

है। बोनस की मांग उठती है। जो मांग करे वह तो कुछ भी मांग कर सकते हैं। लेकिन जिन्हें निर्णय करना होता है उनको देखना होता है कि हमारी स्थायी व्यवस्था किस प्रकार से चलेगी। बोनस दे कर के अगर धर्म व्यवस्था अच्छी बना सकते हैं तो जरूर दीजिये। आज आप कैपिटलिस्टों की बात करते हैं। कम से कम कांग्रेस वालों को तो यह शोभा नहीं देता। माननीय समर मुखर्जी बोलें तो ठीक भी है। आज आप बड़े पेपर वालों की बात करते हैं, पंजीपतियों की बातें करते हैं जिनसे चुनाव लड़ने के लिये पैसे लिये हैं। बड़े पेपर वाले इस कारण से चिल्लाते हैं कि आज उनको डर लगने लगा है कि जनता पार्टी आयी है, कैपिटलिस्टों का भला नहीं होगा, इसलिए वह चाहता है कि आप बैठ जायें जिससे उनका भला होने लगे। यह जो पेपर्स हैं यह सही रूप से रिप्रजेंट नहीं करते हैं जनता की भावना को। आप कहते हैं कि मास मूड आज जनता पार्टी के खिलाफ है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कितने मेम्बर मासेज के बीच में गये हैं? आज मासेज का मूड यह है कि जितने भी गांव में रिफार्म किये गये हैं, जो सिचाई की योजनायें और सड़कें बनायी गयी हैं, इंडस्ट्रियल सेन्टर्स खोले गये हैं उतने मासेज ने पहले कभी नहीं देखे थे। आज वह देखते हैं कि कुछ परिवर्तन आ रहा है। और इससे कुछ लोगों को वेदना भी हो रही है। माननीय नायक जी ने अच्छी बात कही कि मन्मथ चरण सिंह ने कुछ हरल रिफार्म किये थे, यह बात भलग थी कि उसके कारण कुछ मुख्य मंत्री उनके बदल दिये गये। लेकिन जब आप हमारे वित्त मंत्री को गाली बक रहे थे तो उसके साथ-साथ यह भी तो कहते कि गांवों की भलाई के लिये उन्होंने यह काम किया। आज जनता पार्टी गांवों की ओर देखती है तो निश्चित रूप से शहर के लोगों को तकलीफ होगी। और चूंकि आप शहर को रिप्रजेंट करते हैं इसलिए आप कहते हैं कि मास मूड सरकार के खिलाफ है। कभी आप गांव में जा कर देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि हरल मासेज हमारे साथ हैं। अभी सीधी में चुनाव हुआ जहां हमने देखा कि वहां की जनता ने कांग्रेस (आई) को डिसकार्ड कर दिया है।

आप पुलिस रिबोल्ट की बात करते हो, ला एंड आईर खराब हुआ इस की बात करते हो। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि जो व्यवस्था आपने 30 साल में दी है उसी का यह परिणाम है जो आज भोगा जा रहा है। आप जो ला एंड आईर की बात करते हैं तो आपको देखना होगा कि कौन सी सरकार व्यवस्था चला सकती है? क्या कोई बैकल्पिक सरकार है जो व्यवस्था चला सके? यदि कोई बैकल्पिक सरकार नहीं है जो व्यवस्था चला सके तो आप स्वयं ला एंड आईर के खिलाफ कार्यवाही करना चाहते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, बहुत सी सरकारों को बदला गया यह बात कही गई। वह परम्परा

कहां से आरम्भ हुई? मैं यह नहीं कहता कि यह परम्परा अच्छी है। लेकिन जो हुई तो आपकी ही है, पहले आप नेता विरोधी दल थे, फिर दूसरे हुए और अब फिर आप नेता विरोधी दल हो गये। तो यह परम्परा तो आप लोगों की ही दी हुई है। माननीय चम्पू साहब नेता विरोधी दल हो गये, आपको बंगला मिलेगा, गाड़ी मिलेगी। लेकिन यह सब हुआ कैसे। इतने लोग आपके साथ कहां से और किस के कारण आ गये? क्योंकि संजय वाली बात सिर्फ उठी। तो सिर्फ एक संजय इतने लोगों को दल-बदल करवा सकता है और आप उसको स्वीकार कर सकते हैं? क्या आपको इज्जत की यह शोभा देता है? पद तो शोभा दे सकता है, लेकिन क्या यह दल-बदल भी आपको शोभा देता है? यह बात आपकी इज्जत को शोभा नहीं देती है कि आप हम तरह से दल-बदल की बात करें।

यहां पर जिस समय दल-बदल का कानून लाने की बात थी, तो कुछ टेक्नीकल कारणों से....

