

Finance (Department of Revenue) Notification G.S.R. No. 1132, dated the 1st October, 1960, amending Government Notification No. 76/59-Central Excises, dated the 20th August, 1960. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2435/60.]

AMENDMENTS IN THE DELHI SALES TAX RULES, 1951

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (4) of section 26 of the Bengal Finance (Sales Tax) Act, 1941, a copy of Notification No. F. 3(42)/60-Fin(E), dated the 6th September, 1960, publishing further amendments in the Delhi Sales Tax Rules, 1951, issued by the Delhi Administration. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2440/60.]

THE CITIZENSHIP (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1960

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA): Sir, I beg to lay on *the* Table, under sub-section (4) of section 18 of the Citizenship Act, 1955, a copy of the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification S.O. No. 2290, dated the 16th September, 1960, publishing the Citizenship (Amendment) Rules, 1960. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2474/60.]

REPORT OF THE RAILWAY CONVENTION COMMITTEE, 1960

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Railway Convention Committee, 1960.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO SHRIMATI G. PARTHASARATHY

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the following letter dated the 8th November, 1960, written from Peking has been received from Shrimati G. Parthasarathy:

"Owing to personal and health reasons, I regret I am unable to

attend the session of the Rajya Sabha commencing on November the 28th and shall be grateful if you will permit me to be absent from meetings of the House during this session. I am undergoing a course of injections and treatment which would be interrupted if I come to Delhi just now. I hope therefore, the House will forgive my absence, as I intend to be present, uninterruptedly, at all meetings of the House from January to April, 1961."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shrimati G. Parthasarathy for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

No *hon.. Member dissented.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

THE DOWRY PROHIBITION BILL, 1959—continued

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR (Bihar): The other day speaking on this Bill I wanted to point out to the House that the question of dowry has been exaggerated on both sides and I also wanted to say that it was not just that this system of dowry should have been attacked from various quarters of this House. This system of dowry has its roots, has been in existence, since six to seven thousand years. The philosophers of India of the Vedic period have had this sort of thing and it has come down from the Vedic period right up to the present day. And the fault lies not with the system of dowry but the fault lies with the Hindu society, that section of the society which gave quarters to all sorts of defects and all sorts of corruption in the practice of this system of dowry. In this way a bad name is being given to the system today. As I said, Sir, this system of dowry has come down in this country since ages past and if we had systematically and

[Shah Mohamad Umair.] scientifically followed that system, there would have been no room for the present objections and the present corruption would not have crept into the society. Now, what has happened is this. One side has got a businesslike mind not to give any dowry while on the other side people are trying to oppose. Now, they want to deprive the women-folk who have been suffering from ages of this dowry simply because of certain wrong methods which have been adopted. You have deprived them in matters of property, in matters of inheritance and now people want that even this amount of dowry should not be there so that the male party may be completely free of the burden of womenfolk.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): They have been given a share in the property by the Hindu Succession Act.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: But that Succession Act has not been implemented and I think it will not be implemented in the manner in which the society demands and in which the society requires it to be done. You have only passed the Bill but you have not enforced it as yet. You have also passed the Special Marriage Act and many other such Acts but all these things have not been enforced. They are not acted upon. After the Bills are passed, there is some responsibility on the society to have it enforced, to accept it and to act up to it. You have to show your acceptance of that by enforcing the provisions of the measure and by the method of their working. But that has not been done. So I say that this legislation to do away with the system of dowry will not cure the ills which have crept into the society because a businesslike mentality has grown on both sides. I admit that a certain section—a negligible section—of youth has grown in the society which demands this sort of exorbitant dowry and tilak. But dowry and tilak are the necessary part of life. That cannot be condemned; that system cannot be

