, Para No. 1.20)

2.11 The Committee again reviewed the status of rehabilitation and reconstruction works 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 utilisation of funds under MPLAD Scheme for rehabilitation and reconstruction works 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 suffering 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.

Reply of the Government

2.12 No action is pending on the part of the Ministry.

Deputy Commissioner, Andamans has reported that the works are in progress. Sanction has been issued for the construction of Community Centre at Joginder Nagar. The road to Joginder Nagar was washed away due to Tsunami. The Border Road Organization is in the process of constructing the road.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 9, Para No. 1.21)

2.13 The Committee were critical of the variation of figures related loss of lives as reported by the Planning Commission Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration. In the absence of exact figures the Committee wondered as 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 site 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 utilized for some other project. Nodal Districts had failed to transfer the funds to the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration.

Reply of the Government

2.14 No action is pending on the part of the Ministry.

As per the report received from DC, Andamans as on 28.2.2007, construction of community halls at Joginder Nagar, Campbell Bay, Nicobar District are in progress.

Out of the total amount of Rs.854.81 lakh an amount of Rs.67 lakh is yet to be transferred to Andaman & Nicobar Islands by the respective Nodal District Authorities. The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation has requested the DCs/DMs and the Chief Secretaries of the concerned States for immediate transfer of the funds to enable timely completion of the rehabilitation works.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 10, Para No. 1.22)

2.15 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 recommended 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.

Reply of the Government

2.16 No action is pending on the part of the Ministry.

The action needs to be taken by Ministry of Home Affairs in coordination with various Ministries/Departments. The suggestions of the Committee are being forwarded to Min of Home Affairs for necessary action.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 13, 15 & 18, Para No. 2.13, 2.15 & 2.18)

2.17 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 the 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 Panchayat 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 the 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 development project and plug the resource gap between the Central and State Government's funds.

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 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.

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

Reply of the Government

2.18 It would also be worth mentioning prior to conceptualizing the scheme it was seen that very often the MPs are approached by the constituents for small works of a capital nature to be done in their constituencies. The scheme was, therefore, conceptualized to enable Member of Parliament to recommend developmental and infrastructural works of small nature with emphasis on creation of durable community assets based on locally felt need to be taken up in their constituency. This apparently shows that **Scheme was not started as an incentive or facility** for a Member of Parliament but to provide scope for a more pro-active role in the need-based development of the local areas. The Members of Parliament derive their legitimacy due to their being peoples' representatives. They aim to represent the hopes and aspirations of the people and possess an intuitive understanding of their needs. This is the very axiomatic edifice on which the MPLAD Scheme is based and the scheme envisages, through a recommendatory role, for a more direct involvement of the Members of Parliament in the betterment of people. In fact, the scheme attempts to foster a symbiotic relationship between the people and their representatives, in an innovative manner. The MPLADS is basically a constituency development fund in which the MP plays a catalytic role. This is in consonance with the current global thinking on development and the demands of the civil society, particularly in the context of under-developed and developing countries, for a more interventionist and pro-active role for Parliamentarians in the ground-level and local community development.

The constitutional validity of the Scheme has been challenged and 9 writ petitions by different persons had been filed in the Supreme Court of India.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 14, Para No. 2.14)

2.19 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 and 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 the District Collector and not by MP.

Reply of the Government

2.20 It would also be worth mentioning prior to conceptualizing the scheme it was seen that very often the MPs are approached by the constituents for small works of a capital nature to be done in their constituencies. The scheme was, therefore, conceptualized to enable Member of Parliament to recommend developmental and infrastructural works of small nature with emphasis on creation of durable community assets based on locally felt need to be taken up in their constituency. This apparently shows that **Scheme was not started as an incentive or facility** for a Member of Parliament but to provide scope for a more pro-active role in the need-based development of the local areas.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 16, Para No. 2.16)

2.21 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.

Reply of the Government

2.22 The constitutional validity of the Scheme has been challenged and 9 writ petitions by different persons had been filed in the Supreme Court of India on the ground that concept of the scheme is against the parliamentary system envisaged in the constitution

Recommendation (Sl. No. 20 & 21, Para No. 4.5 & 4.6)

2.23 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.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.24 In view of the recommendations of the committee, no action is required to be taken by the Ministry.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 22, Para No. 5.4)

2.25 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.

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. The District Collector had, 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.

The Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation vide their letter 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.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.26 No action is pending on the part of the Ministry.