MR. SPEAKER: Kindly finish. There is a half-an-hour discussion left.

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्या इनका भाषण अगले दिन जारी रहेगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : खत्म हो गया।

17.30 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

PREMATURE COLLAPSE OF CHAMBAL
BRIDGE

SHRI SHAMBHU NATH CHATURVEDI (Agra): Sir, under Rule 55(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business I wish to raise a discussion on the points arising out of the answer given on 30th April, 1979 to Unstarred Question No. 9125 regarding premature collapse of Chambal Bridge.

17.31 hrs.

[SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR in the Chair]

The Chambal Bridge on the Agra-Bombay Highway was completed and thrown open to traffic in 1959-60. While still under construction, a Junior Engineer, Shri Gurdial Upadhyaya, supervising the work reported large-scale pilferage

[Shri Shamlu Nath Chaturvedi]

of cement and execution of sub-standard work on pier No. 17 of the bridge. 13 years later, the bridge collapsed precisely at this point entailing a loss of more than Rs. 3 crores to the public exchequer. Yet no one has been held accountable for either mal-practices alleged by Shri Upadhyaya or the incompetence and negligence of the high level engineers in-charge of this construction.

The first question was put as early as 1st August, 1977. And I was told that the allegations of Shri Upadhyaya have not been substantiated by the departmental superiors as well as by the Chief Technical Examiner of the Ministry. They did not find the workmanship of sub-standard quality, but attributed the collapse to other reasons, and therefore, the Government did not propose, to institute any other enquiry nor did it propose to hand over the case to the CBI. That was the demand made by me that the enquiry should be done by an impartial authority whether it is a commission or CBI.

After receiving this answer, subsequent questions were asked by way of clarification and the first clarification that I sought was: whether Shri Upadhyaya was afforded an opportunity during the enquiry to substantiate his allegations; if so, is his statement on record? Whether the record of cement consumption maintained by Shri Upadhyaya was examined and did it show a wide discrepancy between the quantity of cement that was required to be used and actually consumed? If so, how was it explained? In short, whether the question of pilferage of cement and other material was specifically gone into by the technical expert or the high level committee and is there report on this point on record? The answer was:

"The report of Shri Upadhyaya during the construction of the Chambal Bridge alleging, *inter alia* pilferage of cement and sub-standard work in piers 14 to 17 was duly investigated by the officers of CPWD and Chief Technical Examiner of the Ministry of Works & Housing. Shri Upadhyaya was present throughout the enquiry and was allowed full freedom to point out defects and produce any evidence before the Chief Technical Examiner. The allegations made by him, however, were not substantiated, and the work was not found to be of sub-standard quality."

Look at the evasive manner of replying. A man reports specifically that cement has been pilfered. His statement is nowhere in the record. It is stated that he was

present throughout the enquiry. How is it credible? The bridge collapsed and thirteen years later this Committee was set up to go into and investigate the problem. what does it say?

"This matter of Shri Upadhyaya's complaint was also brought to the notice of the Committee of Technical Experts (constituted after the collapse of the bridge) through a press report appearing in Blitz dated the 13th October, 1973."

This shows the importance attached and desire for investigating and finding out the truth in the minds of the Technical Committee and some members of the department.

"The Engineer-in-Chief of the CPWD, who was a member of the Committee of Technical Experts, was requested to submit a detailed report in the matter. The note received from the Chief Engineer (Vigilance) of the CPWD was duly considered by this Committee of Technical Experts, and in view of the fact that the allegations made by Shri Upadhyaya had not been found substantiated by the Chief Technical Examiner of the Ministry of Works & Housing, this Committee of Experts did not consider it necessary to go into the complaint of Shri Upadhyaya *de novo* especially because this Committee had identified subsidence of foundation under pier No. 17 at the sub-standard founding level as the cause of the collapse of the Bridge."

