

MR. SPEAKER: I am sending a reply to that hon. Member.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: Don't record. If they do not understand law, I cannot help it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): On a point of order. The Constitution has provided a special constituency for the Scheduled Castes and it is according to the Constitution that reserved constituencies are provided and the Members representing those constituencies are expected....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We will consider; will you give notice of it?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is recorded.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is recorded. The whole idea is to disrupt the House.

12.30 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS SIGNED BY THE
LATE PRESIDENT REGARDING PROCLAMA-
TION OF EMERGENCY REPORTED TO BE
MISSING

SHRI MUKHTIAR SINGH MALIK (Sonapat): Sir, I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

"The original documents signed by the late President regarding Proclamation of Emergency on 25th June, 1975, which are reported to be missing."

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI DHANIK LAL MANDAL): Sir, The original Proclamation of Emergency dated 25th June, 1975, duly signed by the late President Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is available on record and is not missing.

(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: If the idea is to disturb, then go on, but I am not going to yield.

(Interruptions)*

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): For one hour Parliament cannot become a vacuum. What is going on in the Parliament—I am asking?

MR. SPEAKER: You must ask yourself, Mr. Lakkappa.

(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Qureshi, I will not give you anything today, even if you persist till 6 O'clock: You can rest assured. Nobody is going to bully me. That much you must understand. You must have known me by this time, Mr. Qureshi.

SHRI MOHD SHAFI QURESHI (Anantnag): I am making a humble request....

MR. SPEAKER. When it comes, your humble request will be considered. Even if you persist till 6 O'clock, I am not going to allow you. If I allow you, then I must allow others. This House is not going to be run at somebody's command. Either I run it or I do not run it. You may go on till the evening, nothing will be allowed. I have been trying to be fair to everybody. Either this House goes on quietly or it does not. Mr. Qureshi, if you have anything, you can come and meet me in the Chamber. You are always welcome. I have dealt with you most courteously as I deal with everybody. Mr. Malik. Now you are the malik!

श्री मुक्तिवार सिंह मलिक : इस कालिग एडमन का जवाब नहीं महोदय ने तथा तीन मिनट में दे दिया है।

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusaral): We could not hear the hon. Minister's reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister's reply is:

"The original Proclamation of Emergency dated 25th June, 1975, duly signed by the late President, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is available on record and is not missing".

That is all the reply.

श्री मुक्तिवार सिंह मलिक : अगर मंत्री महोदय के जवाब को सही और मुक्त मान लिया जाए तो क्या यह हाउस को बताने की कोशिश करते कि जिस प्रश्नकार ने इस किस्म की झूठी खबर दी है, ऐसे इम्पोर्टेंट डाकुमेंट के बारे में मनसमीबोज खबर दी है उस प्रश्नकार के खिलाफ क्या कोई कार्रवाई उन्हीं की है। इस एयरलैसी की बजह से जीने उन्हीं महीने जेल काटी है। इस खबर का क्रेडिबिलिटी तब नहीं आया है जबमेंट की तरफ से या प्रश्नकार की तरफ से। इस कालिग एडमन मोशन को तीन बका रिपीट किया गया है। आज आपने इसको एडमिट किया है और यह हाउस के प्रश्नकार है। आज मिनिस्टर साहब जाड़े हो कर कहते हैं कि मैं वेपर एग्जेक्यूटिव हूँ। मैं आपके गोदिल में एक बात लाया चाहता हूँ। एयरलैसी के बारे में 24 जून को एक डाकुमेंट तैयार करने श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी राष्ट्रपति के पास गई थी। वहाँ जाकर उनसे —

MR. SPEAKER: You have made your point as to why did he not take action?

श्री मुक्तिवार सिंह मलिक : इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि कोई रेकॉर्ड ही नहीं किया जा सकता है।

MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise.

SHRI MUKHTIAR SINGH MALIK: I am making my point. You will please hear me. Let me make my point. (Interruptions).

What is this.

MR. SPEAKER: The only question is: whether the Proclamation signed by late President is missing. The answer is: this is available.

SHRI MUKHTIAR SINGH MALIK: I have a right to speak. I am narrating the facts about the emergency on 25th June, 1975.

24 जून को श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी एक डाकुमेंट तैयार करवाकर राष्ट्रपति जी के पास उसको ले गई थी। वहाँ पर उसके ऊपर दस्तखत करवाये और उसके बाद अगले दिन जब उन्हीं कुछ करना बाह्य तो कुछ मीमल लैकुना निकला जिसकी बजह से उन्हीं ने 24 के कागजात को बचल कर 25 तारीख को जाकर के दस्तखत करवाये। तो मंत्री जी क्लियर करें कि आया 24 जून के वेपर्स भी फ्राइल में हैं कि नहीं? It is hard fact and we want to know about it.