Government of India vide letter addressed to the Commissioner of Revenue Administration & Relief Commissioner, Government of Tamil Nadu has sanctioned "construction of Fish Landing Centre with RCC Jetty at Enayamputhenthurai" in Kanniyakumari District with an estimated cost of Rs.150 lakh in place of the work 'Desalination plants for water supply at Simon Colony' sanctioned earlier vide letter subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Construction of Office Building and Labour Welfare Fund are not allowed under MPLADS Guidelines.
- (ii) The District Collector, Kanyakumari may be advised to ensure that only permissible item of works are sanctioned.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 23, Para No. 6.3)

2.27 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.

Reply of the Government

2.28 No action is envisaged as the proposal has been rejected by the Committee.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 24 & 25, Para No. 7.8 & 7.9)

2.29 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 (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 but 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. 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)

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

Reply of the Government

2.30 The Committee took note of the reasoning of the Ministry that memorial or memorial buildings are not covered under MPLADS and decided not to pursue the matter further.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 26, Para No. 8.3)

2.31 Utilization of MPLADS funds for providing Scholarships to poor children for higher education – proposal of Shri Sudarshan Agarwal, Governor of Uttaranchal.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.32 The grants and loans are not admissible under the Guidelines on MPLADS. Hence, no action is envisaged on the proposal.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 27, Para No. 9.3)

2.33 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

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, immovable 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.

Reply of the Government

2.34 No action is pending in the Ministry.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 28, Para No. 10.2)

2.35 Payment of Salary to Primary School teachers – Proposal of Sh. Charanjit Singh Atwal, Hon'ble Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.36 No action required.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 30, Para No. 12.2)

2.37 Purchase of Land for School-- Proposal of Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.38 In view of the committees' recommendations, no action is envisaged.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 31 Para No. 13.2)

2.39 Construction of School Building outside the Parliamentary Constituency-- Proposal of Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi, Hon'ble Minister of Water Resources.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.40 In view of the committees recommendations, no action is envisaged. In this connection, para 2.2 of MPLADS guidelines is relevant.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 33 Para No. 14.5)

2.41 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.

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 meager 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 meager 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 fulfill the basic requirements of the constituencies in a more effective manner.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.42 The proposal to enhance the allocation of MPLADS funds from Rs 2 crore to five crore is under examination of the Govt.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 34, 35 & 36 Para No. 15.8,15.9 & 15.10)

2.43 Selection of subject(s) for examination by Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS).

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.

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.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.44 The requisite material and comments of the Ministry has already been sent to the Committee vide letter No.C-36/2005-MPLADS dated 27.2.2007.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 37 & 38 Para No. 16.5, & 16.6)

2.45 Sanction for construction of works in relaxation of cost ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakh in respect of registered Society/Trust.

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 Pratishthan 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.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.46 In pursuance of these recommendations, Ministry has called such proposals from the District Authorities. The proposals received have been sent to the Committee. The remaining proposal, if any, received will be forwarded for consideration of the Lok Sabha Committee on MPLADS.

Recommendation (Sl. No. 39 Para No. 17.3)

2.47 Approval of works in relaxation to cost ceiling limit of Rs. 25 lakhs

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.
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.
3. Dr. H.T. Sangliana, MP -- Repair of Road from Yelahanka – Vijayapura road to join Budigere Cross via Sathanur, Bagalur, Gopalapura, Yediur, M.Hosahalli onto Budigere Cross in Jala Hobli, Bangalore North Taluk, Bangalore Urban District costing Rs.125 lakh in Bangalore North Parliamentary constituency.
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.
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.
6. Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunication 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.
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.
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/-.
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/-.
10. Shri Sachin Pilot, MP-- 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 was to be contributed from MPLADS funds.

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/-.
12. Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunication 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.
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/-.
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.

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.

Reply of the Government

2.48 (i) **Shri Abul Hasnat Khan, ex-MP:-** The approval of the Ministry to relax para 4.1 of the guidelines for construction of a bridge across the river Kaksha in Suti-II Block at an estimated cost of Rs.63.78 lakh was conveyed vide letter dated 20.1.2005.

(ii) **Shri Hannan Mollah, MP:-** The Ministry conveyed its approval to relax para 4.1 of the guidelines for upgradation and improvement of Rabindra Bhawan Auditorium at Uluberia, West Bengal.

(iii) **Dr. H.T. Sangliana, MP:-** The Govt. conveyed its approval to relax the provision of para 4.1 in regard to the reformation of the Road from Yelahanka-

Vijayapura road to join Budigere Cross via Sathanur with a total cost of Rs.125 lakh under MPLADS as a 'special case' vide letter dated 14th March 2005.

