

MR. CHAIRMAN: Copies have been circulated. It is agreed now.

ENQUIRY RE CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE

IMPOSITION OF SECTION 144 IN NEW DELHI

SHRI K. P. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I have given a Calling Attention Motion. In today's papers we see that section 144 has been imposed in New Delhi in order to prevent the Central Government employees from taking out a procession and making a representation to the Prime Minister. Now, we had a similar thing very recently. I do not know why this section 144 has been imposed. When the Government has not been able to come to a decision regarding the D.A. issue and they are prevaricating on the issue, the Central Government employees are naturally agitated. Two instalments of DA. are due to them. This time if they want to take out any procession or make any representation to the Prime Minister, I do not know why they should be prevented from doing so. Two or three of their men can be met and the Prime Minister and Government must receive their memorandum. Why should Government impose section 144 and then bring in the question of prestige and such things? The Council naturally will have to take out a procession.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have stated the matter and the Government will look into it.

SRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : This is a serious matter *viz.*, the imposition of section 144. Previously the practice has been that several demonstrations have been allowed to come near Parliament and make representations and also to go to the residence of the Prime Minister. But for the last few months we have been noticing that any genuine demonstration that was sought to be

brought out had been prevented by the imposition of section 144. Therefore, we would like to know what is the danger in allowing a democratic expression of popular opinion either near Parliament or near the residence of the Prime Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have expressed your view. Nothing more. Next item; further consideration of the Finance Bill. The House will sit through lunch and the Minister will reply at 4 p.M.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

THE FINANCE (No. 2) BILL, 1967— *continued*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. R. T. Parthasarathy, Mr. Kota Punnaiah, Mr. R. P. Khaitan, Miss Mary Naidu, Mr. A. M. Tariq, Mr. S. K. D. Paliwal, Mr.- Mallikarjundu.

SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU (Andhra Pradesh): I am here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The names of all those who are not here are cancelled.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Madam Deputy Chairman, while you should impose some penalty on the Congress Benches, you should give me the first chance.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: After Mr. Mallikarjunudu.

SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU: Madam Deputy Chairman, it now seems to me that our economic situation is somewhat paradoxical. It is caught between two contradictory forces which are pulling in opposite directions. On the one side there are the forces of inflation, and on the other there are the forces of recession. It is just like a country battling against two countries, fighting on two fronts. If Pakistan and China were to choose to attack India, then we