

[Shri Arvindakshan Kaimal]

of planning of services and for inefficiency. The proportionate weight of cargo has been going down in this country. There are the reasons why the railway finances are in their present state.

The Committee on Transport Policy and Co-ordination had observed:

"The share of Indian Railways in total goods traffic carried by rail and road together has diminished from about 89 per cent in 1950-51 to about 77 per cent in 1964-65."

"In passenger transport, the share of Indian Railways has declined during the period from about 74 per cent, to about 55 per cent."

The total investment in Railways is a fantastic figure. In 1950-51 it was about Rs. 827 crores. Today, by various means, the total capital invested is in the region of Rs. 3,000 crores.

In spite of those huge capital resources and unlimited monopolistic rights, the Government has miserably failed to run the railways efficiently and to offer cheap, comfortable travel and cheap and good and efficient carriage of cargo.

4 P.M.

The railways have very seldom shown a sense of good planning or aptitude to draw up a good plan. They are very haphazard in their manners. They call on their easily available finances and squander and misuse them to the best advantage of people who are not certainly the common people.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kaimal, would you give way for the Minister of External Affairs? You can continue later.

SHRI ARVINDAKSHAN KAIMAL: All right, Madam.

# STATEMENT RE. INDIA-BURMA BOUNDARY AGREEMENT

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): Madam, I have the honour to place on the Table of the House a copy of the Boundary Agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Burma which was signed in Rangoon on 10th March, 1967 along with its attached maps. The Agreement incorporates the description of the traditional boundary according to its existing alignment. It has further been delineated on agreed-maps which form an annexure to the Agreement. The Agreement will be followed up by the constitution of a Joint Boundary Commission charged with the task of planning and carrying out the demarcation of the boundary between the two countries and the preparation of detailed boundary maps and the drafting of a boundary treaty.

The India-Burma boundary has always been a friendly boundary and there has not been any dispute regarding any part of it. It was based on natural features and defined in provincial notifications in the pre-Independence period. It was, however, felt that in keeping with the very cordial relations between India and Burma, we should formalise the boundary as befitting two friendly independent sovereign States. The matter was discussed when I visited Rangoon in January this year and had the honour of meeting General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Burma, and the Foreign Minister of Burma, and it was agreed that the matter should be processed further.

Accordingly, an Indian Delegation visited Rangoon on 17th February this year and held discussions with a Burmese Delegation, as a result of which the present Agreement was signed in Rangoon on 10th March, 1967. Both Governments have ratified the Agreement and the Instruments of Ratification were exchanged in New Delhi on the 30th May, 1967.

The India-Burma boundary is about 1450 kilometres long from its southern extremity till it reaches its northern extremity which is the trijunction of the boundaries of India, Burma and China.

As I have said earlier, there was never any dispute between India and Burma at any point of the border. Both the Governments had been publishing maps showing identical alignment of the boundary. It was, therefore, only a question of confirming this well-known, traditional boundary. The negotiations leading to the Agreement were marked by close cooperation and friendly exchange of views. As the Preamble to the Agreement says, both India and Burma firmly believe that the formal delimitation and demarcation of the entire traditional boundary between the two countries would further strengthen their friendly relations. I am sure that the Members of the House would like to associate themselves with me in expressing our appreciation of the cordiality and friendly cooperation shown by the Government of Burma. This Agreement constitutes an important milestone in the long history of friendly relations between India and Burma.

The Agreement is only the first step. The Joint Boundary Commission to be appointed by the two Governments will proceed to have the boundary demarcated on the ground. The Commission will also prepare the draft of a Boundary Treaty to be signed by India and Burma. That will be the final act in this process of friendship to transform this traditional border between the two friendly neighbouring countries into a fully delineated and demarcated boundary.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh): Madam, I do not know the details of the terms of the agreement, but sometimes before, as you are aware, as the Government is aware—the border of Nagaland is with the Burma border—there was an understanding that for 25 miles each side, towards the Burma side and towards

the Indian side, there would be free movement of Nagas. This freedom was misused and many of the Nagas used to go to Burma and from Burma to China, and then there was lot of trouble on account of the training and the activities that were carried on because of this open border. May I know whether this consideration has been taken into account while finalising the agreement and whether any specific attempt has been made to include this in the agreement or not?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Madam, that is an entirely different question. There are Nagas in Burma as there are Nagas in India, and the question about Nagas there visiting Nagas here or the Nagas here going there has nothing to do with the boundary question.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: There is no proper boundary between Nagaland and Burma and they are freely allowed.

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: We have adhere to the traditional boundary or the boundary settled by notification. In the Burmese maps and the Indian maps the boundary is the same. The position still remains that there are some Nagas on our side and there are some Nagas on the other side. We were not discussing the question of our Nagas going over to the other side or their Nagas going over to this side.

