

The Deputy Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri P. S. Naskar): Yes. Some progress has been made. Out of 2,298 claims registered with the Central Claims Organisation, 747 claims have been settled.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi: May I know the total amount of the registered claims and the amount that has been paid?

Shri P. S. Naskar: The present position is this. The total number of claims for refund of security deposit pertaining to the pre-partition period filed by the contractors—Indian nationals—against the Central Government, State Governments and the local bodies in West Pakistan is 2,298 and the amount is Rs. 131.9 lakhs. The total number of such claims disposed of, that is, verified and accepted or rejected, by the Pakistan Government is 747. Out of that, the number verified is 342; rejected, 405. Total is 747. The amount is Rs. 74.81 lakhs.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi: Is it not a fact that these security deposits are duly supported by documentary evidence in the possession of the contractors and, if so, may I know the reason for the delay in the payment of the rest of the amount, that is, 50 per cent, yet?

Shri P. S. Naskar: We are negotiating with the Pakistan Government for expediting the residuary work there.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: May I know whether the Government have taken any step, or enquired into the matter, about the claims that have been rejected by Pakistan?

Shri P. S. Naskar: As we also accept or reject their claims according to our rules, the Pakistan Government also, I presume, do that.

Shri S. C. Samanta: Is it not a fact that just after partition a Partition Council was formed with members of both the countries and which dealt with this question, and may I know who is dealing with these cases now?

Shri P. S. Naskar: I do not know about the Council or Committee. But whatever work is being done now, it is under the Indo-Pakistan Agreement. We have had several meetings, after that Agreement, to dispose of all these claims.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: There may be an Agreement, but I want to know whether it is a fact that there were some claims, that some work has been done and receipt has been received by the contractors to the effect that the work has been done and that still no payment has been made. Even the stones are there and all the materials are there. Still the claims are rejected.

Shri P. S. Naskar: I can only say that up to the last date for submitting the claims, whatever applications for claims we have received, we have forwarded them to the Pakistan Government.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: But the question is whether the Government of India have considered the cases of those persons who had got their receipts and all the evidence for claims, and why the claims were still rejected by the Pakistan Government and why the Government of India have accepted that position.

Shri P. S. Naskar: I would only request the hon. Member that if he has any such claims with him, he could forward them to us, and we will certainly look into the matter.

Sardar Iqbal Singh: Those claims are with the Ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

Tukergam

*165. **Shri Shivnanajappa:** Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Pakistan Government are realising revenue from the villagers of Tukergam on the Cachar-Sylhet border; and

(b) if so, whether the Indian Government has protested against this act of Pakistan?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shrimati Lakshmi Menon): (a) There is no information that land revenue is being realised from the villagers of Tokergram. However, Chaukidari tax from them has been demanded by the Pakistani authorities.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri Shivnanjappa: May I know whether the issue was discussed with Pakistan at any official or diplomatic level and, if so, with what result?

Shrimati Lakshmi Menon: The answer to part (b) of the main question is, "Does not arise".

Shri S. M. Banerjee: In reply to a similar question the other day, the Deputy Minister replied that the Chief Secretaries of Assam and Pakistan were to meet to discuss this occupied territory of Tokergram. I want to know when this meeting is going to take place and whether it is going to take place in Assam.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I am not quite sure, but I do not think a date has been fixed. The idea is that it should be held fairly early.

Shri Hem Barua: May I know whether this new development in Tokergram, that is, the collection of Chaukidari tax, is rather a milestone in Pakistan's claim that Tokergram belongs to Pakistan, and all the more so after it is let out in Karachi that the Nehru-Noon agreement has lost its sanctity with Gen Ayub's Government and, if so, what positive steps do the Government propose to take to speed up the recovery of Tokergram?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The steps can either be diplomatic or military. As I said on a previous occasion, in regard to Tokergram particularly, and generally, our policy is to avoid any

large-scale military steps, not on any particular ground of, if I may use the word, 'non-violence', but because one has to think of all the consequences of military steps. Normally we want to avoid military steps. Even now, as the House knows, there have been recently totally unjustified firings on the frontier there near Dawki and other places, without the slightest justification. They have gone on, stopped, and gone on, at the present moment they have stopped. All I can say is, we are completely alive to the situation and alert, and if necessity arises, we should take action.