objected to because that is a system which has come down the ages and it was real justice to the daughters. Because after being married the daughters does not remain connected in any way materially to the house except that she has got her[^]J[^]*-: relations there whom *siy*[^] leaves behind. Therefore, it is necessary that if the parents have not resources, have got the means, they should certainly give some do[^]vry. What is the wisdom behind this restriction of Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 2,000 which you are trying to impose? If the parents have the means and if they want to give to their daughters, they should be free to give ample dowry to their daughters. Why are you restricting them by the force of law? Of course, restriction must be there in the case of some of those misguided youths who demand exorbitant dowry and exorbitant amounts for their marriage. But this is not the way. I can only suggest that in this Bill you have not provided any encouragement to the society—to those misguided youths—who have left their path and changed their way of life, to come to their senses and accept the ways of the society. You can say it is a business mentality—in which all of us may be included. The misguided youths require some encouragement. What is the encouraging clause in your Bill? You can do away with this evil only by giving some special scholarships in schools and colleges, special rewards for those youths who are poor like the Scheduled Castes, Harijans and other backward classes. In this way encouragement by way of grants, by way of giving some assurance to them, that the youths who come forward boldly will be encouraged in getting employment should be given. All these things are totally omitted in your Bill. You simply want that a restriction should be made and the floodgates of the law courts will be opened to the society. They will corrupt the society still more. Of course, there is corruption, but that corruption the society can cure by practical and scientific methods, if the Govern-

ment adopt them. It cannot be cured simply by condemning the society. How can you condemn the system, the system which was followed in the time of Ramachandraji, the system which was followed in the time of Lord Krishna, the system of dowry? From six thousand years back up to this moment it is there. Of course, you are injuring the cause of the system by your business mentality. That mentality is created in the classrooms of schools and colleges. When this sort of mentality is created in the youths, it can only be remedied and cured if the Government comes forward with a generous proposal to provide those youths with employment; give them generous scholarships and send them abroad for foreign training. These are the methods. What margin are you allowing for the social organisations to cure the ills, to the Members of the Houses to cure the ills? You are simply restricting things and you are strengthening the hands of the Police and strengthening the hands of the courts. This society has been built up after ages of labour by the philosophers of this country dating back to ten thousand years. You want that you should cure the ills of the society merely by passing three clauses in a Bill. This cannot be done. If you are really sincere, you should find ways means of encouraging those members of society and those youths who are economically backward. How can you say that a youth, who has spent ten or twelve years or eighteen years in reading, from school right up to colleges, should not take money? He is bankrupt. He has got nothing. If he gets a good match, a good family, which is a rich one, why should he not demand a certain amount of dowry, which will help his future life, his future married life also? Therefore, it is not the system that should be condemned. I would particularly tell Government and the Law Minister also that before they brought forward this Bill, they ought to have made a survey of this evil, in what section of the society this evil is there. This evil is

704 RS—4.

not creeping in the lower sections, among the Harijans and other backward classes.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: No, no.

SHAH MOHAMAD UMAIR: I cannot accept it. It is not among the Scheduled Castes. It is prevailing in some sections, among the upper middle classes and the richer classes. For that the system is not to be decried. But what action has to be taken has to be considered by you. Therefore, a survey should be made to find out in what sections it is existing. My hon. friend said the other day that certain caste organisations or Sabhas have passed resolutions, this and that. I say it is good. The caste system is not good, but so long as the caste system exists, those Sabhas or caste organisations should not merely pass resolutions but should enforce them. In any case no such exorbitant dowry should be demanded by either side. At least by that they will compensate for the evil of the caste system. Even this much is not being done. They do not implement their own resolutions. Therefore, my suggestion to the Government is that the Bill, should be withdrawn. It should be circulated for eliciting public opinion and after eliciting public opinion, it should be brought before the House. The Government can ask for suggestions, so that the society may be remoulded in such a scientific way that the previous history, the previous background of the society, the ancient traditions of the society and the philosophers' labours may not be lost.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I am not enamoured of this Bill. I do not think that even in the best of circumstances it will be easy to enforce it. It may meet with the same fate as the Sarada Act. If the Government, taking advantage of the difference of opinion between the two Houses, had decided to drop it, I would not at all have been sorry. I am sorry that the Gov-