SHRI M. VERO (Nagaland): I may tell the Foreign Minister that still many of the Naga villages in Burma wish to join India and therefore I have asked him to consult the Government of Nagaland before the agreement is made. I would like to know whether he has consulted them. If not, may I know the political reasons?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: As I said, that question was not discussed at all. That is a separate question which at the suggestion of my hon. friend I will certainly take up with the Burmese Government. It has

[Shri M. C. Chagla]  
nothing to do with the delimiting or delineation of the boundary line.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) :  
श्री चागला को अगर हम सवाल करें तो किमी प्रकार से भ्रम नहीं रहना चाहिए, इसलिए कि भारत सरकार, हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान, हिन्दुस्तान और तिब्बत, हिन्दुस्तान और चीन की जो सीमाएं हैं उनके बारे में विवाद का सामना करती रहती है। उससे हम बहुत दुख उठा चुके हैं। तो अब यह कृपा करके बतलाने का कष्ट करें कि ट्रेडिशनल लाइन पहले जो थी अगर उस पर हमने हस्ताक्षर किये हैं तब तो कोई बड़ी भारी बात यह नहीं है लेकिन अराकान के जंगलों में से जो हमारी सीमा की लाइन गुजरती है उस पर क्या आपने किसी प्रकार का विशेष मार्क लगाने का कष्ट किया है, या बर्लिन की दीवार की तरह कोई काटेदार चीज लगाई है या कुछ ऐसा किया है जिससे हमारे यहां की आबादी उधर न जा सके और उधर की आबादी हमारे यहां न आ सके या उनके अलावा कभी-कभी जंगलों में या नदियों में जहां सीमायें हैं, वह हमारी नदियों में आकर कह दें यह हमारी नदी है या हम आ कर कह दें यह हमारी नदी है, तो क्या उनके नकश में किसी प्रकार का स्पष्ट मार्क होगा, क्या हमारी सरकार ने कोई ऐसा कार्यक्रम बनाने की व्यवस्था की है ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: As I said, Madam, we have taken the traditional boundary, accepted boundary, which has not been formalised. The attempt was to formalise it. There was no question about the Naga population on this side of the boundary or that. It very often happens that in a country some people are on this side of the boundary and some people are on the other side. This happens all over the world. It is perfectly true that there are Nagas on this side of India and there are Nagas on the other side of Burma. But that question was not considered, nor discussed. These are dealing purely with the question of traditional boundary. I hope I have satisfied him.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मैं यह पूछ रहा था कि आप यह बतायें कि अराकान के जंगलों में आपने अपनी सीमा की क्या व्याख्या की है कि वहां पर यह ट्रेडिशनल लाइन है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister is saying that the traditional boundary line is formalised now. That is all.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि यह जो ट्रेडिशनल बाउन्ड्री है उसको फार्मलाइज करने की श्री चागला साहब ने बड़ी कृपा की, तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि उन्होंने इसको फार्मलाइज करने का क्या तरीका अख्तियार किया है, फार्मलाइज कैसे हुआ ? क्या केवल एक ही कागज पर दस्तखत हो जाने से ट्रेडिशनल बाउन्ड्री लाइन को फार्मलाइज करने का तरीका माना जाता है जिसको मैं नहीं मानता हूं कि दुनिया में कहीं और भी इस तरह से माना जाता होगा। तो क्या कारण उत्पन्न हुए कि जो ट्रेडिशनल लाइन थी ही उसको फिर से फार्मलाइज करने के लिए भारत सरकार को जरूरत पड़ी ? माननीय, मैं आपके जरिये यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बाउन्ड्री के सवाल को लेकर सरकार सीमा के सवाल को घपले में रखने की कोशिश कर रही है। हम तो मुक्त-भोगी हो चुके हैं और हमें कच्छ के बारे में मालूम हो चुका है..

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please put your question.

श्री राजनारायण : तो मेरा सवाल यह है कि क्या नैसेसिटी अराइज हुई जिससे सरकार को यह फार्मलाइज करने की जरूरत पड़ी। क्या फार्मलाइज करना केवल दस्तखत करना मात्र है या कोई बाउन्ड्री लाइन खींचने का कोई तरीका अख्तियार करेंगे या फिर जिस तरह से मैकमाहन रेखा मानी गई है उसी तरीके से यह भी मानी जायेगी, यह सरकार बतलाये ?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Sir, the necessity was very great. It is perfectly true that there was no dispute between Burma and ourselves as to the boundary. Now, we had the Burmese maps; we had the Indian maps; we had the various notifications which were issued before independence. In one or two cases, there were no notifications but the boundary was traditional, that is, accepted by both sides. Now, both sides sat down and prepared a map which is placed on the Table of the House, which boundary was delineated, formalised and shown as the boundary between India and Burma so that in future there can be no dispute between the two countries as to what the boundary is. Now, I do not understand why my hon. friend says that this would create difficulties in future. What is the difficulty?