25 जून को दस्तखत करवाये। मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि 25 जून की ललाई हुई इमरजेंसी की बजह से देश को कितना भारी मुश्किल हुआ है, ताबों लोग जेल में रहे, 19 महीने तक हमारे जैसे लोग जेल में रहे।

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Sir I rise on a point of order and I seek your guidance and ruling on this. The Calling Attention is:

"to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the original documents signed by the late President regarding Proclamation of Emergency on 25 June, 1975 which are reported to be missing."

The answer given by the Minister just now is:

"The original Proclamation for Emergency dated 25th June, 1975 duly signed by the late President Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is available on record and is not missing."

My point of order is that if the Calling Attention had also said—apart from the fact that it was reported to be missing—some other facts relating to the signing and declaration of Emergency on that day by the late President and if you had allowed it, I would have understood all this debate. What does not come to my mind is: How is it that you in your wisdom permitted this motion to be put on

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

the Order Paper? Because, Your practice—as I have been noticing—and rightly so, is when you are not sure of the facts you have always said in the House: "I am ascertaining the facts from the Minister concerned and after ascertaining the facts I will allow the motion to be admitted." I should have thought, on this you could have asked the Home Minister—in the present case, the Prime Minister—and if it had been done, then you would have yourself rejected it outright. My point is, if this kind of practice is allowed to be continued, then hon'ble Members will go on giving you notices on the basis of press reports alone and if they are to be admitted and then if it was found out 'that nothing happened then wrong practice will be created and the section of the' press which goes on giving wild reports will be further encouraged. So, I will request the Chair not to admit such things unless the Chair is very certain that the facts are true. Only then discussion could take place.

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with your point of order. We should have referred this matter to the government for their comments. There has been a lapse. Because persistent reports were published we should not have relied on them alone in allowing it. You are absolutely right. In future we will be more careful.

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS: Sir, no further questions should be allowed.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Once he has been allowed, I cannot now wriggle out.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): What is now going to be allowed? Are you going to allow the questions which are not relevant?

MR. SPEAKER: Within the limits, I will allow.

(Interruptions)

श्री सुकित्तार सिंह बलिक : इस नोटिफिकेशन को एक फोटो स्टेट काफी शाह कमीशन को भी भेजी गई थीर वहां भी पता बना है कि शाह कमीशन ने भी इसको गेइमिट नहीं किया Photostat copy was not duly signed by the President.

इस तरह का ऐप्रोहेसन इस 25 जून के नोटिफिकेशन के बारे में है यानी मिनिस्टर साहब कमीशन करेंगे कि यह इसकी कोपीबिंदो में गये या नहीं? कैबिनेट की एगुवन के वरीर 25 जून, को प्रोजीस्ट से पता नहीं किन मिस्टीरियस सरकारस्टानोव में दस्तबत कराये गये ?

MR. SPEAKER: You are going out of the question. It has nothing to do with this.

श्री सुकित्तार सिंह बलिक : यह सारी चीजें जनरेबल मिनिस्टर ने हाउस के सामने कमीशन करनी चाहिये । जो जान बनती नहीं कि यह वेपर्स एग्जेक्युटिव है या मिनिंग हूग, यह क्वेश्चन कैसे हुई ? सारी चीजें हाउस के सामने रखनी चाहिये ।

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): May I say, Sir, that on this Calling Attention Notice, as you rightly said, greater care should have been taken and an enquiry should have been Made? If that had been done this would not have been allowed. On this question when it is said the notice is there, the order is there, it was produced also before the Shah Commission, the Shah Commission took a photostat copy, not that a photostate copy was given to them. Therefore, I don't think there can be any discussion about all that in this way.

SHRI G M BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a very important and a pertinent question arises. I must put it very frankly before this House. A point of order was also raised that such a notice ought not to have been admitted. . .

MR. SPEAKER No, no. Ought not to have been admitted, without ascertaining the facts. . .

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: I am coming to that particular point, and that is, if such notices are not accepted in future, then, the nation and

the country will continue to be under certain misunderstanding. The press reports appeared. These misunderstandings were created that the papers are missing. The Government, for reasons best known to themselves, and for political exploitation of this particular impression that was created, did not choose to come forward with any contradiction whatsoever.

