

wai> located in the Umrer Tehsil of Nagpur district, about 2 miles east of North East of Pular. The nature and extent of the deposit are yet to be investigated.

RIFLE CLUBS AND ASSOCIATIONS

108. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state the facilities granted by Government to Rifle Clubs and Associations in India?

THE MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR) : A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

The facilities given by the Government of India to Rifle Clubs and Associations are: —

- (1) training in the use of firearms and target practice to members of recognised rifle clubs by local Army personnel where local police are not available for the purpose;
- (2) entertainment of applications from recognised rifle clubs for direct import of arms and ammunition from abroad;
- (3) supply of ammunition to rifle clubs from Ordnance depots at concessional rates;
- (4) grant of Rs. 10,000 to the National Rifle Association of India, in connection with each of the 4 annual National Shooting Championship Competitions held by that Association;
- (5) the following facilities in connection with the above-mentioned competitions:
 - (i) assistance by the Army in the form of service personnel to conduct and supervise the four championships

held in 1952, 1953, 1955 and 1956;

- (ii) provision of military accommodation on payment of rent;

- (iii) loan of military firing ranges.

HISTORY OF FREEDOM MOVEMENT

109. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister for EDUCATION be pleased to state:

(a) the number of countries from which material was collected for compilation of the History of Freedom Movement; and

(b) the expenditure incurred on collection of the above material?

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD): (a) Nine, apart from India.

REPORT ON THE SECOND FIVE-YEAR PLAN

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, I have the honour to present the Report of the Planning Commission on the Second Five Year Plan.

Slightly over three and a half years ago, I had the privilege to present the j Report of the first Five Year Plan to this House. At that time, the first Plan had already been functioning for about a year and a half by the time that Report was ready and was presented to Parliament. Now, we I have come to this House soon after I the second Five Year Plan' is suppos-j ed to have begun; that began on the j 1st April. These dates are convenient to consider these matters but, of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] course, there is no break between the first and the second and the third. Planning is continuous; the implementation of a Plan is continuous just as the life and activities of the country are continuous. Nevertheless, it is helpful to see in these periods of time as to how far we have gone and what we have achieved, and to decide what to do in the future.

Hon. Members will get this rather bulky volume containing the Report from the Notice Office today. They will also probably get summaries of it, cyclostyled, I think, for the present but they will be printed very soon and circulated to Members. In addition to this, the Planning Commission proposes to issue, as soon as possible, bigger summaries, in printed book form, not only in English but also in the various Indian languages, sections of the book separately printed, and also other material dealing with this.

12 NOON

I understand that it has been decided that Joint Committees of this House and of the Lok Sabha should consider this Report from to-day onwards, and sometime to-day the Chairmen of those four Committees will meet the Members and the Minister for Planning to decide on their procedure, and they will consider this for about a week. Those Committees will be divided up taking four groups of subjects, one Committee A considering the Plan outlay and allocations, the second Committee B, industry, minerals, transport and communications; Committee C—Land reform, agriculture and irrigation and power and Committee D, the fourth Committee—Social services and labour policy.

Roughly speaking, this Report can be divided up into two parts, the second part dealing with the detailed programme and projects and the first part with the broader issues.

Members will no doubt be interested in both parts, more especially in so far as the detailed programme applies to their own areas, but probably the first part containing the broad policies, approach, etc. will be more important from the point of view of this House because it is from that that the rest follows and I imagine that when the time comes, as it will in about a week's time or so, for this House to debate on this Report, more attention will be paid to the first part containing the principles etc. In regard to the details it would be more convenient for them to be considered whenever necessary not in a debate in this House but by hon. Members meeting the Minister for Planning or other representatives of the Planning Commission and discussing them with them. Now, Sir, I do not wish at this stage—of course this matter will again come up before this House—I do not wish to say much about this Report except this that, as we have proceeded with our business of planning, naturally our experience has increased; to some extent our vision has widened; to some extent the material we play with, statistics, information, etc., is much greater than it was. It is by no means enough even now, but when we started with the First Five Year Plan we were conditioned and limited in many ways. We had very little data, very little statistics and such statistics as were supplied to us were often very unreliable being based usually on some pat-wari statement in a village about agricultural production. Also we were tied up at the time when the First Five Year Plan began, with a number of major schemes, which we could not and did not want to leave. Now those major schemes absorbed a great part of our resources and we had not too much left for our other plans. That was one reason why the actual Report, the First Five Year Plan Report, came up before this House a year and a half after the Plan was supposed to begin functioning. Well, since then we have had this Five Year Plan and we have had reports about the measure of success it