(iv) **Shri Manoranjan Bhakta, MP:-** The Ministry conveyed its approval to relax para 4.1 of the guidelines for construction of (a) RCC Retaining Well of existing playground at Namunaghar, A&N Islands (b) Compound wall for the Grave Yard at Stewartgunj and (c) Road from main road to house site colony of Kadamtala village vide letters dated 13th July 2005, 23.8.2005 and 27.9.2005 respectively.

(v) **Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya, MP:-** The Ministry conveyed its approval to relax para 4.1 of the guidelines for construction of Steel Shed at Safai Block, Etawah District, UP vide letter dated 14th May 2005.

(vi) **Shri Dayanidhi Maran, Hon'ble Minister for Telecommunications and Information Technology:-** The Ministry accepted the recommendation of the Committee and conveyed its approval for construction of (a) class room in the 2nd Floor of Administrative and Academic Block and (b) Library and class room building for Govt. Polytechnic at Purasawakkam, Chennai vide letter dated 13th July 2005 and (c) five class rooms at Jaigopal Garodia Govt. Girls Hr. Sec. School, Choolaimedu vide letter dated 24th August 2005.

(vii) **Shri Sachin Pilot, MP:-**The Ministry conveyed its approval to relax para 4.1 of the guidelines for construction of Hingota Anicut for providing Irrigation and drinking water facility in Dausa constituency vide letter dated 23.09.2005.

(viii) **Shri Sandeep Dikshit, MP:-** The Ministry conveyed its approval for construction of drain and road from Bakner to Narela-Bawana Road in Narela Zone at an estimated cost of Rs.35,00,400/- relaxing para 4.1 vide letter dated 30.12.2005.

(ix) **Shri Francis Fanthome and Maj. Gen. Shri Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri, MPs:-**The Ministry conveyed its approval to relax para 4.1 of the guidelines for construction of Blood Bank Building of Indian Mediical Blood Bank Society of Uttranchal, Dehradun vide letter dated 30.11.2005.

(x) **Shri Kapil Sibal, MP:-**The Ministry conveyed its approval to relax para 4.1 of the guidelines for construction of an Auditorium in J.D. Women's College, Patna vide letter dated 13.12.2004.

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

Recommendation (Sl. No. 29, Para No. 11.3)

3.1 Solar Energy Projects in Haryana – Proposal from Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan (MP)

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.

Reply of the Government

3.2 In view of the Committee's recommendations, no action is envisaged on the proposal of the Hon'ble MP.

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation (Sl. No.7, Para No. 1.19)

4.1 On the spot assessment of rehabilitation and reconstruction works undertaken in the Tsunami affected areas.

The Committee 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.

Reply of the Government

4.2 The normal procedure is to release the annual allocation of Rs.2 crore of the Constituency to the DCs/DMs of the Nodal Districts. Hence, the concerned DCs/DMs had been requested to transfer the funds consented by the respective Members of Parliament to the Tsunami affected districts.

Recommendation (Sl. No.11, Para No. 2.7)

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

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.

Reply of the Government

4.4 In response to our letter, CAG has desired complete reply of the Audit Paras with remedial measures taken by the States to avoid recurrence of such lapses. Despite repeated requests to District Authorities, complete replies have not been received. Rigorous efforts are being made to obtain the complete information by personal liaison with the State Governments and the District Authorities.

Recommendation (Sl. No.12, Para No. 2.12)

4.5 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.

Reply of the Government

4.6 Necessary action has been taken over the lacunae pointed in the Comptroller and Auditor General Reports at the time of revision of MPLADS Guidelines in Nov 2005. When ever any instance of poor implementation of the scheme is brought to the notice of the Ministry, the concerned State Government were asked to take necessary action. So far as Monitoring aspects of the scheme is concerned, recently the Ministry has entrusted the work to NABCONS.

Recommendation (Sl. No.17, Para No. 2.17)

4.7 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.

Reply of the Government

4.8 It would also be worth mentioning prior to conceptualizing the scheme it was seen that very often the MPs are approached by the constituents for small works of a capital nature to be done in their constituencies. The scheme was, therefore, conceptualized to enable Member of Parliament to recommend developmental and infrastructural works of small nature with emphasis on creation of durable community assets based on locally felt need to be taken up in their constituency. This apparently shows that **Scheme was not started as an incentive or facility** for a Member of Parliament but to provide scope for a more pro-active role in the need-based development of the local areas.

The Members of Parliament derive their legitimacy due to their being peoples' representatives. They aim to represent the hopes and aspirations of the people and possess an intuitive understanding of their needs. This is the very axiomatic edifice on which the MPLAD Scheme is based and the scheme envisages, through a recommendatory role, for a more direct involvement of the Members of Parliament in the betterment of people. In fact, the scheme attempts to foster a symbiotic relationship between the people and their representatives, in an innovative manner. The MPLADS is basically a constituency development fund in which the MP plays a catalytic role.