This is the fairness and impartiality with which this report was dealt with. When this report came, naturally I asked a question (Question No. 707 dated 12th April) that if defective workmanship and sub-standard material was not one of the causes for the collapse of the bridge, whether the other causes were identified; and if the cause identified was faulty design or unstable foundation, was anyone held actionable for it. What is the reply? The reply is:

"The Committee of Technical Experts appointed by the Government of India to investigate into the causes of the collapse of the four reinforced concrete arch spans between piers 16 and 20 (from Agra end), after getting detailed sub-soil investigations carried out and interpreting the results thereof, came to the conclusion that the collapse of these four spans followed the subsidence of the foundation of pier No. 17. The foundation of this pier was found to be resting on a highly altered zone of clay matrix conglomerate, which was not strong enough to withstand the loads coming

over it. The Committee further held that this subsidence, however, seemed to have been preceded by excessive scour of the overburden material in the bed of the river around this pier affecting the bearing capacity of the strata on which the cutting edges of the wells of this foundation were resting."

Sir, this is all technical jargon, but the point is that first of all this question was raised in the Rajya Sabha when the bridge collapsed initially and in reply, only two parts of the question were answered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have consumed 10 minutes. After all, we have to finish in half an hour. Please come to the point and put the relevant question.

SHRI SHAMBHU NATH CHATURVEDI: These are the very important points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is Half-an-hour discussion. You will have to finish quickly. I cannot help more than that.

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT): He can take my time also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please try to be brief.

SHRI SHAMBHU NATH CHATURVEDI: I only want to say that only the first portion of this answer was given when the question was raised on 26th July 1978. The later part has been given in answer to subsequent questions and I do not know whether it figured there or it did not figure there, but certainly it will surprise us because this gives a little latitude. This portion was not there: "That this seemed to have been preceded by excessive scour of the overburden material in the bed of the river." Only this much was there:

"The foundation of pier No. 17 was found to be resting on a highly altered zone of clay matrix conglomerate, which was not strong enough to withstand the loads coming over it".

My point was that this entire engineering Department was there and it was their duty to see that foundation was on solid ground. Somebody should have been held accountable for the fact that if the foundations were defective, they were laid at places which would not sustain the weight of the bridge. But nobody was held accountable.

Then I had asked when this inquiry was made, whether the mortar was subjected to examination. I am told now that yes, the mortar was subjected to examination by the technical examiner who investigated the first report. The mortar was never examined after the collapse of the bridge. This Committee which investigated the causes of the collapse of this bridge never went into the question. It did not take the trouble of getting the mortar of this pier examined to verify whether it has been a sub-standard material as reported by Gurdial Upadhyaya or not. This was not done. And thereafter, Shri Gurdial Upadhyaya was subjected to different types of harassment. Well, except his statement I have no other evidence to support this part of the story that he was thrown into the river, but fortunately he swam ashore, but he was forcibly admitted to the Agra lunatic asylum and when the medical officer told the Central Public Works Department that he will have to give an adverse report, he will have to say that he was absolutely of sound mind, he was taken out of the lunatic asylum. This was the harassment and he has been under suspension for the last 19 years. He would have been dismissed from service if he had not taken shelter by a writ in the High Court. Such is the harassment that has been inflicted. I have been only asking for an impartial inquiry into this matter. It is common knowledge that an individual finds himself powerless against the organised might of the department. Only the other day when I was speaking on the question of this Lokpal Bill, I said that no grievances of the public can ever be dealt with by such a functionary. We want an Ombudsman. If there had been one, this matter would have been dealt with within six months. Here, the entire department is ranged against him. Every report made against him by an officer of the department becomes a matter of prestige.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must conclude now. Others have to put questions.

SHRI SHAMBHU NATH CHATURVEDI: I personally went to the Minister and talked to him. This person has been under suspension for 19 years. The gravest injustice has been done to him. The department and the Ministry have been fighting shy of an impartial inquiry. I demand that there should be such an inquiry in the interests of justice and fairplay.

I would like to say that this question has been dealt with in a manner which brings no credit to the Government. First this question was addressed to the Works & Housing Ministry. It was quietly passed on to the Ministry of Shipping & Trans-

[Shri Shambhu Nath Chaturvedi]

port. Every time an inconvenient question was put, it was transferred back to the Works & Housing Ministry. Twice it has been transferred so as to gain time, to allow people to manoeuvre things.

