

I would beg of the House once again not to connect this Resolution or this discussion with any warlike preparations of any kind or form, which might mislead others, for that is not the object. I should like this rifle training and these rifle clubs, even if there were perfect peace and contentment in the country, and we were on the friendliest terms with everybody in the world at large. Even then, the establishment of these rifle clubs is necessary for the proper building up of the youth of India.

I would not take the time of the House any further. I would accept the amendment moved by my hon. friend Shri S. C. Samanta, with the addition that he has made to the same.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: I have got only a few words to say. I am very glad that the hon. Minister of Home Affairs has given a very generous approach to the entire problem, and that he is anxious to accept the more comprehensive amendment that has been given notice of by Shri S. C. Samanta. I would therefore not press my Resolution.

But I may say that I was amused to hear our esteemed friends Shri Khardekar and Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy; the one advocated militarisation, while the other advocated sterilisation.

An Hon. Member: Moralisation.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: With these few words, I beg to withdraw my Resolution, in view of the assurance that the amendment of Shri S. C. Samanta is to be accepted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must keep the Resolution.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: But the amendment is going to be accepted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may say that he is accepting the amendment.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: I have already suggested that I am accepting the amendment, and I am not going to press my Resolution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the amendment of Shri S. C. Samanta to the vote of the House. If that is accepted, the original Resolution will go automatically.* The question is:

That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that with a view to inculcate discipline, marksmanship, initiative and leadership in the youth of India, Government should immediately provide all proper and practicable facilities to rifle training institutions in India."

The motion was adopted.

6 P.M.

RESOLUTION RE WITHDRAWAL
OF CADETS FROM THE NATIONAL
DEFENCE ACADEMY

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed to discuss the Resolution of Sardar Hukam Singh. The time-limit is one hour. It will finish at 7. How long does the hon. Member propose to take?

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala—Bhatinda): Half an hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he himself takes half an hour, then what about the Government?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Shahabad South): What about others?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I will be very brief.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Fifteen minutes. He may take as long as he wants to take. But we have fixed one hour.

An Hon. Member: Fifteen minutes will do.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): I would suggest that the hon. Mover may take 15 minutes, then 15 minutes for the Minister and the rest for others.

*Other amendments were deemed to have been negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Immediately after the hon. Mover concludes. I will call upon the hon. Minister to speak. Let us see what the reaction of Government is. Then we shall proceed.

Sardar Hukam Singh: There was a provision, Sir, that an additional half an hour would be allotted, if necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of five Members of Parliament be appointed to examine the system of withdrawal of Cadets from the National Defence Academy and to suggest remedial measures where withdrawals during the last two years have been found to be unsatisfactory".

This is a Resolution of very great importance. It might be said others are of no less importance. But I feel so because this national institution of ours at Dehra Dun is performing a very heavy responsibility and it is the concern of everybody without affiliation of any party so that they must be interested in the progress that it makes or the way in which it functions. I am glad to find that besides myself, there are several Members in the ruling party who have given notice of the same resolution.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: This expression is distasteful. We are all servants.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Therefore, I am gratified to find that even Congress Members—some of them—have given notice of the same resolution. Now, he ought to be satisfied.

That encourages me in my conviction that this Resolution is of very great importance.

It would be, I should say, known to every hon. Member of this House how difficult it is to get admission to the National Defence Academy. There is a complicated procedure followed for the admission of cadets. In the first

instance, a candidate or applicant has to appear before the Public Service Commission in an all-India competition. After he is successful there, he is produced before the Services Selection Board. This Board, I should say, consists of various experts in every line and men of mature judgment. Some psychiatrists are also associated in that interview, who even claim that they can find out and judge the hidden qualities of a cadet as well. The Services Selection Board examines the quality of leadership and the personality of a candidate in all respects and tests the candidate in all manners humanly possible. At least this is the claim that they make. In short, the Selection Board has to assure itself and give a verdict that the candidate possesses all the qualities that go to make an officer in the Indian Army. During this process of interview that is held there, the candidate is subjected to great hardships and difficult tests—physical as well as mental. Sometimes it has been found that in those physical exercises and physical tests several candidates broke their limbs and bones as well. Government are aware of that because they get an undertaking from the candidate that if such a thing happens, then certainly Government would not be responsible for any compensation for the injury that the candidate receives during those tests. It is not only a theoretical provision there, but it has been found that several persons there have received injuries, because that was a condition and never has any compensation been claimed. Above all, after the candidate has stood those tests—first, of the U.P.S.C., and subsequently of the Selection Board—he is put before a medical board and after satisfying itself in all respects the medical board gives a certificate to the effect that that person, that candidate, is fit for service in the whole world.