Shri Hem Barua: My question is about a particular point, it was let out in Karachi, as I said on a previous occasion also, that the Nehru-Noon agreement does not hold any force with the Pakistan Government, because of the reference of the transfer of Cooch-Bihar enclaves and the Berubari Union to the Supreme Court and all that. I just wanted to know whether this Tokergram problem is connected with this also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not remember that particular phrase used on behalf of Pakistan to which the hon. Member refers. But this has nothing to do with it. This is not part of any agreement. Tokergram is a village of two parts, one on this side of the river and the other on the other side, on the west, across the river, about 200 acres on what might be called the Pakistan side of the river. Pakistan occupied that, although ever since partition and independence, it has been under the occupation of India. A little more than a year ago they occupied it. There is absolutely no justification for it all. It was pointed out at the time of the Prime Ministers' meeting—it did not form part of our discussion—and it was admitted by the other Prime Minister. But he raised another question about the Patharia Forest and said, "You are occupying some land on the Patharia Forest; if you walk out of that, we walk out of Tokergram." He wanted to make some sort of a bargain. We said, "We

do not agree with what you say about the Patharia Forest. Let there be a proper demarcation of Patharia, a temporary one, and after that, we should not cross that temporary line. That has to be decided by the two Conservators of Forests." The two Conservators met, but did not agree and there the matter remains.

So, in that sense, Tukurgram was talked about, but it was no part of any agreement, though it was admitted by the Prime Minister of Pakistan then that that was part of India

Shri Hem Barua: I want to know why Tukurgram was allowed to be held to ransom by Pakistan for the solution of the Patharia problem. Originally it was not associated like that. Only when Mr. Noon came and met our Prime Minister, a new situation developed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not think it is quite correct to say that we linked it up. It was stated by the other Prime Minister; it is not a question of our linking it up. We go on claiming it separately, but we agreed to take up the other question also

Shri Hem Barua: Tukurgram was a separate and isolated problem altogether, but it was ultimately linked with Patharia. I fail to understand this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon Prime Minister has answered that he did not bring it up, but the other gentleman wanted both to be settled . . .

Shri Hem Barua: We are a party to that

Mr. Speaker: We are arguing that matter. . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Question 192 may be clubbed with this, since some portion of it relating to Patharia Forest has been answered by the Prime Minister. It is a very important question.

Shri Assar: In view of the hon. Prime Minister's reply, can it be said that the Nehru-Noon agreement is valid yet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not prepared to answer that in any legal sense. It is difficult for me to answer.

Shrimati Masda Ahmed: According to Press reports—I refer to the Assam Tribune editorial on June 10, 1959—not only Tukurgram, but a few more areas which are integral parts of India are in illegal possession of Pakistan. If it is so, what measures have been taken to repel such encroachment upon our territory?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: According to the editorial in a paper issued in Assam, some areas unnamed are in occupation of Pakistan. How can I answer that question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Lady Member will send it on to the hon Prime Minister.

Shrimati Masda Ahmed: These areas are Faizal, Tilla, Iliastilla and Tengarkandi in North Cachar Hill District

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon Prime Minister answer question 192 also?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Certainly, Sir, if you wish

Construction of Bunkers by Pakistani Troops in Patharia Reserve Forest

+

{ **Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:**
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Jagdish Awasthi:
 *192. { **Shri Sarju Pandey:**
Shri Bibhuti Mishra:
Shri Raghunath Singh:
Shri Assar:
Shri Vajpayee:
Shri Hem Raj:

Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there was continuous machine gun firing by the Pakistani troops on the Indian border post at Hartakitilla in the Patharia Forest and Karimganj areas on the 12th and 13th June, 1959;

(b) if so, the extent of loss in life and property;