If such honest and good officers are treated in this manner, then God help our country.

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT): The hon. Member has gone to great lengths in giving details of the questions and the answers that the Government have given to them. It would have been fair to the Government if the hon. Member has also brought to the notice of the House the attitude of the Government or the Minister, who is his colleague, when the matter was brought to his notice. If he had met me earlier, he would not have been so bitter as he was just now. I am grateful that he did mention that he asked me to go into the case of Mr. Upadhyay. I looked into the case, whatever be my capacity, I responded to his desire, and went into all the details, as much as I could. Unfortunately, he seems to be mixing up things.

When Mr. Upadhyay took over as Junior Engineer, 82 per cent of this bridge work had already been done. Foundation wall of Pier No. 17 had already been constructed. Even then, when he made a complaint, an absolutely independent enquiry was conducted by the Technical Adviser who is not part and parcel of the C.P.W.D. Unfortunately, the expert committee's report is being mixed up with Mr. Upadhyay's complaint. It has nothing to do with that.

The bridge collapsed after 13 years. it is true. The personnel of that committee was as under: there were persons from different departments and different Ministries on the Committee—

Shri S. N. Sinha, Director General (Road Development & Additional Secretary, Ministry of Shipping & Transport);

Shri U.S. Rao, Additional Member (Works) Railways Board;

Shri O. Muthachen, Engineer-in-chief, CPWD;

Maj. Gen. J. S. Bawa, Director General (Border Roads);

Shri V. S. Krishnaswamy, Deputy Director General, Geological Survey of India;

Shri D. P. Jain, Chief Engineer (Roads), PWD, Rajasthan, Jaipur;

Shri D. T. Grover, Chief Engineer (Roads), Ministry of Shipping & Transport.

In fact the probe by the Experts Committee had nothing to do with Mr. Upadhyay's complaint. Of course, there was a report in *the Blitz* and it was brought to the notice of the Experts Committee. They went into that, but not on the basis of the complaint from Mr. Upadhyay. His complaint has been finally disposed of, when the Chief Technical Examiner went in to the question. The mortar was examined in the Alipore Test House, Calcutta, which is a renowned one and the percentage of cement found in the mortar was absolutely according to the specifications. I would have been happy if the hon. Member had given the details also. I went into this question in greater detail. I went even to the extent of thinking that since the fellow had remained suspended for so long, he may be reinstated. He has already been punished a lot—this is what I thought. We made an application to the court, because he had gone to the court, as to whether we can reinstate him. It is only a day or two before the court has disposed of our application by taking a note of it and the District counsel has opined that we might proceed with whatever action we may like to take in the matter.

Unfortunately he also made a mention about the Agra Lunatic Asylum. I did not want to bring in that matter because it is a sad affair. It is not a happy affair at all. But my own impression is—I am not a doctor, I am not going to give a certificate about his mental condition—so long as I was with him in my room, I was scared of him because there is something abnormal in him. It may be because of the difficulties he has had to face, I do not know. But I have been more than fair to him. I can assure the hon. member that no injustice has been done to him. The mortar was examined. He is also confusing and mixing up things. The pier structure comprises of two parts, the pier part and the foundation well part. Unfortunately his complaint was about the pier part, but there has been no defect in the pier. Even when it collapsed, it was the foundation well which collapsed. The foundation diameter was about 6.5 metres. The soil was tested. The base of the foundation well was in an arch form. Unfortunately, on that base, this sort of a layer, which is called matrix conglomerate was at its end.

Even this committee has not been able to fix the responsibility at one point or on one individual. This is the whole thing. They had taken all precautions, which ought to have been taken technically. The foundation well was absolutely alright. But at the end of the foundation, well,

unfortunately this sort of alayer existed, which caused the pier to collapse. Therefore, I would only say that one need not be bitter on that. It had been unfortunate. But when I had gone into the matter in detail, when I have met the fellow and tried to solve the problem and when the Government has ordered his reinstatement—we were waiting for the orders of the court because he had gone to the court—it is absolutely unfair to say that some injustice had been done to the fellow. I do not wish to say anything more.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I must say that we are witnessing a very interesting thing, if I may call it, a romance of parliamentary functioning and discussions, that this kind of a Half-An-Hour discussion follows the No-Confidence motion. But this is exactly what Parliament is meant for, not merely for discussing big issues but even individual issues involving policy questions and possible injustice to citizens. The individual issues involving possible injustice have to be probed into with the same depth and earnestness as in the case of big issues.