From this it will be clear how complicated is the procedure and what checks over checks are put before admission is granted to a candidate who wants to seek it in that institution. It

will be better, I suppose, if I read some portions from the *Defence Science Journal* where there is an article by Dr. Sohan Lal, Chief Psychologist, Ministry of Defence. He has said about these admissions:

"A careful examination of this system of selection reveals that the written examination aims at measuring a candidate's abilities developed by the exercise of cognitive powers. The interview, on the other hand, attempts to assess the personality traits of the candidate by observing his behaviour pattern in the interview situation and interpreting it in the light of the biographical data obtained during the interview...The introduction of psychological techniques in the process of selection is a development of this system."

Then he has further to remark:

"In 1941, Britain had evolved a system of selection for officers in which psychological techniques were employed. It was an improvement on the old American method used in 1917 inasmuch as it measured the intelligence of the candidates and also assessed their personalities. This method was adopted after suitable modifications for the Indian armed forces in the year 1943."

For the tests that are applied, he has to say:

"There is one disadvantage in the formal interview, namely, that it may not be possible during the short time available to the interviewer to be able to pierce through the masked behaviour of a candidate".

Now they claim that by the present method even 'masked behaviour' is revealed.

"The basic personality of a candidate can be seen either by a trained eye or by putting the subject under an emotional stress or by administering Projection Tests".

Then about these Boards as well, he says:

"There are three methods of assessing a candidate's personality. The first is the method of formal interview...The second is that of putting a candidate in situations which are mainiatures of those which he is likely to come across during his service career ...The third is the method of using the projective technique... A list of qualities of personality has been prepared. This has been arrived at by condensing the opinions of over 250 senior officers of the Indian Army with regard to qualities which, according to them, an average officer should possess."

The object of my reading these passages is to demonstrate and to show clearly how difficult tests are applied there and every caution is taken to see that really the candidate possesses those qualities that are required of an officer who is to be in the Indian Army. Finally, when he concludes the article, he says:

"It will be noticed, therefore, that there are so many agencies connected with the selection procedure that the chances of any irregularities being practised unnoticed are very small. The number of checks under which the system works ensure the greatest measure of fairness that is possible in human affairs".

When this might be the case, one wonders how it is that after so many checks and so many tests we find—when the candidate is admitted and he has been there for, say, two or three years—instances where those candidates have been withdrawn, asked to leave—rejected. And the chief ground given was that it was found that the officers did not possess officer-like qualities. Now, it is a very vague term. It is very difficult to assess, at least for others, whether really that was the case and those persons did not possess those qualities which were required of an

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

officer in the Army. When once we find that these candidates were tested and found, by the Selection Board applying all those tests that human agency can devise, to possess all those officer-like qualities and, if after some time the duration in some cases is even two years or three years—the training authorities in the Academy come to the conclusion that these very persons lack those qualities which go to form an officer, then we certainly come to the conclusion that either the original tests were defective and the claim that is made by the Government on behalf of those Selection Boards is very tall or.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the percentage of persons so rejected?

Sardar Hukam Singh: That would be for the Minister to say because I have not been able to find out exactly the percentage. But, at the other place, the Minister was pleased to remark—I read—that it would not be more than 2 per cent. I read that in a debate, when Pandit Kunzru took up that question in a speech he made in the Council of States, he said that he was astonished to find that people were being rejected after 20 or 25 months of training. We can only conclude

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has a Committee been appointed?

Sardar Hukam Singh: If you want me to take it up now, I will do so.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As the hon. Member likes.

Sardar Hukam Singh: A Committee has been appointed because there was a discussion. But that is a different Committee. That was on the 14th of November, 1953. The Committee has been appointed and Pandit H. N. Kunzru is the Chairman of that Committee. The terms of reference are to find out whether the assessment of the cadets to the training at the National Defence Academy and the corresponding institutions in the Navy and Air Force is fair and reason-

able, and whether there is any scope for improvement with a view to reduce the number of rejections. The object is to find out whether the method is sound and fair and, if it is not, whether there is any possibility or scope for reducing these rejections. It has been admitted even by the Government that there are rejections and they should be reduced somehow. But, my purpose would not be served by that resolution.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): That at least shows the vigilance of the Government.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I congratulate the Minister for Defence Organisation that he is so vigilant that even my remark gets a quick reply.