Recommendation (Sl. No.19, Para No. 3.5)

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

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.

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 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
<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>

Reply of the Government

4.10 The recommendation was not accepted as the recommended wording gives impression as if the MPLADS funds entitlement is going to change frequently which is not correct. The indication of the exact amount is better for proper guidance of all concerned

4.11

<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 vide Para 2.7 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.</p>
---	---

Reply of the Government

4.12 It is submitted that in MPLAD Scheme, an MP is required to concentrate on the development of his area covered by his constituency and not outside. Relaxation to this provision has been allowed for natural calamity of rare severity where the MP can allow up to 50 lakh and another Rs. 10 lakh for a calamity in the State. This is considered adequate.

4.13

<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>Recommendation-not accepted. The Ministry has retained their proposed para vide Para 2.6 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.</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>	

Reply of the Government

4.14 The recommendation was not accepted the reasons being that there are MPs who have not recommended works for years together and suddenly at the fag end of their tenure, they recommend works. Delay in recommending the works results not only in depriving the public of the benefit of the works for the intervening period but also in escalation of cost. Moreover, the district authorities also face problem in getting the large number of works examined, issuing sanctions and getting them executed in a time frame manner. Therefore, time limit of 90 days was considered adequate for the works.

4.15

<p>Para 2.12-The District Authority shall identify the agency through which a particular work recommended by the MP should be executed.</p> <p>The Committee decided that MPs should also be informed of the agency identified at the selection stage by the District Authority.</p>	<p>Recommendation-not accepted. The Ministry has retained their proposed para vide para 2.11 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.</p>
---	--

Reply of the Government

4.16 The guidelines provide that a copy of the sanction letter has to be sent to the concerned MP which also contains the name of the executing agency. This meets the requirement of the Committee.

4.17

<p>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.</p> <p>The Committee recommended that the works 'the work' be replaced with the words 'the project'.</p>	<p>Recommendation-not accepted. The Ministry has retained the Para 3.4.</p>
--	--

Reply of the Government

4.18 It caters the small nature of works for community needs which need not be treated as projects.

4.19

<p>Para 3.7-The shortfall in the estimated cost vis-à-vis the one recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP.</p> <p>The Committee proposed that any shortfall in the estimated cost as recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP within one month.</p>	<p>Recommendation-not accepted. However, the Para 3.9 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS provides that the shortfall in the estimated cost vis-à-vis the one recommended by the MP should be intimated to the MP within 45 days of the receipt of the proposal.</p>
---	---

Reply of the Government

4.20 The Committee intended to prescribe one month's time for giving intimation of the shortfall in the estimated cost to the MP. The district authorities have been allowed 45 day' time for giving sanction to a recommended work.

4.21

<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>
---	---

Reply of the Government

4.22 The said condition was included in the financial year 2004-05 in the background of large accumulated unspent balance with the district authorities. This proved effective in bringing down the cumulative funds in the districts. Moreover, no useful purpose is served by parking funds with the district authorities. The amount of one crore is half of the total entitlement of an MP and is an advance with the nodal authority. This condition has not adversely affected the execution of works under the scheme as also the release of funds. In view of the growing criticism against the MPLADS in the news papers, such checks on the flow of funds is necessary. Hence, the provision was retained.

4.23

<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>The Committee recommended besides 'education and culture' health should also be made eligible to draw funds under the scheme.</p>	<p>Recommendation-not accepted. The Ministry has retained their proposed para vide Para 2.9 of the new Guidelines on MPLADS.</p>
--	---

Reply of the Government

4.24 The recommendation was not accepted for adding 'health' in the para as similar demands from other sectors may be difficult to prevent.

4.25

<p>Para 3.21 of the revised Guidelines inter alia reads as follows:-</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 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.</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>
---	--

Reply of the Government

4.26 In view of the criticism in the media and elsewhere of the Scheme, a broad definition of family has been adopted, which ensures transparency and accountability of the Scheme. The matter was also taken up with Ministry of Law & Justice and the views of this Ministry in this regard have already been conveyed to the Lok Sabha Secretariat.

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.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

Recommendation (Sl. No. 32, Para No. 14.4)

5.1 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 meager 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 meager 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 fulfill the basic requirements of the constituencies in a more effective manner.

Reply of the Government

5.2 The proposal to enhance the allocation of MPLADS funds from Rs 2 crore to five crore is under examination of the Govt.