My hon. friend, Shri S. N. Chaturvedi, deserves to be congratulated for his perseverance. He asked five questions beginning from 1st August, 1977 to 30th April, 1979. I do not know the background; I do not know the details nor do I know the gentleman, whether he is lunatic or eccentric or not. But I am concerned with the basic issue on which I want to ask my question. How is it that those five questions over a period of only two years have been answered by two different Ministries? The first question was answered by his Ministry; subsequently, three questions were answered by his colleague, Mr. Chand Ram and, again, the fifth question was answered by him. So, the cycle is complete. Secondly, I want to know how is it that different answers are given to the same set of questions? I have carefully studied the answers. My impression is that the answers are conflicting, if not contradictory. I would like him to enlighten us on that.

Then, Shri Chaturvedi referred to answers to parts (c) and (d) of the first question of 1st August, 1977. I shall not take the time of the House by repeating the answers. I hope, the House knows those answers and, at least, the Minister knows the answers. In answer to part (c), it is stated:

“Shri Upadhyaya had been charge-sheeted and suspended in 1960 on several charges but not with a view to harassing him.”

The word “not” is underlined in the answers. I would like to know, if not harassment, what were the grounds of charge-sheeting Shri Upadhyaya? Secondly, in answer to part (d), it is stated:

“Government does not propose to institute any other enquiry, nor does it propose to hand over the case to the C.B.I.”.

The Government may have their own reasons, I believe. But the fact remains that the bridge collapsed. And nothing happens. If these things are to happen again, what will happen? The Government must at least assure this House and, through this House, the country that some kind of responsibility will be located and punishment will be given to those who are found guilty. If not, then this is a very serious matter. The whole bridge collapses and nothing happens; no satisfactory inquiry takes place.

Lastly, my impression is that somehow, by reading all the five answers carefully, the truth is unfortunately either hidden or removed. I think, the bureaucratic way of answering is such that the truth is not coming out, whereas the whole purpose of the question Hour and Half-An-Hour discussion is to get the truth out. What is this mechanism which does not give the truth? That is my question.

श्री आर० डी० गहटाणी (जोधपुर) : श्री मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि 13 वर्ष बाद यह पुल टूट गया। उन्होंने इस 13 वर्ष की अवधि को बहुत लम्बा समय माना है। यह पुल 13 वर्ष बाद ही क्यों टूट गया? पुल तो सी वर्ष नहीं टूटते। इसके कारण मेरी तो समझ में नहीं आये। मुझे तो लगता है कि इस पुल के बनाने में ही नहीं बल्कि जूनियर इंजीनीयर उपाध्याय के साथ भी लापरवाही बरती गई और बलुबंदी जी ने जो बार बार सवाल किये उनके सवाल के साथ भी लापरवाही बरती गयी है। बलुबंदी जी ने जो सवाल पूछा, उसे आप देखें। उनका सवाल पहली अगस्त 1977 का है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just keeping mum up till now. But, ultimately, Rule 55 allows us to put questions for an explanation only regarding the question which has been just asked here, and not all the four questions you had put earlier.

यह जो प्रश्न 9125, 30-4-79 का है उसके सम्बन्ध में कोई एक्सप्लेनेशन पूछना हो तो वह पूछिये।

श्री आर० डी० गहटाणी : मैं बही पूछ रहा हूँ। यह जो पुल के बारे में श्री पिछले सवाल के जवाब देने के बारे में जो लापरवाही बरती

[श्री भार० डी० गट्टानी]

गयी है, उसकी बात मैं कह रहा हूँ। आप उस सवाल को देखें। उस में एक से अधिक जगह पर यह कहा गया है कि पुल गिरने के एक से अधिक कारण थे। उसमें भी लापरवाही बरती गयी। दूसरे सवाल के जवाब में यह मंजूर किया गया कि इसके गिरने का एक ही कारण था कि नींव कमजोर थी। फिर उनसे यह भी पूछा गया कि इस पुल के टूटने के लिये दोषी कौन है? चौथे सवाल के बारे में यह जवाब दिया गया कि अभी तक इसकी जांच की जा रही है कि दोषी कौन है। आखिरी सवाल के जवाब में यह कह दिया गया कि सेन्ट्रल पब्लिक वर्क्स डिपार्टमेंट के अफसर दोषी नहीं पाये गये। अभी तक इस बात का जवाब नहीं आया है कि इस सब के लिए दोषी कौन है। अगर यह नींव की कमजोरी के कारण से हुआ है...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the House want to continue for some time more?