has achieved. I think it is justifiable for us to say that the First Five Year Plan, by and large, was a success. In some matters it was a great success. In some matters it was not such a great success but it fulfilled anticipations, but taking it all in all the Five Year Plan succeeded and succeeded in two ways. One was the fact of reaching the targets aimed at and going beyond them in regard to food, in regard to cloth, in regard to several other things but something that is much more important really, that is, in creating a hopeful atmosphere in the country, that is to say, our people became planning-conscious. Our people realised that by this method of planning we were advancing. We were making good on the food front to some extent; in regard to certain industries also our production rose. I do not mean to say that in the context of the enormous and difficult problems that we are facing in India the Five Year Plan succeeded in solving any of those vast problems—of course not, but it did succeed in a greater measure than was anticipated by many of us in this country and many outside this country, who take an interest friendly or unfriendly in our activities, and we succeeded in creating that basic atmosphere of hope and success following the effort which is so necessary to every kind of organised effort at planning. Now we started with this great advantage on this occasion, which we did not have previously, because to-day everybody in India—perhaps I exaggerate—at least very large numbers of people in India talk of planning, think of planning, discuss planning even in our villages; maybe their idea of planning is somewhat limited, but that does not matter; it is bound to be so, and people realise that it is by this planned approach that we are likely to succeed in solving our great problems. That has been a great advantage to us. The second advantage has been, as I said that we have some more statistics, some more experience, but with the greater experience and with the great-

er knowledge that we have now, also has come an appreciation of the greater difficulties that we have to face. The problems which were vague become more concrete and in becoming more concrete we realise how big they are. Perhaps many people in this country who talk rather vaguely about the solution of our problems would get this appreciation of the bigness and complexity of those problems if they sat down and considered them in that intensive way that the Planning Commission had to do. Anyhow it is good that we have a greater sense of reality of the difficulty of the great work we have undertaken and at the same time of our own capacity to overcome those difficulties.

Now, even while the First Five Year Plan was functioning, work on the Second Plan began. It began, broadly speaking, two years ago. Of course in a sense it was always there, it was always thinking of the next step, but two years ago it began in a more precise way, and during these two years we have gone through innumerable processes of consultation and discussion amongst all manner of groups in this country. We tried to go right down to the village to find out the needs of the village and from the village to the district. We came to the conclusion that the district was in a sense the pivot of planning. Of course the district is too small for any major scheme, that is true, but still just as in the apparatus of administration, we gave the district a certain importance; then we came to the State level and the States, I should like to say, in this matter of planning not only co-operated fully with the Planning Commission and the Government of India, but did so with an enthusiasm and with a backing of hard work that was most heartening.

This Plan could never have been made or produced here without this great effort of cooperation and goodwill that we have had from all sections of the community. There were the various organisations, the State Governments etc.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Then you go into a different field, that is, we consult specialists; we consult economists, statisticians, engineers, educationists, various panels of the Planning Commission dealing with specialised subjects. We consult of course all the time the various Ministries of the Government of India. We consult quite a number of foreign specialists; not for our detailed plan—that is our business—but nevertheless to get ideas from them and we have had in the course of the last two to three years any number of very eminent foreign experts on planning, statistics, economics and like subjects in India who had produced vast numbers of specialised papers on these subjects which have been considered. It does not mean that we have adopted all that they have said. Indeed they have often said things contradicting each other. So there is no question of adopting everything they said. But even those who came from abroad or here, even when they differed basically about the approach to the problem of planning, it was quite extraordinary that a very large measure of agreement came out in regard to the problems of India.

Now, one fact stood out and that was, while we should learn and learn a great deal from the experience of other countries where they have planned and where they have not planned—from both places we must learn—nevertheless we have to think out and fashion out our own line of action basing it on the particular conditions in India and not on the conditions existing somewhere else. That is to say, we have to rely on our own application of whether it is economics or anything else to the problems of India—not because those who came from abroad were people not capable of doing this but firstly because most of these people who come from abroad come from countries which are industrialised, which have gone through this process of industrialisation. The economic problems they have to face are different from ours, are different