And it is this Calling Attention today that has come up which has given an opportunity to us for bringing out a denial from the Government, because it has been admitted and it is on the Order Paper. Sir, therefore, I ask the Government: For what reasons they did not consider it necessary to issue a contradiction, to repudiate and to deny such an important statement, which creates misunderstanding under the situation? Why did they allow a situation of misunderstanding to prevail? Is it for political purposes, that they wanted to take advantage of everything? Is it a fact—I ask the Government—that this report that has appeared, has appeared because of the encouragement given by the Government? And then the Government remains quiet enough, allowing these misunderstandings to prevail, and no denial is given. Sir, in the House points of orders are raised. The hon. Prime Minister also says that care should have been taken. Where are we to go in order to secure a denial of such statement, in order to see that the atmosphere that prevails is free from such misunderstanding? Now, I therefore ask this important question. An important news has appeared. The Indian Express has issued that particular statement, a paper that may have a leaning towards them. And then they keep quite. Therefore I ask: Why was a contradiction not given in time? Was it in order to have some political exploitation?

And, Sir I may further add this and then conclude. Today also several

important articles are missing. They are reported in the papers as missing. It has been reported that certain Ministers are missing, having resigned. George Fernandes, we are told, is missing, having resigned. No statement is coming and the situation is not being clarified.

So, let the Home Minister clarify both the points: Why the contradiction in time was not issued and why they tried to have political exploitation? That is number one. And secondly, let him clarify whether these important ministers are missing from the Cabinet and whether they have resigned or not. These points may please be clarified.

MR. SPEAKER: About the second aspect it is for you to say anything if you like.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: The original document was produced before the Shah Commission and if a wrong report appears in the papers, how is the Government going to exploit it? It is my hon friend, who is trying to exploit it, not the Government. One cannot go on denying things that do not exist and if they go on persisting, what can I do?

I am not going to reply to any other questions which are not relevant....
 (Interruptions)

डा० रावजी सिंह (बालनपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, की प्रेश जर्मन और स्वेडिशमैन इन दोनों पत्रों में बताया था कि शाह कमीशन का ड्राफ्ट तैयार किया गया है, और हिन्दू में निकला था कि वह सच है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सबवार सब पहले की तरह केस्टिव नहीं है। उनमें जो भी समाचार निकलता है, कोई उसका उद्यन करता है और कोई मंजूर करता है। शाह कमीशन के सेक्रेटरी, श्री रावजीपालन, ने कहा था कि उन्हें फोटोस्टेट कापी मिली थी। श्री बालनपुर ने कहा है :

"Mr. Dhawan had visited the President and had delivered the draft of the proclamation of Emergency for his signatures."

उसके बाद मि० बालनपुर कहते हैं :

[बा. रामजी सिंह]

"The President told him that...

MR. SPEAKER: How does that aspect come in?

DR. RAMJI SINGH: Mr. Balachandran says further:

"The President told him that he had signed the proclamation and given the same to Mr Dhawan, who had taken it back with him along with the Prime Minister's letter."

उसके बाद श्री बालचन्द्रन् यह भी कहते हैं :

"There was no draft proclamation enclosed with the letter."

अक्टर बालम भी कहते हैं :

"An important letter from the Prime Minister was delivered to him at about 10.30 p.m. on June 25, 1975; and that he delivered to the President."

MR. SPEAKER: This is not within the scope of the Calling Attention.

DR. RAMJI SINGH: Let the Government deny everything.

मैं केवल इतना ही जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ब्राह्म कमीशन को फोटोस्टेट कापी दी गई थी, मतलब राष्ट्रपति के सेक्रेटरी ने इस तरह का बयान दिया है या नहीं, अगर दिया है, तो वह सत्य है या असत्य है।

MR. SPEAKER: It has already been answered that the original document was given to the Shah Commission.

Shri Mani Ram Bagri.

श्री मनी राम बागरी (सबुरा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कालिग एटन्शन पहली तारीख को दिया गया। अंततः यह कायदा है कि किसी भी दिन एक कालिग एटन्शन नोटिस के द्वारा कोई दूसरा कालिग एटन्शन नोटिस नहीं होगा। कालिग एटन्शन देने का मतलब है कि वह किसी महत्वपूर्ण विषय के बारे में है, कोई जनहित और देशहित की बात है, ताकि कबल उस पर विचार कर सकें। जब कभी हम कोय किसी कालिग एटन्शन के लिए प्लॉट आरिड आर्बर् अफेयर्स हैं, जो आप उसके लिए समय नहीं देते हैं। मुझे यह आश्चर्य का सबब है कि आपने आज समय दिया है और कुछ तलेरिकेमेन्ट हुई है। मुझे काम करने के इस तरीके पर सख्त बुराया है। मैंने कालिग एटन्शन नोटिस पहली तारीख को दिया और वह 4 तारीख को नामजूर हुआ। फिर 4 तारीख को दोबारा दिया। आपने या