SHRI SHAMBHU NATH CHATURVEDI: Yes, for half-an-hour.

SHRI SIKANDAR BAKHT: That is too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chaturvedi, you are responsible for this. I had requested you at that time to finish in ten minutes....

SHRI SHAMBHU NATH CHATURVEDI: I am sorry, but this matter has been going on for such a long time and it cannot be disposed of within half an hour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then you should have chosen some other procedure.

SHRI SHAMBHU NATH CHATURVEDI: You are in the Chair and you are the guardian of our rights. The purpose of putting these questions is to find out the truth, not just for sticking to rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will make the best effort but, ultimately, rules also have to be followed.

SHRI SHAMBHU NATH CHATURVEDI: It is in your discretion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not my discretion, though five to ten minutes does not matter.

आप सवाल पूछिये, ये सारी बातें कहने की नहीं हैं। मैं नियम पढ़ देता हूँ। नियम यह हैं—

"The member who has given notice may make a short statement and the Minister concerned shall reply shortly. Any Member who has previously intimated to the speaker may be permitted to ask a question for the purpose of further elucidating any matter of fact."

So, it is not for a discussion.

श्री भार० डी० गट्टानी: सवाल पूछने के बहाने भूमिका बनानी पड़ती है। मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि अभी तक यह क्यों नहीं मालूम हो पाया कि आखिर पुल के टूटने में किस का कमर था। यह तो एक जगह कहा गया है कि कि पुल की नींव में जमीन ही ऐसी निकली। क्या जब नींव खोदी जा रही थी उस वक्त यह बात नहीं मालूम हो सकी कि यह जगह कमजोर है, यहां पर खम्भा नहीं होना चाहिए?

दूसरा मेरा सवाल यह है कि बिचारे उपाध्याय के साथ भी जो लापरवाही बरती गयी, अगर वह 1959 में शिकायत नहीं करता तो संभवतः मस्पेंड नहीं किया जाता। 1960 में वह मस्पेंड किया गया और 1971 में सवाल नहीं पूछा जाता तो उसका मस्पेंशन भी नहीं हटाया जाता। मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि कौन सी वजुहात थीं, कौन से कारण थे जिसके कारण उनको निलम्बित करना पड़ा और इतने अर्थ तक निलम्बित करना पड़ा। ये मेरे चन्द सवाल हैं। साथ ही साथ मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है—अगर वही बनियाद थी और

The Committee of Technical Experts has nothing to do with the junior Executive Engineer's Report.

उससे लेना-देना नहीं था तो फिर श्री उपाध्याय की शिकायत की क्या जांच हुई होगी?

डा० रामजी सिंह: जो यह तीन करोड़ का नुकसान हुआ है और जिस कारण हुआ है उसके सम्बन्ध में यह कहा गया है:

"The question of fixation of responsibility for the premature collapse of the bridge has been examined and it was found that responsibility cannot be fixed on any officer of the CPWD."

This is the greatest irresponsibility—not to fix up the responsibility for the loss of Rs. 3 crores of public money.

अगर सी० पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० पर नहीं थी तो क्या भार० एस० एस० पर थी, कांग्रेस-भाई पर थी आप पर थी, किस पर थी? इस तरह से क्वेश्चन को इवेड करना ठीक नहीं है। यह अफसरों की चालबाजी है। तीन करोड़ के नुकसान को दबाने

के लिए ही ऐसा किया गया प्रतीत होता है। यह कहा गया है कि किसी पर रिसर्पासिबिलिटी फिक्स नहीं की जा सकती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ग्रेटेस्ट इरिसर्पासिबिलिटी वाली बात है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस की मंत्री महोदय सफाई करें।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : उत्तर में कहा गया है कि इसका एक पाया, एक पिल्लर टूटा है और वहाँ मिट्टी ज्यादा थी। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या निर्माण के समय मिट्टी ज्यादा जमा हो गई थी या बाद में हुई, बन जाने के बाद हुई?

मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इसकी कोई गारंटी भी थी कि यह इनने साल नहीं टूटेगा?

मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय बना था उस समय कितना इस पर खर्च हुआ था और इसके टूटने के कारण कितनी हानि हुई है? अब इसको बनाने पर कितना खर्च आएगा

1973 में यह टूट गया था और आज तक भी नहीं बना है। यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण मार्ग है। दिल्ली-बम्बई, आगरा-बम्बई का यह प्रमुख मार्ग है। रेल मार्ग अगर टूट जाए तो इसी मार्ग से आवागमन हो सकता है और दूसरा कोई मार्ग इसके भलावा वहाँ नहीं रह जाता है। इस पुल को बनाने के लिए क्या कई बार टैंडर भी नहीं मंगाये जा चुके हैं? अब क्या स्थिति है और कब तक यह पुल बन कर तैयार हो जाएगा। इसके निर्माण में कोई दोष रहे है या नहीं रहे है? क्या रॉसको ठेकेदार से बनवाया गया था या सरकारी अफस द्वारा यह बनवाया गया था? जो दोषी पाए जाएंगे उनके खिलाफ क्या आप कोई कार्यवाही करेंगे और इसकी पूरी तरह से जांच करेंगे?

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : ज्यादातर सवाल रिसर्पासिबिलिटी के बारे में हुए हैं। मावलंकर साहब ने कहा है कि यह क्या जादूगिरी है कि कभी इस सवाल का जवाब शिपिंग एंड ट्रांसपोर्ट मिनिस्टर देता है और कभी वक्स हाउसिंग मिनिस्टर देता है। मैं अर्ज करता हूँ कि यह काम उस मिनिस्टर के लिए हमारी मिनिस्टर ने किया था इसलिए दोनों का सम्बन्ध इससे जुड़ जाता है।

जहां तक रिसर्पासिबिलिटी की बात है मावलंकर साहब ने दूध की बात कही है। मैं उनकी बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ, एहताराम से उनको देखता हूँ। मैं उनको बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमेशा यही कोशिश करता हूँ कि जो दूध हो उसी को आनरेबल मैम्बर के सामने लाऊँ, उसके भलावा और कुछ नहीं। सच्चाई यह है कि यह 1973 में कोलेप्स हुआ और उसकी जांच करने के लिए म्ख्तलिफ डिपार्टमेंट्स को जो टापोमोस्ट अफसर

बे उनकी कमेटी बनी। उसको आप एक्सपर्ट कमेटी कह लें या ब्यूरोक्रेट्स की कह लें, कुछ भी कह लें—(इंटरप्शन) एक्सपर्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट का कोई ताल्लुक उपाध्याय साहब की शिकायत से नहीं है। उसको इसके साथ मिक्स आप करने का सवाल पैदा नहीं होता है।

मैं पहले रिसर्पासिबिलिटी का जवाब दे दूँ। मुझे रिसर्पासिबिलिटी के लिए यह कहना है कि जो कुछ उस एक्सपर्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है वह मैंने आपके सामने रखी। और अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि मुझे उनकी रिपोर्ट में यह लगा कि शायद इसकी रिसर्पासिबिलिटी नहीं फिक्स की जा सकती है तो नाजायज नहीं होगा। क्रेडिबिलिटी उस कमेटी की जरूर माननी चाहिए क्योंकि उसमें म्ख्तलिफ महकमों के सीनियर अफसरान थे। उसमें जियो-लाजिकल सर्वे आफ इंडिया का भी सीनियर अफसर था। उनकी क्रेडिबिलिटी को हम डाउट करें यह मुनासिब बात नहीं है। उन्होंने कहा है कि हम किसी इडिबिजुअल पर इसकी जिम्मेदारी नहीं लगा सकते हैं। जितना मैंने समझने की कोशिश की है तो मैंने भ्रंदाज किया फाउन्डेशन जो विल का बैस है उसमें एक अर्थ है। जिस स्ट्रेटा का जिक्र किया है वह अर्थ के मकान पर मौजूद नहीं है। लेकिन क्योंकि 6, 7 मीटर डायमीटर है उसके किनारों पर वह स्ट्रेटा खतरनाक है। सायल टेस्ट सेन्ट्रल पोइंट से हुई।

That unfortunately seems to be a trick that nature has played on the experts.