from that of a country which is under-developed, which wants to industrialise itself rapidly maintaining and preserving the democratic structure of our Constitution and of our society. In fact this particular problem had not been faced anywhere before in any country. Other countries had industrialised themselves in the course of generations and attained a high position and their problems were entirely different because they had the apparatus of industrialism with them. Sometimes they did not function; sometimes they created difficulties but the apparatus was there; the foundation was there. Some countries, as the House will know, have industrialised themselves rapidly, fairly rapidly, in the course of the last, say, 30 or 40 years. I may point out even that rapid industrialisation has taken 20, 30, 40 years. People may forget and imagine that these things can be done as if by some jugglery in the course of a few years. Even the most rapid approach takes generations. Now those countries; which had done so rapidly were obviously important for us to consider; we could learn much from them because they had passed through the stage of under-Industrialisation, underdevelopment, almost before our eyes, while other countries had taken 100 to 150 years over it. But then of course conditions differed greatly between those countries and ours as they always do between two countries going through these processes. The political structure and the rest were different too. Also the unfortunate fact stares us that we have started in this country at an almost lower level than any country. We are very proud of our country as we should be but from an economic point of view in any statistical analysis of income etc. India occupies almost the bottom place. One has to remember that, how we have to start from scratch and we have to lift ourselves up almost by our boot laces. It is not an easy task and yet it can be done. It is beginning to be done and I have no doubt that it will be done, but one must realise this point. Therefore we took advantage of

advice from every quarter in India, jxpert, inexpert, political, geographi-cal, all over from village upwards to the State and from foreign experts too. A little over a year ago, about a year and a half ago, we asked the Indian Statistical Institute to consider certain specific problems, that we placed before them, statistically. The problem we put to them at that time was, if we want to put an end to unemployment in India within a stated period, what investment was necessary, apart from other things, whatever the period might be. Of course the investment might be completely outside our capacity but we wanted to find out. We said, 'let us say roughly ten years' time; what investment would be necessary to finish unemployment?' Well, they set about thinking about this matter and in doing so they covered a much wider field really because it was no good saying that the investment would be so many crores or so many thousands of crores. That was no good; they had to work it out as to how that investment would produce employment and they had to work it out with not adequate data before them. Anyhow, the House may remember that ultimately a memorandum was produced which* was called a •draft outline or some such thing and subsequently it came to be known as the Plan frame. It was pointed out later that many of the figures in this Plan frame were not correct, because more correct figures came in and they had to be substituted for the incorrect ones. But the value of that Plan frame was that it was an organised logical approach to a difficult problem of how to spread out our investment in various ways in various activities and produce employment and produce goods, of course, naturally. So regardless of the actual figures that they had given, it was the approach that was important. That Plan frame was considered by the Economic Section of the Planning Commission, by the Economic Section of the Finance Ministry and they produced a document which, broadly speaking, was in agreement with the approach

of the Plan frame. Maybe here and there the figures were different. Then we convened the Panel of Economists which the Planning Commission has constituted and which contains all the most eminent economists in India. They came and sat for a few days to discuss these papers, the Plan frame and the other documents, and they produced a third document of weight. Also they did not go into the details. They being cautious folk did not wish to take responsibility for everything but broadly speaking they agreed with that approach and pointed out something that should be done. Now, this again, all these three papers and more were put before the National Development Council which the House knows consists of Chief Ministers from all the States plus the Central Ministers plus the Planning Commission. The National Development Council generally and broadly approved of that approach of the Plan-frame and the panel of economists and the rest, not in detail, but broadly and asked us to go ahead. In particular they approved of the target or the objective laid down. I think it was 25 per cent increase in the national income in five years and that ten to twelve million jobs should be found for the working population, new and old. That was the broad approach. Even then the National Development Council realised that a 25 per cent increase, which meant five per cent per annum, was not an easy task. Naturally we want to give as high a figure as possible, but the point is we have to achieve it. And broadly speaking every one per cent per annum that you wish to add—say instead of five per cent you wish to say six per cent—represented one thousand crores rupees more investment. It was a big sum, in the five year period, I mean. Nevertheless, we felt we cannot go below this 25 per cent, because it is just keeping our head above water, we have to go faster than the increase in population and all that. So, we agreed to that. This was just about a year ago.

Then, on the basis of that, more definite and precise work started for

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

the preparation of the Second Plan. A memorandum was prepared. The memorandum was considered and a draft outline was then prepared. Again, there were numerous consultations between each State Government and the Planning Commission. Now, we were coming down to — if I may use a colloquial phrase—brass tacks and we had to deal with actual things and actual schemes, apart from the big policies. The big policies were being considered also at the same time. The House may remember that at one stage my colleague, the Minister for Planning, and other colleagues met—and to some extent I also was present—many Members of Parliament who formed the Consultative Committee of Parliament for Planning and had very useful discussions for several days. All this helped in making that Draft Plan and ultimately the Draft Plan was produced, rather this Draft Outline; I think, in February last after much effort. This was published, distributed widely, comments invited, again a series of discussions on that took place and finally we came to the Draft Outline being revised repeatedly in the course of those discussions, considered ultimately by the Cabinet and finally by the National Development Council which met some days ago and passed certain resolutions which I shall read out to the House. Now, in the course of all these discussions, all kinds of new avenues of thinking opened out for us. I am not quite sure that we have all succeeded in digesting all those ideas, but our minds are full. The whole process has been speaking for myself—being not an expert in these fields—a most profitable experience in educating myself. And if I may venture to say so, to some extent in the course of these years of planning, we have been educating not only ourselves but the nation in various degrees. So, in considering all these matters we saw that on the one hand there were so many uncertainties about our resources,