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.] ernment has not adopted that course. If it thinks that it can get credit for passing measures of social reform so easily, it is mistaken. However, now that the Bill is to be considered by us; let us consider the nature of the amendments passed by us. A certain Bill was introduced on behalf of the Government in the Lok Sabha. The Lok Sabha made certain amendments to the Bill.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): It first came to the Rajya Sabha.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The Rajya Sabha made certain amendments. The other House did not agree. We have to consider now whether our amendments are reasonable or not. Now, let us take the first amendment, that is, the addition of the words "either directly or indirectly" after the word "given" in clause 2. That is after the words "valuable security given" in clause 2 of the Bill. Now, these words figure in the Bill as it was introduced in this House.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): I would like to make a correction. This Bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha and then it came to us.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: I think she is more correct. My first statement was correct.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Yes, it was.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Now, the Bill as introduced in the Lok Sabha on the 24th April, 1959 contained these words, but the Lok Sabha deleted these words thinking that they were superfluous. Let us suppose that the words are superfluous. But is the meaning of the words used in clause 2 so clear as to make it absolutely unnecessary to have these words, or would the addition of these words be harmful? The Law Minister said in the other House when our amendments were placed before it that he

clear in his speech in introducing the Bill that "given" would really mean given directly or indirectly. The Rajya Sabha acting upon what he said thought it better to make that explicit, and, therefore, added the words "directly or indirectly" after the word "given", as I have already said. That we are on the right track is shown by the fact that when our amendments were considered by the Lok Sabha, the Law Minister said that he for his part would be prepared to accept the amendment rather than force an unnecessary joint sitting.

Then, Sir, I come to the second amendment. The second amendment relates to the deletion of an explanation inserted by the Lok Sabha. I shall read out that explanation in order to enable the House to know what its effect would have been. The first explanation introduced by the Lok Sabha ran as follows:—

"For the removal of doubts, it is hereby declared that any presents made at the time of a marriage to either party to the marriage in the form of cash, ornaments, clothes or other articles, shall not be deemed to be dowry within the meaning of this section, unless they are made as consideration for the marriage of the said parties."

Let us consider first the necessity and then the effect of introducing this explanation. Before I do so I should like to read out sub-clause (b) of clause 2 the meaning of which is supposed to be made clear by the explanation inserted by the Lok Sabha. This sub-clause says:

"In this Act, "dowry" means any property or valuable security given or agreed to be given by the parents of either party to a marriage or by any other person, to either party to the marriage or to any other person at or before or after the marriage as consideration for the marriage of the said parties, but does not include dower or mahr in the case

of persons to whom the Muslim Personal Law (Shariat) applies."

It makes a gift made by either party to a marriage or by any other person to either party to the marriage or to any other person who is not a party to the marriage, if it is given as consideration for the marriage of the said parties, punishable. This paragraph is very comprehensive, and I should have thought that the meaning was clear. If there was a prosecution of a person on this point and if the prosecution could not prove that the gift had been given as consideration for the marriage, the prosecution would fail. Nothing needs to be added to it. But the Lok Sabha has added the explanation that I read out. What will be the effect of this explanation? I think that it may provide loopholes to those who want to give gifts as a consideration for the marriage but who want to make out that they are voluntary "gifts". This was pointed out by the Law Minister in the Lok Sabha when our amendment was considered. Nevertheless the Lok Sabha insisted on rejecting the amendment made by U3. Really there must have been some misunderstanding on this point. When we made our amendments there was absolutely no desire on our part to quarrel with the Lok Sabha. When Bills are placed before both Houses, the opinion of both Houses, in respect of all the clauses cannot be the same. We agreed with some of the amendments made by the Lok Sabha, because they seemed to us to be sound, but in respect of some amendments we thought that they were unfortunate. The second amendment, that is the introduction of the explanation read out by me, was really unfortunate, because the meaning of sub-clause (b) of clause 2 as read out by me is quite clear. The explanation, it seems to me, instead of making the operation of that sub-clause tighter would provide loopholes for those who

want to find out some way of giving a dowry and yet escape the punishment provided for those who give dowries.

Then, Sir, I come to the last amendment made by the Rajya Sabha. The Bill as it was placed before the Lok Sabha contained this clause:—

"If any person, after the commencement of this Act, demands, directly or indirectly, from the parents or guardian of a bride or bridegroom, as the case may be, any dowry, he shall be punishable with imprisonment which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to five thousand rupees, or with both."