My point is that that resolution does not fulfil the purpose that I have in mind because, I want, in addition to that enquiry and assessment, that cases where the Tribunal or Commission that is appointed find that within the last two years—it will not be possible for that Commission to come to any conclusion until they take up individual cases—on account of the whims and caprices of certain officers, certain cadets have been withdrawn and there has been some unfairness or injustice to them, they should have the competence as well to set them right. That is the object of my Resolution. If the Government are prepared to add that term to the original terms of reference that they would be competent to go into that question as well and set right those cases where they come to the conclusion that the rejections or withdrawals were not correct, then my purpose would have been served. Of course, I have asked for a Parliamentary Committee. That can also be done by having one or two Members added. Even if the Government thinks that there is no need to have any other Member, then too, I would not persist. But the terms of reference should include that, when they come to the conclusion that there has been in-

justice done in some cases, then, certainly, they should have the right, the authority and power to set those right. That is the main difference between my Resolution and the terms of reference of the Committee appointed by the Government.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Then this would become a permanent committee, which it is not.

Sardar Hukam Singh: It should be a permanent committee. Pandit Kunzru also took objection to the Director of the Defence Academy being allowed to remain there because he was a foreigner. Of course, we might require some foreigners to continue for some time simply on the ground that he is a foreigner. But, when for our Commander-in-Chief we can find an Indian, there is no reason why, so far as training is concerned, we should not have any Indian, who could be entrusted with this job of training the cadets in the National Defence Academy. We have also heard that instead of taking action in that respect the Government has been pleased to give an extension to that gentleman against whom many complaints are coming out.

Now, reverting to my own Resolution again, I have this much further to say that after the tests by the Selection Boards—for whom the Government claims perfection and spends lakhs of rupees on advertisements and films that they have got this perfect system of selection—we fail to understand what there is that results in the complaints that trainees are being withdrawn or rejected after undergoing so many months of training.

If the first system has any defects, then that should be amended. But, if we claim, as the Government does, that that system is perfect so far as is humanly possible, then we have to see what other defects there are that these training authorities find two or three years later that these cadets lack officer-like qualities. My first objection is this. These candidates are sent to the Academy for training. The selection is made by the U.P.S.C. and

the Selection Board. They have selected those candidates. It is for training that they are entrusted to the Academy. They have to train them and not to carry on fresh selections, and say this one we will have and that one we reject. It is not the business of the National Academy to scrutinise at a later stage that this boy does not suit the purpose that he has to serve. The selection has already taken place.

The second way of thinking is that these are persons who have been given permanent commissions. Among the professors or teachers who are in charge of this training, we have a number of temporary Commissioned Officers and Emergency Commissioned Officers—those who were themselves considered not fit for permanent commissions. It would certainly be a queer thing to entrust these boys to those persons who could not get permanent commissions themselves. That is another anomaly that exists.

The third thing that I came to know of is that there were some members of the staff who had come from the State Forces. I have nothing particular to complain against the State Forces. Of course, when the integration took place, there was a test applied to them. But that test and the passing in that test does not mean that those State Force Officers have passed through the original tests that are required to be undergone by these cadets. They had never an opportunity, in the Princely States, to undergo those tests. They may be good soldiers or officers who may go and work in the field. They might have some practical experience. But in this National Academy they have to teach the cadets things which they never learnt themselves. Therefore to put persons—a few they may be, but that does not matter—who never had such training and who cannot see into the character or hidden qualities of the cadets, in charge of the training of the cadets is something that looks odd to me at least.

Then there are relegations also. This works very hard on the cadets

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

of the National Defence Academy. For after some time even though it is found that the boy has made up for his deficiency, he loses his seniority and is put behind by about six months. When the boy is found to have come up to the standard expected of him, at the time of his commissioning his seniority should be fixed in relation to his date of enlistment in the Academy.

The other complaint is that when a cadet is relegated there is no arrangement for special coaching. He is left to himself. If in the course of training, boys are found who are not able to keep pace with their colleagues, they should be given special coaching in the subjects in which they are found to be deficient. This is a complaint which is very often made, and I suggest the committee, if one is appointed, should go specially into this aspect of training.

I do not for a moment vouchsafe for the correctness of all my statements; nor do I say that everything I say is correct. I have nothing personal against any individual officer, or member of the staff whether he be a foreigner or one of our own countrymen. But it is commonly alleged that the whims and caprices of subordinate staff do play a great role in these relegations and rejection. The officer at the top may be all right, but there is the danger of the likes and dislikes and small prejudices of persons in charge of the training of these cadets, especially those who themselves did not have such training, affecting such rejections and relegations. Even if there is the slightest element of truth in these allegations, it is but fit and proper that an enquiry is made and things set aright.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East cum Ballia Distt.—West): Will it not give rise to a spirit of indiscipline?