यह जेहालय में, या आपके काम करने के तरीके में सबन और साथ का संयुक्त बेका मुकामान किया है, क्योंकि अगर कोई चीज नहीं थी, तो आपकी डिस्पलाइड करना चाहिए था। यह कोई बतिये की मुकामान नहीं है कि आपने जेबा और उन्होंने कर दिया। क्या यह मंत्री को कोई झूठाल नहीं था? अगर यह बात नहीं थी, तो यह मंत्री ने आप को कैसे इजाजत दे दी? मैंने पहली तारीख को कालिग एटन्शन भेजा और 4 तारीख को आपने कैसे डिस्पलाइड कर दिया? और इम्पार्टेंट भवान थे, उन को किस तरीके से हालि पहुंचती है? मैं समझना हूँ कि इस के पीछे कुछ कारण हैं और इस के पीछे कारण यह है, तीन बार किस्म के एक इस बस्त देना में पैदा हो रहे हैं? हो सकता है कि आप के काम करने का तरीका और जो यह मंत्रियों के काम करने का तरीका है उस से सबन के मेम्बरों का जो हक है उस का उल्लंघन हो रहा हो। आप सोचिएगा कि किस तरीके से समय धाया हुआ है एक बात पर जिस के बारे में पहली तारीख को लिखा गया। प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि मैं हर एक बात को कंटेडिडिड नहीं कर्ना। लेकिन अगर कहीं यह भा जाय कि कहीं समयवा हो गया या कहीं रायट हो गया तो यह आप कंटेडिडिड नहीं करेंगे? यह आप को कंटेडिडिड करना परना और करना चाहिए। यह कोई मामूली बात नहीं थी, इतना बड़ा आरोप कि आप का दस्तावेज गुप्त हो गया और उस के ऊपर कालिग एटन्शन धाया, जिस की आप मंजूरी देते रहे और इन के बाद भी इन को मामूली बात समझते हैं और कहते हैं कि मैं हर बात की कंटेडिडिड नहीं कर्ना। यह हर बात की तरह बात नहीं है। यह इतनी जरूरी बात है कि जिस के ऊपर कालिग एटन्शन धाया है और मैं आप से बाहता हूँ कि क्या आप इस अर्थमना को सुधारने की कोशिश करेंगे? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह बतती कहां से हुई है? घर संभालय की तरह से हुई है या नीकरवाही की तरह से हुई है जिस से कि गलनकहमी पांच दिन तक देना में कैसी रही और उस को आज भी साफ नहीं किया गया है। आज भी बड़ी विलेरी के साथ यह बात नहीं कही गई है। मैं बाहता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री बड़ी विलेरी के साथ इस का बजाव द कि वह सभी डाकुमेंट न गुप्त हुए न गुप्त होंगे, फना जगह कन्डे में है। यह गलत खबर प्रसारों में छपी थी और हम इस बात की जांच कर रहे हैं कि यह गलत खबर साबिक के तौर पर छपी या इस का कुछ और कारण था। हो सकता है किसी नीकरवाही ने छपवाया हो या किसी राजनीतिक बंध का इत्त में हाथ हो। इस बात के मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ कि इस तरीके से कोई मंत्री अपनी जिम्मेदारी से भाग जाय। यह कमजोर मंत्रियों की बात होती है। कालिग एटन्शन आप और उस की कम धर्मिमत है, यह बात सिक नहीं है। बार और मेम्बरों के दस्तबाज से जो कालिग एटन्शन आप यह आयली बात प्रधान मंत्री की मंजूरी में हो सकती है, सबन की मंजूरी में और मुझे की नजर में मामूली बात नहीं है। आज आप उस मुझी पर हैं, प्रधान मंत्री वहां हैं, अगर मंत्री नहीं हो तो कभी सबन के सामनाय सत्य है। तो मैं बाहता हूँ कि सब की साथ मुझे बांध कीडिएगा। इस की प्राप मुझे जांच करिए और सबन को बतलाइ कि नारथ

क्या है कि जो प्रश्नोत्तरों को कॉलेज स्टेशन को संबोधित किया और फिर 5 तारीख को उक्त की संबोधित किया और इस तरीके से सदन का कुल्लयोग किया गया ।

MR. SPEAKER: As far as the Prime Minister is concerned, he need not answer.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Speaker, I have to rise on a point of order. You were pleased to say that in future, the Office should be more careful.