मैं मानता हूँ कि ब्रिज बनाया और उसमें 3 करोड़ का नुकसान हुआ जो कि नहीं होना चाहिए था क्योंकि आखिर यह पैसा जनता का है और सरकार पब्लिक फंड्स की ट्रस्टी है। लेकिन कभी कभी हो सकता है कि ऐसा हादसा हो जाय।

Nature plays tricks on things and experts. It has been happening all along and it has happened. Everyday something is happening. See the Skylab. Now I do not think that the American govt. is going to pin it down on some experts.

तो यह न समझा जाय कि मैं इवेड कर रहा हूँ। कोई इवेड करने का सवाल नहीं है। और अगर ऐसा होता तो चतुर्वेदी साहब ने जब बात की है, खतोकितावत की है तो मैं इतनी दिलचस्पी के साथ इसमें जाता ही नहीं। चतुर्वेदी साहब उन बातों का जवाब नहीं दे सकते क्योंकि वह कोर्ट में हैं। लेकिन मैंने कहा कि बात अर्था हो गया सस्पेंड हुए अब इनको रीइस्टे कर देना चाहिए।

You know it. These orders have been passed. The case is sub-judice. We had to go to the Court whether he should be reinstated or not.

[श्री सिकन्दर बख्त]

आपकी तरफ तबज्जह नहीं होती तो इतनी दिल-चस्पी का सवाल ही नहीं उठता। इवेड करने के मुताल्लिक तो यों बहुत कहा जा सकता है। मुझे धरगर यह लगता कि उपाध्याय के साथ ना-इन्साफी हो रही है, क्योंकि इसको चतुर्वेदी साहब जानते हैं कि जिस तफसील के साथ यहाँ आया हूँ और यह सोच कर आया हूँ कि उपाध्याय के साथ नाइंसाफी हो रही है। लेकिन बाद में मुझे लगा कि मेरे जहन में जो एक वायस सा आया तो वह दुरुस्त नहीं है। तो मुझे जब सारे कागजात पढ़ने हैं, फाइल देखनी हैं तो इपाध्यायली देखनी है। मेरी राय में इन्साफ यह है कि उसके साथ जो कुछ हुआ है उसमें कुछ जयादती नहीं हुई है। रीइन्स्टेटमेंट का सवाल यह है कि वह खद कोर्ट में है, उसके वावजूद भी उसको हमने रीइन्स्टेट करने के लिए कह दिया है। आदमी जो दिलचस्पी ले उसको इवेड करने की क्या जरूरत है? क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि इवेड करूंगा तो मुसोबत में फसूंगा। इसलिए यहलू सवाल खत्म हो चुका है, और इसको हर पहलू से देख लिया गया है। अब इस सवाल को मजिद परसू करने की कोई गुजाइश नहीं है।

प्रो० पी० जी० माबलंकर : उपाध्याय के खिलाफ क्या आउन्स ये ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is necessary.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : उसका काम चालू है बहुत जल्दी हो जाएगा। तारीख तो मुझे मालूम

नहीं है। जो सवाल आनरेबिल मेम्बरान ने ठाया है वह बाहर का है। मेरे साथी फरमा रहे हैं कि अगले मानसून तक पूरा हो जाएगा।

श्री छवि राम अग्रवाल : मेरे क्षेत्र का है, मंत्री जी ने पूरी जानकारी नहीं दी है।

श्री सम्भू नाथ चतुर्वेदी : एक मिनिस्ट्री से दूसरी मिनिस्ट्री पर टालने की बात नहीं है। रेस्पॉसिबिलिटी तो आपकी है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि उसी स्टेटा में बराबर अब भी नया पुल बन रहा है।

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : इसका जवाब मैं दे सकता हूँ। आपने औरिजिनल सवाल किया था उसी मुकाम पर क्या बन रहा है? उसका जवाब पहली चीज तो यह है कि पीअर्स उस मुकाम पर नहीं है, जहाँ पहले थे, लेकिन मुकाम से कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता, वह मेडिकस कान्गलोमरेट स्ट्राटा उससे बहुत नीचे जा रहे हैं।

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18-16 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, July 12, 1979/Asadha 21, 1901 (Saka).