Sardar Hukam Singh: Then, Sir, when after two or three years of training a cadet is rejected, though he may

have enlisted himself only for the army, a certificate is issued that he is not suitable for any of the armed forces. This is another matter which has to be seriously looked into. The candidate enlisted himself only for the Army and the test applied at the Academy was whether he would be a suitable officer for the Army. I fail to see why the certificate should extend to the other wings for which he was never recruited and for which he was never trained. This certificate bars the entry of the cadet to other branches as well.

Then again when a candidate is put on the warning list and is to be rejected he is at once deprived of his uniform, even before the order of confirmation comes from the Minister of Defence Organisation, or whoever else might be the deciding authority. Soon after the recommendation of rejection is made the cadet, a young man who had a brilliant future before him, is deprived of his uniform and subjected to indignity. This humiliates the cadet and demoralises him. The authorities at the Academy should at least wait till they get approval or confirmation of their recommendation, before they punish the cadet and deprive him of all the privileges and concessions that he was enjoying. But even before they get the approval from above action is taken against the young man and for two or three weeks the cadet is kept like a criminal and subjected to an ordeal. This has a great demoralising effect on the boy, as even to affect his future. Not only is it a punishment of the cadet but also of his parents who have spent so much money on his education and have also entertained high hopes that he would turn out to be an officer.

It is therefore very essential that we should find out whether the drawback is in the initial selection. If it is so we have to remedy it. If it is found that the defect is not in the initial selection, there should be something wrong with the training, be-

cause in the course of two or three years it is found that certain qualities which we adjudged to be in the candidate have evaporated!

This is a serious matter and should be gone into thoroughly and at least the cases of rejection that have taken place during the last two years should be enquired into.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: How many cases have happened?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I am not aware of it: perhaps the hon. Minister to tell us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will place the Resolution before the House.

Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of five Members of Parliament be appointed to examine the system of withdrawal of Cadets from the National Defence Academy and to suggest remedial measures where withdrawals during the last two years have been found to be unsatisfactory."

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): On a point of Order, Sir, is this an administrative matter to be corrected or rectified by a Resolution?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not see any point of order in it. The House is always competent to give its own opinion and call upon the Government to take a particular course of action.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): It is only a point of disorder.

The Deputy Minister of Defence (**Sardar Majithia**): Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity of intervening in the debate at this early stage, because I feel that there are quite a number of misunderstandings and I should like to remove them at the earliest opportunity.

To begin with let us consider the problem of rejection of cadets. Let me first take, as the hon. Member put it, the rejection rate. I shall give the House our figures and also of the

various other countries of which we know.

I should like to start off with America first. At West Point the percentage of withdrawals is 12·3. At the Naval Academy, again in the United States, it is 12·73. In the Netherlands Armed Forces it is 18 per cent. In Belgium it is 17·5 per cent. At Sandhurst, that is England, it is 8·7 per cent. And at Kingston it is 40 per cent.

Sardar Hukam Singh: May I make a request? It would be very helpful to the House if the hon. Minister also gives the period during which these withdrawals have taken place after their admission to the institutions.

Sardar Majithia: If the hon. Member will bear with me for a moment I will give all that. Well, this was during the last three years, the average of the last three years.

Now I would like to come over to our own country. In the first J.S.W. course the percentage of withdrawals was 5·8; in the second course it was 11·7; in the third course it was 7·1; in the fourth course it was 3·0; in the fifth course it was 3·8; in the 6th course it was 5·2; and in the 7th course, which was from 14th January 1952 to the end of 1953, it was 3 per cent.

Now, these are of the Joint Services Wing. These withdrawals, as you will see, Sir, are very very low as compared to the other countries which have had such a lot of experience.

Apart from this I would give the House further figures. The hon. Member was confining himself particularly to the army. I will now give the House the percentage of withdrawals at Dehra Dun, that is in the Military Wing of the Academy. In the second course the percentage was 3·6; in the third course it was 3·3; in the fourth course it was 4·4; in the fifth course it was 4·9; in the sixth course it was 6·6; in the seventh course it was 4·2; in the eighth course it was 1·5; in the ninth course it was 6·1; in the tenth course it was 2·4; in the

[Sardar Majithia]

eleventh course it was 4·7; and in the twelfth course it was 5·7. These again, are very much lower than the withdrawals in the other countries.

