

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have Government cared to find out the names of those who had booked and the names of those who had actually travelled within the period referred to by the previous questioner, Mr. Bhargava?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He wants to know whether they have cared to find out and Mr. Bhargava was saying that they should find out.

SHRI B. BHAGAVATI: Tickets are issued only to persons who actually travel.

*939. [The questioner (Shri B. N. Bhargava) was absent. For answer, vide cols. 5382-5383 infra.]

OFFICERS IN RAILWAY PROTECTION FORCE

*940. SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH: Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

fa) the number of Class I, Class II, Class III and Class IV officers in the Railway Protection Force;

Ob) whether they are classified as 'Public Servants'; and

(c) if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY) j (a) The number of officers in the Railway Protection Force, class-wise is as follows:—

Class I	...	25
Class II		97
Class III		2,423
Class IV		46,674

(b) All members of the Railway Protection Force come within the classification of 'public servants' and have to be treated as such.

(c) Does not arise.

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH: May I know whether it is a fact that only when an enquiry is on that these people are treated as public servants and not always?

SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY: By the very nature of their work, they will come within the definition of a public servant under the Indian Penal Code.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: May I know what they are expected to protect?

SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY: The property of the railways and the property entrusted to the railways.

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH: May I know whether Government is aware that unless there is a fault against a particular person who is on duty he is not regarded as a public servant and is treated as an ordinary man?

SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY: Is it a hypothetical case or has he got any practical case in which case, he may refer it to me and I shall look into it.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: May I know how many of these security officers had been serving formerly in the army and were taken over by the Railways?

SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY: This is a large question and I would require notice.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: May I know whether there is any difference between the Service Conduct Rules of the employees of the R.P.F. and other railway employees?

SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY: They are governed by the R.P.F. Act and the rules made thereunder.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: May I know whether there is a large number of retired Government officers who have been put in this R.P.F. to

man the services and whether year after year their terms have been extended?

SHRI S. V. RAMASWAMY: I refute the suggestion that there is a large number of retired officials. There are one or two—a few cases—and for special qualifications we have taken their services in the R.P.F.

*941. [The questioner (Shri V. M. Chordia) was absent. For answer, vide col. 5383 infra.]

APPLICATION OF INDIAN FOREST ACT IN HIMACHAL PRADESH

♦942. SHRI SHIVA NAND RAMAUL: Will the Minister of FOOD AND AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Himachal Pradesh Administration has applied the Indian Forest Act, 1927 in Himachal Pradesh and declared all private forests in the territory, particularly in the district of Sirmur, as "protected Forests";

(b) whether it is a fact that after the passage and enforcement of the Himachal Pradesh Private Forests Act, 1954, the operation of the Indian Forest Act was not repealed; and

(c) whether it is a fact that the rules in force in the erstwhile Sirmur State were adopted for the enforcement of the Indian Forest Act and 50 per cent, of the sale proceeds were collected by the Department from the owners of the private forests?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI RAM SUBHAG SINGH): (a) No. Only the *zamindari* and *mush-tarka* forests of Sirmur district, Himachal Pradesh have been declared as protected forests under Chapter IV of the Indian Forest Act, 1927.

(b) Yea.

(c) No. The rules for governance of *mushtarka* and *zamindari* forests were framed and notified under the Indian Forest Act, 1927, by the Himachal Pradesh Administration vide Notifications No. Ft. 29-241/B/49-1 and Ft. 43-24/B/49-2 dated the 25th February, 1952, which do not differ much from the rules framed by the erstwhile Sirmur State for the management of these forests. Action is, however, being taken by the Himachal Pradesh Administration to cancel the above Notifications issued under the Indian Forest Act, 1927, so as to bring these forests under the purview of Himachal Pradesh Private Forest Act, 1954. 50 per cent of the sale proceeds from *zamindari* forests were realised by the Administration for the improvement of these forests.

SHRI SHIVA NAND RAMAUL: May I know, Sir, why, after the passage of the Private Forests Act, 1954 in the Himachal Pradesh Legislature, the Indian Forests Act, 1927 was not repealed and the Private Forest Act, 1954 enforced in Himachal Pradesh, particularly in the district of Sirmur?

SHRI RAM SUBHAG SINGH: Actually there was not much difference between the two Acts—the Indian Forest Act, 1927 and the Himachal Pradesh Private Forests Act, 1954. However, we have now advised the Himachal Pradesh Administration to issue a notification to that effect.

SHRI SHIVA NAND RAMAUL: The hon. Minister has just stated that there is not much difference between the Himachal Pradesh Private Forests Act and the Indian Forest Act. Is it not a fact that the Indian Forest Act is applicable only to the waste lands and forests owned by the Government and which are the property of the Government and not any private property, unless they are required specifically for some important public utility purposes?

SHRI RAM SUBHAG SINGH: Yes; Sir, I do recognise the force of the question but, as I said, action is now