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): This clause was deleted by us. The Lok Sabha reinserted it.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Yes. The clause was in the Bill as it was introduced in the Lok Sabha. The Lok Sabha approved of it, when it came before us, we thought that it should find no place in this Bill and we, therefore, deleted it. The Lok Sabha has now reinserted it. Let us consider how, if we allow this clause to remain, which is clause 4 of the Bill, it can be given effect to. The demand of a dowry is by itself to be made penal not the giving of a dowry or the taking of a dowry but demanding a dowry is to be made penal. How is it to be proved in any case that a marriage was broken off simply because a man, that is the father of the bride or the bridegroom, demanded some money as a consideration for the marriage? As the Law Minister pointed out in the other House, we know that there are unfortunately parties and feuds in our rural areas. And it will be quite easy for any person to have a prosecution started against a man on the ground that he demanded a dowry. Now is it desirable, Sir, that we should give an opportunity to any person who bears

[Dr. H. N. Kunzru.] ill-will to another person to have a prosecution started against the latter? Our object should be to prevent such prosecutions from being started and we ought to see that people are not given any opportunity merely to satisfy their grudge against a man, to bring him into trouble. It was, therefore, deleted in this House with the support of the lady Members here. Now they may say, "Well, if you are making the giving or taking of a dowry penal, why should not demanding a dowry be also made penal?" Now, Sir, what is the object of this Bill? Is it really to bring about reform, or to send people to jail? Its object, I take it, is constructive though the form that it has taken cannot be approved by me. Now, if we look at the Bill from that point of view, then the most important clause in the Bill, as pointed out repeatedly by the Law Minister in the other House, is clause 6. Now this clause 6 lays down that even if a person is forced to give a dowry, the cash or the property given as dowry will go to the bride—she has the right to claim whatever has been given as dowry. Now this, I think, is much more constructive and useful than the penal clause for, what will the effect of clause 6 be? The first point to bear in mind is that clause 4, which is a penal one, gives no advantage whatsoever to the bride. Her father-in-law may be sent to jail for taking dowry, but she will not get the property or the money that her father had had to part with. Clause 6, on the other hand, strengthens the position of the bride in that respect; it gives her a remedy and that remedy consists in her right to go to a court of law and demand that her father-in-law should make over the property to her. Now, in such a case evidence will be forthcoming; her own husband may be willing¹ to give evidence in her favour if he feels that his father will not be sent to jail if he gives evidence against him. So what is the purpose then of retaining clause 4? Clause 4 and clause 6 *no IV* together. Our object being constructive and not to make

the operation of the Bill as difficult as possible, I think it is not merely desirable but necessary that clause 4 should be dropped. I have spoken of the difficulty of giving effect to that clause. The difficulty will consist in want of evidence to prove the charge that the marriage was broken off or not entered into because one of the parties concerned in the marriage demanded a dowry. How is that to be proved? Will any of the relations of the person demanding the dowry give evidence against him unless they have some ill-will against him—you may look at it from any point of view you like. It is, in my opinion, clearly undesirable to retain clause 4, and I am glad to find that even on this point the Law Minister was in favour of the Lok Sabha agreeing to the deletion of clause 4.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND: May I interrupt the hon. Member for his views on one point so that they may be of benefit to the House? Clause 3, which is already there, does penalise the actual taking of the dowry, but clause 4 seeks to penalise even the demand, though it does not materialise and for which the marriage does not take place. People in the other House said that there are many marriages which are broken off when the man goes to the wedding ceremony and at that time refuses to marry the girl because the higher demand made was not met. Thus the girl is blackmailed because of the demand for a few more thousand rupees than was originally agreed to. The result is that the marriage does not take place. So they felt that such people who harassed the parent of the bride by making demands before the marriage or at the time of the marriage ceremonies and thus blackmailing the girl and, on the demand not being met, going away, thus putting at nought the proposed marriage, should be penalised, that the very demand should be penalised.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Sir, we are all familiar with such cases, but they are very few.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Yes, very few.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: But compare the na.assmem tnaï can be caused by the retention of this clause with what occurs now. The scale on which the evil exists now is small compared to what it will be if clause 4 is accepted by us, and I have no doubt in my mind that clause 4 should be deleted. It may be said that what is being deleted by us was contained in clause 4 in the Bill as it was originally introduced, and the Law Minister was asked in the other House as to how it happened that though he was in agreement now with the views of the Rajya Sabha he sponsored a Bill containing those words or clauses to which the Rajya Sabha took exception. His explanation was clear. He introduced the Bill on behalf of the Government and he had to introduce it as it had been drafted. As a Member of the Government he can take no sides. But as no whip had been issued, he was free to express his own personal opinions, and his personal opinion was that the Rajya Sabha had acted wisely in making the amendments that I have just referred to. I feel therefore, Sir . . .