The hon. Member made out that the selection is very severe. It goes to the credit of the Government that they have got a system by which they pick up cadets and later on they do not have to suffer from their being not fit enough. There is a small percentage which has to be thrown out. Mostly they get their commissions. It will not be out of place to mention the system now.

To begin with, the Services Selection Board has been mentioned. I have not only seen it working but am intimately connected with it, and I should like to say that the tests which are given to the candidates in Selection Boards have a scientific basis. Every effort is made to check up on the candidate. We see his potentialities and we do give due allowance for his immaturity. It is not that we judge him from the officer like qualities which we expect from the officers. We see that he has the potential to develop those officer like qualities; and that is what we look for. Later on, during his training period, if we find that that particular candidate has not developed what we expected him to develop, we have to throw him out.

It will be quite pertinent here to mention how many people have been thrown out due to this lack of officer like qualities. I will again go back to the figures, and the House will perhaps be surprised to know—because the hon. Member made out such a case for it—that in the first J.S.W. course out of 190, two cadets were thrown out for lack of these officer like qualities. In the second course, out of 111, again, two cadets were thrown out—which means just two per cent, while in the first case it was one per cent. In the third course, out of 98, one was thrown out. In the fourth course, out of 101 none was thrown out. In the fifth course,

out of 183, three were thrown out. In the sixth course, out of 174, two were thrown out. In the seventh course, out of 163, one was thrown out. In the eighth course, out of 202, two were thrown out. In the ninth course, out of 215, three were thrown out. As regards the tenth course which was the last course I have not got the figures.

All this will conclusively prove that rejection is not done at the whim of the instructors. It is really after giving the cadet every possible opportunity, when we find ultimately that he has not got in him what we had expected from him, when he went through the Selection Board, that we are forced to say good-bye to him.

It will not be out of place, again, here to say that this action of sending a cadet away is not taken by the J.S.W. or the Defence Academy. Each and every individual case comes up to the Ministry through the various people and ultimately it is the Minister of Defence Organisation himself who goes through the case, satisfies himself that it is really a fit case, and it is only on his finally saying so that a cadet is withdrawn; not before that. Therefore, that particular reference which the hon. Member made does not have any real justification.

The hon. Member, again, mentioned that the cadets lose quite a bit. That is not correct, for the simple reason that if the individuals who are withdrawn have done two years in the Academy, they are as good as intermediates although they were matriculates to begin with. Therefore, the two years which the hon. Member thinks they have lost, they do not lose; because they go back to the college and continue with their studies without any loss of years. We are at the moment approaching the Universities to grant year to year recognition: in other words, if a person has done one year he should be treated as equivalent to his having completed the first year; and if he has

done two years then he should be treated as an intermediate etc. so that that particular boy will not lose on that account.

He definitely does not lose financially, because that is where the Government comes in. All the expense on his training is borne by Government; it is at government expense, which is quite high, and he is not asked to reimburse the Government. So whatever education he gets, whatever discipline he imbibes, whatever personality he develops is all at government expense and is to his credit side and not debit side.

Again, I should like to mention that the Government considers life a very precious thing, particularly of the young men of our country. We do not treat them so lightly. Obviously, they are very precious to the country and very precious to their parents as well. It is with due regard to these that we ask them to go away. To give you a couple of examples Sir, I would take the case of the Air Force.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A committee has been appointed to look into this matter. This is only a consequential one. In case in one out of hundred cases the committee finds the withdrawal was incorrect, then what happens to that. That is the simple point in this matter, I think.

Sardar Majithia: I am just telling you what the hon. Member is doing by suggesting such a measure. I will give you the case of one cadet.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will assume that there is a hypothetical case....

Sardar Majithia: Why hypothetical? I can give you half a dozen cases with very serious consequences, where even one boy lost his life because we persisted in giving him flying training and ultimately the plane crashed and he killed himself. That is a serious loss. How can you say that a cadet should be continued even if you find that he cannot do the job? That, incidentally, takes me to the other question.

Shri Aigu Rai Shastri: May I with your permission seek some information from the hon. Minister?

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरे देशों का उदाहरण आप ने दिया कि जहाँ पर विद्वानों का परसंटेज हिन्दुस्तान से ज्यादा मालूम होता है, तो क्या वहाँ पर पालिया-मॅटरी कमेटीज कोई हैं कि जो उन विद्वानों को स्कुटीनाइज करती हैं ?