about the various things that we were going to do. Let us say that we were laying down a rigid plan for five years, or perhaps not rigid. There should be no rigidity about it. Some of us felt that perhaps we were aiming too high and we should be in a position to revise it, if necessary. Others felt that we were not aiming high enough and we should do much more than we say. Anyhow, it was no good putting down in the Plan all our wishful thinking. But what emerged from all this was that we put down our present estimate of our resources, of what we propose to do, of what we intend to do, but that we should revise this annually. That is, there should be annual plans. Naturally many of the things that we undertake we shall have to finish. We cannot go halfway and stop something which will last for several years. But broadly speaking we should have, in addition to this Five Year Plan, more precise and definite annual plans, so that we can consider the position from year to year. Secondly, while the five-year period is, in a sense, too long a period for us to be rigid about, it is much too short a period for us to plan, because many things go over the five years and we must know where exactly the Five Year Plan itself is leading to. It is not merely a question of putting up a factory here or something else here and there. That is a minor thing. The main thing is how our whole production apparatus is functioning, what is consumed, what is the surplus left over, how many unemployed are getting jobs, how unemployment vanishes, how living standards rise and all that. It is a terribly complicated process, because it is not merely the thousand or the ten thousand machines or factories—that may be working in India or whatever it is. But, in effect we have to think in terms of 360 million machines working in this country, that is, the human beings in this country, how they work, how they get the work, how they produce, how they consume. So, it becomes a most intricate and fascinating work. Therefore, you require what is called lone-

term planning, perspective planning over more than five years, to go ahead, look ahead ten years, fifteen years, maybe twenty years. Not rigidly—of course, you cannot—but broadly have some idea of the picture of society and the structure in India—industrial, agricultural, social—that you are aiming at. Now, we were helped in this business in a sense when it came to be clearly decided by Government and by Parliament that we should aim at a socialist structure of society. Those terms are not precise, but they are precise enough to indicate the direction in which we are going. That was helpful and that had to be considered then in terms of our planning. It is true that even in the First Five Year Plan many of us—though we may not have said so—thought more or less on those lines and that was reflected somewhat in the First Five Year Plan. But now we have the authority of Parliament to say that this is the picture that we want to produce an attempt was made, therefore, to bring that in here. Not—let me make it quite clear—that I claim or anybody claims that the Second Five Year Plan is going to produce a socialist structure of society in India. Let there be no mistake about it. It will take many five-year plans before we can have that structure of society in this country. We can proceed, we can go along those lines and step by step we shall advance and get nearer to that and new problems will arise. Anyhow we must have that picture before us. Therefore, in addition to flexibility that we should have in our Plan, we have to have this larger perspective which becomes important. In fact, in some countries which have been planning for a long, long time, they have divided up their planning commissions into two parts—the current planning which they call and the perspective planning. There are two planning commissions almost. One thinking in long terms of 15 or 20 years and the other in terms of one year and five years. So, this Plan, after these various processes, ultimately reached the National Development Council and through

National Development Council passed a Resolution which I shall venture to place before you. The Plan was considered and approved by the National Development Council which passed the following Resolution on the 2nd May, 1956; —

"Having considered the draft Second Five Year Plan, the National Development Council places on record its general approval and acceptance of the objectives, priorities and programmes embodied in the Plan and relying on the enthusiasm and support of the people, affirms the common determination of the Central Government and the Governments of all the States of the Union of India to carry out the Plan; and to improve upon the targets set out in it; and calls upon all the citizens of India to work wholeheartedly for the full and timely realisation of the tasks, targets and aims of the Second Five Year Plan."

I may now read some extracts from the introduction which we have given to this Second Five Year Plan: —

"Theft beginning and the end of a Five Year Plan are vital dates in the nation's history. Each Five Year Plan is both an assessment of the past and a call for the future. It seeks to translate into practical action the aspirations and ideals of the millions in the country and gives to each of us the opportunity of service in the common cause of eliminating poverty and raising standards of living.

