

**EVIDENCE TENDERED BEFORE
THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE
HOUSES ON THE DELHI SECONDARY
EDUCATION BILL, 1964**

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nominated). Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the evidence tendered before the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for better organization and development of secondary education in the Union territory of Delhi.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Now you may continue, Mr Ramamurti

**THE REPRESENTATION OF THE
PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1963
(TO AMEND SECTIONS 7, 83, AND 90
AND INSERTION OF NEW SECTIONS
97A, 136A AND 136B) Continued**

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI. Therefore, Madam, I would ask Mr. Raghunatha Reddy himself to give a little more thought to it. I am asking him to withdraw the whole of it but for the acceptance of the first amendment. I would also urge the Government to accept the first amendment straightway. As far as the other parts of the Bill are concerned, I would request him and the Government to give a little more thought to the whole question and see how the will of the people can really be kept up, to see that such laws as would frustrate all attempts to subvert the will of the people in these elections are not enacted. Otherwise, I am afraid, Madam, all talk about democracy, parliamentary democracy, all these things will cease to have any meaning whatsoever. We are very fast going to the Tammany Hall methods.

In our country, as far as elections are concerned big business is behind them. I would just remind this Government itself of what the Home Minister stated in 1964 in Lucknow. I do not know if he would stand by that. He stated this when they were going for the Congress-Socialist Forum for getting the Socialists into the Congress. At that time, Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda told to pressmen that one big businessman had spent out of his own pocket the election expenditure of 40 Members of Parliament of the Congress. This is the statement he made. I do not know if he stands by it today. This thing appears in the press

There are people in this country, big business people, who are prepared to foot the entire expenditure of the Party. If they continue doing that and if the people say that these are the Members of Parliament whose entire election expenses have been borne by somebody else, they will not be beholden to them. They must ask them to believe that human nature is like that that they are beholden to them and so their interests will be safeguarded.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN. May I point out to you, Madam, that the salutary Treasury Bench is not listening to the Debate?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is consulting.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN. Because the hon. Member made a serious statement about what the Home Minister is supposed to have stated. That is a kind of thing that the Government Member ought to listen to and either repudiate or accept the allegation.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI. I will give you the press cuttings. It is there.

SHRI C. R. PATTABHI RAMAN : I will speak when my turn comes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Will that time come?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI. He has not repudiated that statement. It appeared in the press.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA. He amended his statement that it was not 45 but 50.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI. I am very thankful for that. Anyway, if 50 M.P.s' election expenses could be financed by one individual . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is 45

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI. He has amended it to 50. You did not hear him. If the election of 50 Members of Parliament could be financed by one individual and if half a dozen such individuals join together in this country, than what is going to be the respect for this Parliament, and if people do not respect this Parliament and they do not have any faith in Parliamentary democracy, are they to be blamed? One should