सरदार मजीथिया : कोई नहीं हैं ।

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : बस, इस मामले पर ज़रा प्रकाश डालिये, क्योंकि जो इस तरह का विचार कर रहे हैं, ऐसी कमेटी अप्वाइंट करने का, तो इस का नतीजा यह होगा कि हम बहुत आरम्भ में ही उन के फौजी जीवन में बहुत ज्यादा डिसेन्शन पैदा कर देंगे और यह उचित नहीं होगा ।

Sardar Majithia: The hon. Member is quite right. In no other country are there Parliamentary committees of that type. As I was saying, the hon. Member raised the point that we throw the fellow out and he has got no place to go. It is not the case. In case a person is found unfit to make the pilot's grade, he is certainly considered in the Air Force for the navigation side. In case we find him lacking there, he is again considered for other services and due consideration is given. It is only if we find that he cannot fit in anywhere, that we have to part company, and only then it is done. Quite a lot of cases, as I said, were brought up by Members of this House to the notice of the Minister for Defence Organisation. He again recalled those papers, went through the cases very carefully and it was found that the decisions arrived at were correct.

Apart from this, the hon. Member has put up various points about the hardships and injuries. I should not like to dwell on that because I consider that there are no hardships. After all, when you are selecting

officers, you have to get the best from the material that is available to you.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I did not complain of hardships.

Sardar Majithia: Well, I am glad that the hon. Member agrees that we should not relax the standards. For another reason too; we have studied this question very thoroughly and we have found that it should not be so. I will give you another case in which the pass percentage was rather high. In other words, possibly, the instructors were not so 'harsh', as the hon. Member would call it. We found that when border line cadets went on to the Service, the number of accidents in the case of Air Force in that particular lot was very much higher than in the case of others. That again shows the necessity of checking up at every stage.

Apart from this I would like to make one point more, and that is that the Academy cadets are not treated lightly.

An Hon. Member: What about the Army?

Sardar Majithia: I am coming to that. The care given to their training, as the hon. Members know, is very great. To begin with, a cadet is watched by his platoon commander. He is further watched by his company commander. He is again watched by his battalion commander. Then on top of that his commanding officer is watching all the cadets. It is not that one officer gets a funny notion about a particular fellow and he is chucked out. A particular defect must be present in him, noticed by all the instructors, not by one but by so many instructors; not only that, in various ranks right from platoon commander up to the commandant who is a Major-General. It is checked up by all of them and if all of them agree, it is only then that they recommend to the Ministry and the Minister of Defence Organisation that the fellow is fit to be withdrawn. It is only under these circumstances that we do withdraw him.

A word must also be said about the Kunzru Committee to which the hon. Member has made a reference. It is on the cards that the Committee is going round visiting places and collecting evidence. We have in certain cases caught hold of cadets who were being thrown out and we did ask them if they had any complaints. I am glad to say that they have, without exception, said that they had a fair chance and that they really did not have the talent in them and that was why they were thrown out. Individual cadets are asked by the Commanding Officer if they have any suggestions or complaints. They have said that the instructors are very good and that they have nothing to complain about. But, I should like.....

Sardar Hukam Singh: The cadets who have been thrown out have no complaint, but I have a complaint.

Sardar Majithia: Unfortunately, the hon. Member does not know the conditions.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I never claimed to know them.

Sardar Majithia: The hon. Member knows only one side of the picture. Only if you had cared to come and check up, you would find for yourself that the system evolved is very very fair and just and that it is the best that we can have. The results have proved that the system is working efficiently. Of course, there can be exceptions. The hon. Minister is there always to check up and see the instances of injustice whenever they are brought to his notice and remedy them. After all, he can do that. I have taken quite a lot of your time. I am very grateful to you and I should not take any more. With these remarks, I hope the House will be satisfied. I therefore oppose this Resolution.

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South): I shall not take much of your time because the Mover has already explained all the circumstances about the selection as well as training of the cadets. He has also placed before you the cases in which the National

Defence Academy trains cadets and after 2½ years rejects them. I have also given deep consideration to the hon. Deputy Minister's remarks and I find that he has given very careful consideration to the points that he has submitted. But, I wish to tell you that he has forgotten that the very appointment of a Committee and the opening words of the Resolution of the Ministry of Defence clearly prove that the reactions of the Officer cadets were not on these lines. The Resolution says:

"New Delhi, 14th November, 1953.

....To advise the Government of India on matters relating to the rejection of Officer cadets during their training at the National Defence Academy....."

