

Department or not. Those aspects would be replied to by him or by the hon. Prime Minister. All that I would like to say is that this is a sensitive matter and we should not utter anything or behave in a manner which might cause anger and make the situation more worse.

Sir, I would also like to say that even in the last Elections the Congress Party did not raise this issue of Babri Masjid so vociferously as they are doing it now. The reason is not known to us. These issues get priority only when the leaders of the Party move without any direction. I would like to appeal to the hon. Prime Minister to see that this case is concluded at the earliest and all the political parties should abide by the judgement of the Supreme Court. I hope that this Babri Masjid issue is concluded as soon as possible.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, pending Ayodhya cases can be classified into two categories.

The first category is of cases relating to the title dispute. There are five such cases, two of which have remained pending since over 49 years.

The second category is of the case arising out of the happenings of December 6, 1992. In this case, charge-sheets have been filed by the CBI against over fifty persons. This case is pending before the Special Additional Sessions Judge (Ayodhya Prakaran) since 5th October, 1993.

I would like to affirm that ever since I have assumed office in March, 1998, neither I nor my Government has ever interfered in this case, even though the investigating agency, namely, the CBI is directly under me. As has already been indicated in another context, Government holds that interference in a pending prosecution is impermissible in law.

Neither the Constitution nor the law disqualifies a Minister from holding office merely because a charge-sheet is filed by the police or formal charges are framed by the court.

The question as to who should be in the Council of Ministers is one of Prime Ministerial discretion, and sense

of political propriety. Many circumstances are relevant to the final decision of the Prime Minister on these issues.

In view of the fact that no change in the position of court cases has taken place ever since the Ministers concerned were inducted into office in March, 1998, and no allegation of corruption or misuse of office is involved, the demand that the Ministers quit office or that they be barred from replying to certain questions is untenable.

However, the cases will be allowed to proceed without any interference from the Government here or at the State level.

I urge this House to await the judicial verdict.
(Interruptions)

1856 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Second Report

... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, Shri Pramod Mahajan may present the Business Advisory Committee Report.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN) : Sir, I beg to present the Second Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : The House stands adjourned to meet at 11.a.m. tomorrow the 8th December, 1999.

1858 hours

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, December, 8, 1999/ Agrahayana 17, 1921 (Saka)