MR. SPEAKER: No; I did not say "Office should be careful". I said I should be more careful. I represent the Office.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: That is precisely my point of order. It seemed to be in keeping with your dignity that you spoke in a spirit of humility; but one would like to fix the exact responsibility for it. What happens when a notice for a Calling Attention motion is given? A copy of it is forwarded to the Ministry concerned. And it is for the Ministry to tell the Chair that there is no such thing as has been apprehended by an hon. Member.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): A copy goes to the Ministry.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: A copy goes to the Ministry. My submission is that there is no lapse on the part of the Chair. There is a lapse on the part of the Ministry concerned. The Ministry concerned should have given the reply in the negative to the Chair, and told the Chair that there was no foundation for this kind of an apprehension that the hon. Member seemed to be entertaining. They should have persuaded the Chair not to allow the Calling Attention. But if the Chair takes up the responsibility...

MR. SPEAKER: You have made your point. Each one has got his own opinion.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: My humble suggestion is that the Chair

should not assume the responsibility which really lies on the head of the Ministry concerned. There has been no lapse on the part of the Chair. So far as we see, there is a lapse on the part of the Ministry not to have informed the Chair in time about it.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want to give any additional reply Mr. Prime Minister?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: When we received the notice, we did inform that this was not true; but as it was admitted already, a reply to it should be given. So, we have given the reply.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: For three days the notice was repeated. Since you were pleased to give a ruling earlier, you have to give a ruling about it.

MR. SPEAKER: In spite of the fact that notice is given, more often than not, we enquire for facts; we ourselves enquire for facts; that has been the practice. I do not know how this happened. There was a persistent question, a large number of members have been asking the question. One of the criteria that I adopt is that when a large number of members are agitated on a particular question, I try to give it preference. In this matter I proceeded on the hypothesis. When I say 'I', I do not want my office to be included at all; for everything I am responsible, for any mistake. Between my office and myself, it is myself. Therefore, whether there was omission on their part or not, I shall look into the matter. But there was certainly omission on my part.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: May I ask a clarification? It is a very difficult position. The House is sitting. News items appear which are of very vital concern. This is one topical instance. What is the method for the House to know facts of the situation which are coming out in the Press? Call attention notice? No. None of those things come in. This is not a matter for 377. What exactly is the method by which we can elicit information? This particular

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

matter is of vital concern. No repudiation came forward. Is not this House entitled to know facts about reports which are affecting the nation? What exactly is the method?

MR. SPEAKER: This is a matter which is to be considered by the Rules Committee.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Not exactly the Rules Committee. For example, when this matter was put forth, the Prime Minister was here. The Prime Minister owes it to the House, to tell the House what exactly the position is with respect to the resignation, whether he had received it.

MR. SPEAKER: That has not been the practice at all—what you suggest has not been the practice till now; for the last thirty years, it has never been the practice. But there is something in what you say; it may be considered whether we should evolve some method.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I ask this question because the Prime Minister says he has not received it.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned till 2.10.

13.10 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till ten minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at thirteen minutes past fourteen of the Clock

[SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN in the Chair]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

NINETY-THIRD AND NINETY-SIXTH REPORTS

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO (Haramkonda): Sir, I beg to present the following Reports of the Public Accounts Committee:—

(1) Ninety-third Report on action taken by Government on the recom-

mendations contained in the Fifth Report on Relief of Distress caused by Natural Calamities.

(2) Ninety-sixth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Second Report relating to Ministry of Defence.

COMMITTEE ON THE WELFARE OF SCHEDULED CASTES AND SCHEDULED TRIBES

REPORTS OF STUDY TOURS—I TO VI

SHRI RAM DHAN (Laiganj): I beg to lay on the Table the following Reports of the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes:—

(1) Report of Study Tour of Study Group I of the Committee on its visit to Madras, Calicut; Cochin; Kottayam, Trivandrum and Kanva-kumari during June, 1978.

(2) Report of Study Tour of Study Group II of the Committee on its visit to Bombay, Jamnagar, Dwarka, Mithapur, Porbandar, Junagarh, Varaval and Ahmedabad during June, 1978.

(3) Report of Study Tour of Study Group III of the Committee on its visit to Hyderabad, Bangalore, Mysore, Madikeri (Mercara) and Mangalore during June, 1978.

(4) Report of Study Tour of Study Group IV of the Committee on its visit to Bihar during July, 1978.

(5) Report of Study Tour of Study Group V of the Committee on its visit to Gwalior, Indore, Ujjain and Bhopal during July, 1978.

(6) Report of Study Tour of Study Group VI of the Committee on its visit to Meerut, Bareilly, Lucknow, Kanpur and Gorakhpur during July, 1978.