THE MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI A. K. SEN): I spoke as a practical lawyer.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: The Law Minister said that. He was thinking of the practical effect of the measure before the Lok Sabha. He was not concerned with theoretical amendments, I mean with the excellence or otherwise of the amendments in theory; he was concerned with the effect that they would have in practice. In view of this, Sir, I feel that we are on strong ground and that we should not agree to the amendments made by the Lok Sabha. I do not say this, Sir, in any spirit of opposition to the Lok Sabha. No one, I am sure, is actuated by such a spirit here. It is a common thing for the Houses to disagree on some point or other, and usually some agreement is arrived at,

but this matter is so important, that I think the Rajya Sabha should not give way. I am, therefore, against the motion moved by the Law Minister and I ask the House to stick to the amendments made by it.

RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR (Punjab): Mr. Chairman, I will not take more than three minutes of the House.

Sir, when this Bill was brought to the Rajya Sabha, I opposed it, not because I was against the ideology that had prompted the Government to bring forward a measure of this nature before Parliament, but because I was convinced that this would be a dead letter and it could never be enforced. We have already our experience both in Bihar and in Andhra. Bills of this nature had been there on the Statute Book for several years and were never taken any action on. The same fate awaits this measure. Now, when there is this difference of opinion between both the Houses, I would again plead with the Government to withdraw this measure. I am quite convinced in my own mind that we have not got public opinion behind us and our society has not advanced to such an extent that it would accept a social reform of this nature and implement it. Therefore, why should we bring in impractical measures? It is the duty especially of the women Members of Parliament to educate the public. Take the advanced communities in this country. They do not resort to this kind of demanding of dowries. What is the good of bringing forward a measure that will be evaded? Do we want to encourage our people to evade the law? This is what we are doing by bringing in measures for which the country is not ready. Not only are we encouraging evasion of the law, but on the other hand, we are also going to encourage domestic litigation against which I, as a woman, wish to make a very very strong protest. Therefore, Sir, I would plead with the Minister of Law that because of the difference that has arisen between the two Houses of Par-

[Rajkumari Amrit Kaur.] I think this Bill should be withdrawn and more and more public opinion should be elicited. I am quite sure that public opinion will not be in favour of a measure of this kind. It would be wisdom to withdraw it. I echo everything that the speaker before me has said. If at all it has to be passed, then I would not retract the amendments which the Rajya Sabha has made. But I would earnestly plead that the Bill be withdrawn. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Law Minister will wind up at 4 o'clock and all the speeches must be over by that time. Mr. Mitra.

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, I crave your indulgence to digress on the merits of the Bill, apart from the scope of the motion moved by the Law Minister. I agree with the criticism of the hon. Members that this legislation is the most impracticable measure and will hardly serve the object in view.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

This social disease is very deep-rooted and widespread and it is hardly possible to eradicate this disease by palliative remedies.

