

12.37 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): Sir, with your permission, Sir, I would like to inform the House that it is proposed to include the motions for consideration and passing of the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Continuance Bill, 1967, in the agenda of Wednesday, the 29th March, 1967, before the resumption of the debate on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. This has been necessitated because the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act will expire on the 4th of April, 1967 unless the Continuance Bill is passed by both Houses of Parliament and assented to by the President before that date. I have already consulted the Whips of various Groups and they have kindly agreed to this proposal.

Mr. Speaker: Was it agreed to?

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): Yes it was agreed to

12.38 hrs.

STATEMENT Re. TIMES OF INDIA DISPUTE

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): Sir, on the 23rd March, 1967, I had made a statement in the House about the dispute between the management and the employees of the Times of India at Bombay and Delhi. I had then stated that negotiations between the two sides were in progress and I hoped that they would reach an amicable settlement. I am happy now to state that as a result of further discussions and negotiations between the two sides, a settlement has been reached. The strike has been withdrawn and the lock-out lifted and normal work at Bombay and Delhi has been resumed. The papers are likely to commence publication from tomorrow.

12.39 hrs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY MEMBER

(Shri A K Gopalan)

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasargod): Sir, on 18th March, 1967, towards the end of the day's Lok Sabha proceedings, Shri V. C. Shukla, under the pretext of making a personal explanation, stood up and stated, among other things the following:—

"When certain charges were levelled against Shri A. K. Gopalan, there was no point of order raised on this procedural matter. It was only said that these charges were false. Then the Speaker said that if the charges were falsified to his satisfaction, he will have them expunged; and he sent a letter to me and asked me to give the documents in proof of what I had said. I sent the documents as proof of what I had said. The Speaker was satisfied that these were full facts and that is why they were not expunged."

But, immediately after this statement of Shri Shukla, since the House adjourned, I take this opportunity to make a personal explanation and set the record straight.

Shri Shukla uttered a falsehood when he stated that the then Speaker said that if the charges were falsified he would have the charges expunged from the record. The then Speaker never said that. Neither the Speaker, nor anyone else at that, over raised the question of expunging the allegations from the record, during the said proceedings. The Lok Sabha record dated 11th March, 1965 will bear me out completely.

And yet Shri Shukla has put these words in the mouth of the then Speaker so as to mislead the House into believing the latter part of his