The words that the Committee has been appointed about the rejection of the cadets clearly mean that some reports are certainly in the possession of the Ministry of Defence which go to prove that there were certain defects somewhere and therefore the Government was forced to appoint a Committee. The terms of reference also show that. The same thing is repeated here also:

"Is the method of assessment of cadets during the training within the National Defence Academy and in the corresponding institutions of the Navy and the Air Force sound, fair and reasonable?"

That means that there is some doubt in the mind of the Defence Ministry that the method of assessment was defective, that it was not sound, fair and reasonable. Then it says:

"Is there scope for improving with a view to reducing rejections?"

I submit that these words are very important. If my hon. friend the Deputy Minister is satisfied that as compared with other nations, two per cent. or one per cent. is quite satisfactory, where was the necessity for

placing these words in the terms of reference:

"with a view to reducing rejections"?

Sardar Majithia: We would like to reduce it as much as we possibly can.

Shri Dhulekar: If two per cent. or 1 per cent. is quite satisfactory, why should you reduce it? If it were 18 per cent. or 20 per cent. certainly you may reduce it. When the hon. Deputy Minister says that it is quite satisfactory, why appoint a Committee. Where is the question of going into all this investigation, going round the country and spending good money for reducing the rejections which are only 2 per cent., and 1 per cent. I submit that the very position taken up by the Defence Ministry in this case is not correct. I would certainly not insist upon the appointment of a new Committee. I have certainly got a Resolution, but I shall request the Defence Minister that when a Committee has already been appointed to reduce rejections, that Committee may also be instructed to go into the cases over the last two years and if there has been any injustice in any case, that cadet may be re-taken. I do not at all mean in any way that assessment should not be made properly, that no rules should be there, but the very appointment of the Committee means that there have been some injustices, some irregularities, and therefore, if some people have been the victims of these irregularities, then that must be set right. So I hope justice will be done by expanding the terms of reference to this extent only that those cases in which some irregularities have been found, in which people have been thrown out without reason, may be considered sympathetically. That is my submission.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): I am glad that this Resolution has come and the Government is in the position of clarifying the issue. In fact, Mr. Dhulekar's objection seems to be on the very

[Shri Tyagi]

face of it, quite relevant. He says unless there was something wrong, why did the Government appoint a Committee? I confess it is my mistake, because, as I was receiving proposals of relegation...

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt. —South): Is the mistake to appoint a Committee or to have found the fault?

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: To appoint the Committee it seems.

Shri Tyagi: As I was getting complaints about these cadets every time because no action could be taken unless the Government gave their final decision, as I got one after another a few complaints, I and my colleagues objected as to why they should be turned out after they have received two years' training.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: It was very hasty.

Shri Tyagi: It was the very sentiment which my hon. friend Sardar Hukam Singh has put before the House, and my other friend too. Biassed by these very considerations we went on discussing with the headquarters. They tried to justify their position. We felt it was justified. But then we wanted to further investigate into the matter and find out if these relegations and rejection could be avoided. For that purpose the Committee was appointed.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri Weak-kneed policy.

Shri Tyagi: We took pretty good care to see that a non-Government Member of the Parliament sits as Chairman of the Committee. We took Dr. Kunzru who is known for his great interest in Defence matters and his judicious mind. He is also an educationist. There are other educationists also. They sit on the Committee and report to the Government as to whether the system is really defective. Because the Committee has been appointed, it is not a proof of the fact that there is any defect already existing. The only point is that

the Government wanted to be doubly sure that these rejections are done on a fair line and they add to the health of the Armed Forces and do not dispel people from coming into the Armed Forces.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Frank admission.

Shri Tyagi: One point, however, may be realised by the House. If individual cases of rejection are to be looked into by a Committee of the House, it will be a bad precedent. I must say, because the House will then sit in judgment over decisions of the Ministry on cases of dismissal of those who are not Government servants yet, because those students are still students. They are simply selected. They are selected not for service yet. They are selected to deserve coming into that institution for training.

Then, the training is given, as my colleague has already said, at Government expense. We train them, and they do not lose any year of their education, because, even after two years' training, if they have passed in academic subjects, practically all the Intermediate Boards and Universities have agreed to take these boys back in the third year because they have finished two years here.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Are all cadets students from colleges?

Shri Tyagi: Yes. After two years are finished and they have passed in academic subjects, they are recognised as having passed the Intermediate examination of the Universities of India. It is recognised by the Union Public Services Commission, by the Home Ministry and by the Universities. They can go and join any college in the third year and pass their B.A. examination after two years.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): Since when are these concessions given?