श्री राजनारायण : माननीय, मेरा सवाल यह है और मैं अदब से अर्ज कर के सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार यह देख और श्री चागला साहब याद करें कि लद्दाख के इलाके में काश्मीर के सवाल को लेकर एक लाख 22 हजार वर्ग गज जमीन ब्राकायदा दे दी गई है और लोक सभा तथा राज्य सभा में यह सवाल उठाया गया था कि सरकार इतनी भूमि देश की खो चुकी है जो कि सरकार के नक्शे में थी और अब नहीं है, तो सरकार ने बर्मा से सीधे सीमा के सवाल को क्यों नहीं उठाया ?

That was a great necessity.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please put your question.

श्री राजनारायण : तो मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारे राज्य में, अपने देश में जब सीमांकन हुआ था तो उत्तर प्रदेश में एक महीने तक नक्शा टांग दिया गया था ताकि जिस किसी विधान सभा के सदस्य को जानकारी हो या कोई संशोधन करना चाहे तो लाबी में नक्शा पड़ा था उसको देखकर वह अपना सुझाव दे सकता था। जब इतने दिनों से

इतनी बड़ी नेससिटी सरकार को महसूस हो रही थी कि भारत की सीमा का सवाल रह गया है तो सरकार ने उम वक्त जहरत क्यों महसूस नहीं की कि जब बाउन्ड्री लाइन बनने जा रही है तो यहां की जनता से भी राय ले ली जाती। केवल सरकारी अफसरों को शामिल कर लिया जो जानते नहीं हैं कि भारत की भूमि क्या है, बर्मा कहां है, चीन कहां है, जापान कहां है। सरकार इस तरह का नक्शा टांग देती और उस नक्शे को अच्छी तरह से देखकर पुराने नक्शे से मिलाने और अपने सुझाव देते।

उपसभापति : नक्शा इधर रखा है।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं चाहता हूँ कि माननीया, इस बात पर एक दिन पूरा विवाद हो और सरकार इसके लिये एक दिन रखे। हमें वे नक्शे मिलने चाहिये ताकि हम उनको स्टडी कर सकें और देखें कि सरकार ने क्या फार्मलाइज किया है और जो बाउन्ड्री लाइन फार्मलाइज की है वह सही की है और उस से वे भारत की मान्य सीमाएं सुरक्षित कर पाते हैं या नहीं कर पाते हैं।

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: Madam, if we had had our agreement with China, we would not have had the trouble that we have. We took the opportunity—the relations between India and Burma are friendly—to see that there should be no dispute at any time in future; it is not that there was any likelihood of it.

Now, two steps have been taken. One is to formalise it by drawing it on the map.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: On the map? Not on the line?

SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: The second step will be to delimit it on the ground. The pillars will be put up all along the boundary line. And a delegation from here is going and there will be a delegation from

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

there. My hon. friend says that proper caution was not taken. Experts from here, from the Survey of India, from the External Affairs Ministry and from the Defence Ministry went there. There were experts from there. Days were spent to make sure that the boundary was the proper boundary between India and Burma. The boundary is 1,450 km. long, and we have seen to it that not one inch of the Indian territory has been lost or jeopardised in any way. The boundary is exactly between India and Burma which clearly describes how much territory belongs to India and how much territory belongs to Burma. I do not understand this question of my hon. friend.

(Some hon. Members stood up)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think we have taken much time. Mr. Kaimal will continue his speech. This is over.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras): Please, Madam . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We cannot go on. I am satisfied with the answer. Mr. Kaimal.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिन्दर): यह एक प्रमुख सवाल है और मुझ भी इस बारे में प्रश्न करना था . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr. Yajee. Mr. Kaimal, will you kindly continue your speech?

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called Mr. Kaimal, please.

श्री राजनारायण : उन्होंने आर्डे० एन० ए० में रहकर . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We cannot go on in this way. Yes, please continue your speech. Mr. Kaimal. You will get only ten minutes.

THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS), 1967-68—GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

SHRI ARAVINDAKSHAN KAIMAL: Madam Deputy Chairman, as a result of the stagnation in the railway economy, the public sector undertakings will suffer. Take, for example, Bhilai which produces mostly rails and sheets. If you do not purchase the usual expected quantity, there will be unemployment; the capacity will remain idle. The same thing will be with the wagon-builders all over the country. If you do not buy wagons from them. . . (Interruptions). . . They will have to close down, resulting in unemployment and starvation for millions of workers.

The Minister has expressed his concern at the rise in prices of materials, namely, steel and cement. Who has decontrolled steel and cement? Your Congress Government. You have done it under pressure from the monopolists and capitalists. You have dug your own grave, and you are trying to tell others what has happened, that the grave has been dug. You have dug it yourself; Who asked you to decontrol cement and steel, giving them a chance to enhance the prices without any reason? This is a crime that you have committed.

How is this increase in freight and fare rates going to react? This Government all the time was telling us—it was merely a lip-service; we all know it—that they want to hold the price-line.

(THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) IN THE CHAIR).

It cannot be done by magic, they cannot do it. By this increase in fares and freight rates, there will be a spiral of prices rises at every stage. The common man will almost be throttled and taking advantage of this price rise, the capitalist, the producer, will make enormous profits.