

[Shri Dharamrao Afzalpurkar]

Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Central Sales Tax Act, 1956.

(ii) EVIDENCE

**SHRI DHARAMRAO AFZALPURKAR** : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Evidence (Volumes I & II) given before the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Central Sales Tax Act, 1956.

**WILD LIFE (PROTECTION) BILL\***

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (PROF. SHER SINGH)** : Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the protection of wild animals and birds and for matters connected therewith or ancillary and incidental thereto.

**MR. SPEAKER** . The question is : "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the protection of wild animals and birds and for matters connected therewith or ancillary and incidental thereto."

*The motion was adopted*

**PROF. SHER SINGH** I introduce the Bill.

**SEEDS (AMENDMENT) BILL\***

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE)** : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Seeds Act, 1966.

**MR. SPEAKER** : The question is

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to amend the Seeds Act, 1966."

*The motion was adopted*

**SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE** : I introduce the Bill.

12.47 hrs.

**CONSTITUTION (THIRTIETH AMENDMENT) BILL**

**THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE AND PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI H R. GOKHALE)** : Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

The Bill proposes to amend the Article 133(1) of the Constitution in order to do away with the value of the subject matter of dispute as a criterion for exercise of the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in civil matters.

The minimum limit of Rs. 20,000/- mentioned in clause (a) of Article 133(1) was fixed in 1950 at the time of passing of the Constitution. In 1969 it was felt that in view of the change in the value of the rupee, the limit was too low and the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should not be invoked unless a larger amount was involved. A Bill proposing to raise this limit to Rs. 1 lakh was introduced in 1969 in the Rajya Sabha. The then Law Commission was consulted about the Bill and the Commission even at that time felt that it was some what inappropriate that cases whether fit or unfit for consideration of the Supreme Court should be allowed to go to the Court merely on the basis of the value of the property in dispute. The Law Commission then took the view that appeal should lie only on a Certificate of fitness granted by the High Court under clause (c) of Article 133(1) and that clauses (a) and (b) may be deleted. The Bill, however, was passed by the Rajya Sabha in August 1970. The Bill lapsed as the Lok Sabha was since then dissolved.

The Law Commission was thereafter again consulted. In its 44th Report, the Commission recommended that an appeal should lie to the Supreme Court only if the High Court certifies that the case is a fit one for appeal to the Supreme Court. According to the Law Commission, the valuation test discriminated unfairly between