Shri Tyagi: I think they have been there for some time past, at least before I took charge these concessions were there. They are there at present. There was one concession lacking, because the boy who was rejected in the first year, after passing his first year, was not taken in the second year by the colleges. That is one defect which still exists: the colleges would agree to take the student in the third year course, only if he has undergone two years' training. But if a boy has left his training after one year, then, of course, the colleges would not take him into the second year, which they should do. About that proposal, we are still considering, and we shall see to that even those boys who give up the training after one year do not lose any year of their college career.

7 P.M.

I submit once again that the boys are educated not at the expense of their parents, but at Government's expense. We are spending for them, and we are giving them full education—and perhaps better education—which they would otherwise receive in the colleges. That being the case, the choice must of course remain with Government as to which of them they should take, and which of them they should not, because they are not even apprentices. In the case of Government servants, who are taken on probation, in the case of probationers, Government are not required to give any reason before they are discharged. If Government are not satisfied with the work of any probationer, he is given no notice, no chargesheet is needed, no inquiry is needed, and neither does the House care to know how many probationers Government have not confirmed or have taken into regular service. I would submit that it will be going too far if Parliament were to inquire into these individual cases.

I submit that everybody should realise and I hope my hon. friend the Mover of the Resolution realises it perhaps more than I do—that we

should not do anything which will weaken the armed forces. There are matters of discipline on which some people are charged, and our army officers from one end to the other have already judged each case, and after that Government also have judged these cases. If they are to be reopened, I am afraid, the officers at the helm of affairs in the armed forces will lose quite a lot of their prestige. While justice is done to all officers, I as a Minister have taken particular care to see that the prestige of the Army Headquarters, the Naval Headquarters, and the Air Headquarters, is not in the least diluted. The prestige of the Commanders-in-Chief of these armed forces must be above all things. Since they have taken decisions about the cadets, I believe perhaps it will be too small a matter for my hon. friend to press for the holding of an inquiry into each case. I would prefer very much his co-operation into an inquiry into the system, because that will deal with the policy in this regard, and any suggestion on a question of policy will always be welcome.

I can only assure this House and my hon. friend the Mover of the Resolution that as we have taken pretty good care, we shall not sleep over it, but every case will continue to be still further thoroughly examined. I am very hopeful that the Committee which is presided over by Dr H. N. Kunzru will give us some further information on this point, and I hope that things will go well, and there will not be many complaints. I do not think I have to say anything more except that I appeal to the sense of patriotism of my hon. friend not to interfere with the armed forces.

Sardar Hukam Singh: I would like to put only one question to the hon. Minister. If the hon. Minister or Government themselves have appointed that Committee by mistake or otherwise, I presume that in order to come to a finding, they shall have to go into individual cases. Supposing they come to a decision that in a

[Sardar Hukam Singh]

particular case, justice was not done and that the withdrawal of a candidate was without ground, then shall there be any authority either for this Committee or for the Minister, after such a conclusion is arrived at, to set it right? That is the very simple question I would like to put, leaving aside the question of appealing to my patriotism. If the House feels that it is not in the interests of the country, I am not particular to press my Resolution. Once the Committee has been appointed, let that Committee remain. But if that Committee comes to a conclusion that in some particular case, the withdrawal was not justified, is there any remedy provided with the Committee or with the Minister or with Government to set it right?

Shri Tyagi: The Committee is not going to look into individual cases. As I have suggested, the Committee will inquire into the method of selection and into the method of rejection. They will also see on what basis they are rejected. They will look into a few cases of the past also to make up their minds as to whether the manner in which they were rejected should be pursued in future or not. Therefore, they will give us their recommendations as to in what manner we should, in their opinion, assess the capabilities and efficiency of the cadets who are educated there. I am sure their recommendations will be of great value and Government will take advantage of them for future guidance. But surely

they are not going to sit in judgment over the cases which have already been gone into and approved by Government.

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : इस कमेटी को इन्डिविजुअल केसेज में नहीं जाना चाहिये ।

Sardar A. S. Saigal: Sir, through you, may I ask a question from the hon. Minister—whether the recommendations of the Committee which has been appointed will come before the House?

Shri Tyagi: Sir, I will see what the recommendations are. I cannot give an undertaking. But may I again assure this House that I sit in this House as the agent of the House? I am absolutely in their hands and unless there is anything which goes against the security of the country, I have little objection in putting my papers before this House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, is it necessary to put it to the House?

Sardar Hukam Singh: I would like to withdraw it.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House now stands adjourned till 2 P.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Saturday, the 6th March, 1954.