From the speeches it appears that only the bridegrooms' parties take dowry, but in many places brides' parties also take dowry. This is particularly so in Palamau in Bihar. I know that poor-class Brahmins cannot marry because they do not have enough money to be given for their marriage. They have to pay Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 2,000 and then also they marry an under-age girl. Among the aborigines there is a custom that the bride's side takes money from the bridegroom's side. They marry the daughter and they say they have sold the daughter. I differ with the hon. Member, Shah Mohamad Umair, who confined his remarks to the middle or rich class. Of course, in the rich or middle classes that is very acute and very high demands are made, and particularly so in

the case of Government servants. I think that the suggestion made by the hon. Member, Shri R. P. Sinha, to the effect that the Government Servants' Conduct Rules should be amended so that persons marrying with dowry cannot have any Government service or those who have already entered service will be discharged from service, will have the desired effect rather than have this piece of legislation. After all, Sir, who will enforce it? Even the police officers and magistrates are sinners; they may not prosecute or they may connive at things. I, therefore, feel that this is a measure which will remain in the archives and will never be implemented just like the Sarada Act.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: It has produced a very good effect.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: After so many years only. For the present this will remain in the archives.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Question.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: When there was so much food scarcity, there was a measure called the Guests' Control Order. And everybody knows how it was being enforced. All sorts of efforts were made to circumvent the provisions of that law. On many an occasion parties or dinners were arranged for a number of persons exceeding the limits, and hardly any case was instituted. I know of an instance. My father was a very straightforward man. He made a complaint and brought the police to a place where hundreds of persons were taking meals but the police also, after certain enquiries, gave their final report. That way this measure also will never be implemented, and I am afraid it will meet the same fate.

Anyhow, Sir, I must congratulate this House for the amendments that it has made. If you are to make any law, you must see that it is as effective as it can be. Therefore, I have

to say with full respect for the Lok Sabha that it is not moving with the times, because their amendments adding Explanation I will nullify the effects of this legislation. In my opinion, if this law is to be passed, then the amendments suggested by the Rajya Sabha are necessary and desirable. The deletion of the Explanation is certainly desirable, otherwise it will create loopholes of various types and this legislation will have no effect. Therefore, I support the view that Explanation I should be deleted.

Regarding clause 4, my view is that that should also go as it will create difficulties.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You continue a little later. The Prime Minister will make a statement.

STATEMENT *RE* RECENT INCIDENTS IN THE CONGO

THE PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): I am sorry to intervene in this way but I wanted to place before the House certain further information about the recent incidents in the Congo. The House will remember that some 4 or 5 days ago we learnt with a sense of shock that some of our officers there in the Congo had been badly beaten and injured in a more or less mob like fashion and I promised to get as much information as I could and place it before the House. Part of it, of course, has been appearing in the newspapers.

Now what happened was that the Congolese authorities functioning there ordered a Ghana diplomat to leave Leopoldville within a very short time, within a question of hours. He did not agree to leave, at least then, and he appealed to the U.N. authorities to give him protection in case of any attack. The U.N. did give some, placed some kind of armed guard in the

Ghana Embassy. Thereafter, some of the Congolese armed forces attacked that armed guard, there was firing and as a result of the firing, there was some casualty on both sides. I do not know exactly but about—possibly—4, 5 or 6 were shot down both sides included. Among those who were shot down was Col. Nkokolo, who was second in command of the Congolese Armed Forces under Col. Mobutu. I mention his name because it would appear that his death created a great deal of excitement among the Congolese Armed Forces, and apart from other reasons, apart from their general inclination not to be very disciplined and do what they liked, this also may have been a reason for the extraordinary behaviour during the next 3 or 4 days. From November 21st to November 23rd, for three days, there was a state of utter insecurity, more especially so far as the U.N. personnel were concerned, and these Congolese, groups of Congolese soldiery, entered the houses of U.N. personnel, sometimes beat them, sometimes threatened them, usually •toned their cars or took some weapons that they could find. This was done not only to the Indian officers who were mentioned last time but to quite a large variety of people belonging to about a dozen nationalities. I might make it clear here, as I have said previously, that India has no combat forces in the Congo. Although we have about 770 or 780 personnel there—they are military, air force and others. All have gone for non-combat duties like communications, supply, signalling and chiefly hospital work. Of course, we have a big hospital functioning there. They are not armed as combat troops are armed but possibly the officers have some kind of pistol or revolver or something like that which they normally carry. Otherwise, they are not armed. Also, when this conflict took place in the Ghana Embassy, no Indians were there involved in that fighting at all. So it was apparently a resentment against the whole of the U.N. apparatus that made the Congo-