The First Five Year Plan ended in March, 1956. Its approach and outlook are part of our common thinking. It has laid the foundations for achieving the socialist pattern of society—a social and economic order based upon the values of freedom and democracy, without caste, class and privilege, in which there will be a substantial rise in

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] employment and production and the largest measure of social justice attainable.

Our Second Five Year Plan seeks to rebuild rural India, to lay the foundations of industrial progress, and to secure to the greatest extent feasible opportunities for weaker and under-privileged sections of our people and the balanced development of all parts of the country. For a country whose economic development was long retarded these are difficult tasks 'but, given the effort and the sacrifice, they are well within our capacity to achieve.

The Plan which is now presented to Government for submission to Parliament is a result of the labours of large numbers of persons in the Central Government, in the States at various levels and leaders of thought and opinion in every part of the country. In its preparation men and women in all walks of life have given generously of their time and experience. The enthusiasm and the widespread participation which have gone into the making of the Second Five Year Plan are the best augury for its fulfilment."

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : May I ask three points in this connection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Three points?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Just for clarification. The first point is this. The hon. Prime Minister has said that four Committees are being set up and hon. Members can be members of one Committee at a time. But considering the wide range covered by those various Committees, it will be far better if Members can join at least two Committees and the time-table be so arranged that they can join two Committees. The second point is that the Prime Minister has talked about Planning Commission in two parts—one from the long-term point of view and the other from the short-

term point of view. May I point out to the Prime Minister that there has been a difference of opinion in the Planning Commission itself and the phenomenal rise in the prices of foodgrains and cloth during the last six months has been so large that there is danger that our entire planning may founder on the rocks of inflation. Instead of two Planning Commissions, will the Prime Minister consider having Execution Committees? It is even more important than the Planning Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not seeking clarification. That is not clarification. You are making suggestions.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: No, Sir, I want to know what steps are being taken in this connection by the Prime Minister

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think the Prime Minister has honoured the House by making a pretty long speech. In presenting the Report, it was not necessary for him to have made a long speech. He could have said, "I present the Report" or said a few words. But he has given us the advantage of a speech. You are having Committees; you are having a general debate. You had better hold your soul in patience till that date.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: May I say, with regard to the first point that the hon. Member has raised, that Members are meeting the Minister of Planning and they can discuss that matter?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, you said that the Prime Minister honoured us by placing the Report before the House and explaining it. Is it not his duty to do so as Prime Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kunzru, these documents are generally laid on the Table or presented with a few words. That is all that I meant.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: But there is no question either of the Prime Minister or any Minister honouring us by making a speech.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

STATISTICAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE WORKING OF THE PREVENTIVE DETENTION ACT

THE MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers:—

(i) Statistical information in the form of statements regarding the working of the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, during the period 30th September, 1954 to 30th September, 1955.

(ii) Statistical information in the form of statements regarding the working of the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, during the period 30th September, 1955 to 31st December, 1955.

(Placed in Library- See No. S—176[56].)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I have a submission to make. I think that we are going to be supplied with that kind of report that we have received last year. We request the Government, along with the Report, to supply us with the copies of the charge-sheets given to various detenus in various States as well as the copies of the replies to the charge-sheets which are placed before the Advisory Board. Only then would it be possible for us to go into this question carefully and see how the Preventive Detention Act is being operated in the various States. In the absence of these things, the mere statistical data as to why the detenus have been kept in detention and how many, does not help us very much in applying our minds to review the work of the Government.

38 R.S.D.—3

And the Government, as far as I know, are in possession of all the charge-sheets and of all the representations made by the detenus on this. Therefore, I request him through you, before the discussion comes up, that such material should be supplied to us so that we can effectively participate in the discussion.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: It is rather an unusual request, Sir, for this House to convert itself into some kind of a Supreme Court of Appeal or Court of Revision over the Advisory Councils and see that all these charge-sheets come before them. The hon. Member suggests that evidence should be placed before him. I do submit that it is quite extraordinary. This procedure would be a very improper precedent to establish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I never thought that I was making an extraordinary suggestion. I thought that we were to go into this with the necessary material. Nor did I for a single moment think of becoming the Supreme Court or some such thing. After all, we are Parliament—representatives of the people—and we should like to know how the Preventive Detention Act which affects the rights and liberties of the people is being worked in the country. These materials are necessary for that purpose, in order to bring our wisdom to bear on the subject. That is all that we want and I do not think the Prime Minister is right in thinking that I am making an extraordinary suggestion or trying to create a precedent, an impossible precedent, in this House.

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA NOTIFICATION REGARDING RESERVE BANK OF INDIA (NOTI:—REFUND RULES, 1935)

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under the proviso to section 28 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, a