

could not be done because it was against the policy of the Government.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: In view of the oil find at Cambay, is it not very urgently necessary that the opening of a refinery near about Gujarat should be considered, whether in the private sector or in the public sector, at a very early date?

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: Although oil has been found in Cambay, enough oil has not been found in Cambay to justify the immediate consideration of any proposal, whether in the private sector or public sector, to institute a refinery there.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I think the Minister has misunderstood. I did not say that enough oil has been found for a refinery. The proposal for a refinery at Cambay in Gujarat or Bhavnagar is independent of the oil find. The oil-find is an additional reason for establishing another refinery there. That is my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a question.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I was trying to explain to you that he misunderstood my first question. My ques'ion is this. Is not the oil-find an additional reason for going ahead with the plan for a refinery in Gujarat early, whether in the private sector or public sector?

SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: If and when adequate quantity of oil is found in Cambay, it will surely be an additional reason to consider the proposal for setting up a refinery.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing more. It is a stalemate.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: One last question. Is it the policy of the Government to allow refineries to foreign interests in the private sector and not to Indian interests.

I SHRI K. D. MALAVIYA: No. The policy of the Government is not to allow. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Say just W. Do not say more which will bring other questions. Next question.

COMPENSATION PAID TO FORMER INDIAN PRINCES FOR THEIR PALACES

•468. SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL. Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the rate of compensation paid to some of the former Indian princes for their palaces and other properties has recently been revised; and

(b) if so, in how many cases such revision has taken place?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR) : (a) The Government of India have not made any such revision.

(b) Does not arise.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know whether the palaces of former Indian princes enjoy certain prerogatives in the matter of taxation?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: There were certain concessions regarding their properties in general, in palaces, etc. They are independent questions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know whether such palaces are included for the calculation of wealth tax on princes, if any?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I should like the hon. Member to ask this question of the Finance Minister. He would tell it more authoritatively.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: May I know whether any decision or settlement has been arrived at regarding the Falaq Numa Palace at Hyderabad about which negotiations have been going . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are going away from the question. The question is whether there has been any revision of the Indian Princes' allotment. That is how the question started. Then he went on to ask what about their properties and their wealth tax. Now you are coming to a specific palace in Hyderabad and asking whether something is happening or not.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: It does relate to the palace of the erstwhile ruler about which negotiations are going on between the Government of India and the erstwhile ruler of Hyderabad.

SHRI B. SHIVA RAO: May I know if the Home Ministry or the Ministry of Housing is supplied with a list of palaces which are either unoccupied or partially occupied and which the princes themselves are willing to place at the disposal of the Government at very reasonable rates?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: That is an entirely different question. Certain lists are submitted, and Government then take some of them for rent, and in other cases whenever an offer for purchase is made, that question is independently considered.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know whether it is a fact that negotiations are in progress with the Central Government with regard to some of these palaces—general question—with regard to some of these palaces for being taken over by Government on rent or by purchase, and if so, how many palaces are affected by such negotiations already in progress?

SHRI B. N. DATAR: I am not in a position to give the figure at present.

SHRI B. P. BASAPPA SHETTY: May I know whether these palaces have been constructed at the cost of the Government or at the cost of the princes? If they are constructed at the cost of the Government, why not Government take possession of the

palaces and locate Government offices there?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have taken the Raj Bhavans. (No reply.)

*469 and *470. [The questioner (*Dr. R. P. Dube*) was absent. For answers, vide cols. 2598—2603 infra.]

f [POSSESSION OF SPEAR, SWORD ETC. IN DELHI AS UNLAWFUL

दिल्ली में भाला, तलवार इत्यादि का रखना गैर-कानूनी

*४७१. श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान :
क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या यह सच है कि दिल्ली क्षेत्र में भाला, गुप्ती व तलवार इत्यादि का रखना कानून के विरुद्ध है ? यदि हाँ, तो किन-किन ऐसे अन्य हथियारों पर पाबन्दी है ?

*471. SHRI NAWAB SINGH CHAUHAN: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the possession of spear, sword-stick and sword, etc., is unlawful in Delhi area? If so, what are similar other arms on which there is restriction?

[THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N. DATAR): Yes; possession of all these and

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय के राज्य-मंत्री (श्री बी० एन० दातार): जी हाँ; यदि १९५१ के इंडियन आर्म्स रूलज के मातहत लाइसेन्स नहीं लिया है तो इन नियमों के दूसरे शिड्यूल की तीसरी एंट्री में बताये गये हथियारों के अलावा दिल्ली में ये सब हथियार और इसी तरह के दूसरे हथियार रखना गैर-कानूनी है।

similar other arms except those mentioned in entry 3 of Schedule II to the Indian Arms Rules, 1951 is unlawful in Delhi, except under a licence granted under the said Rules.]

t[] English translation.