

almirahs. You know what a bearer bond is. It came to be called a black bond. Now, this lying of these bonds in this fashion, in various banks, in relatively unguarded almirahs, is an open invitation to fraud because all that is required to convert these blank special bonds into valid special bonds is a rubber stamp and a signature. There have already been enough cases of fraud in nationalised and non-nationalised banks and in many cases it has not been found possible to convict the persons involved. In this situation if any shortfall is discovered at a later stage, there will be no way to pinpoint the culprit. I would only take one more minute to emphasize to you because this graphically puts across what the actual state is. Bank sources say, in one centre alone, in the State Bank of India's Parliament Street Office, blank bearer bonds worth Rs. 68 crores were lying in two almirahs. Bank officials also fear considerable confusion when in 1991 they would have to pay out more than Rs. 800 crores. This is the existing confused state of affairs. Now, unless the Government comes out with some way of staggering the payment, there will be total chaos in 1991. I am not exaggerating. The relevance of what I am trying to put across is also accentuated by the fact that some years ago it was discovered by a bank in Agra that Rs. 42 crores of unissuable notes had been eaten away by white ants. In view of all these various possibilities involving crores of rupees because bearer bonds are just like negotiable money, if they are lying in relatively insecure places, it is only right that I raise this matter of urgent public importance in the House in the expectation that the Government comes out with some kind of security measures in this respect.

RE. THE DELHI PROHIBITION OF EVE-TEASING BILL, 1984

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Venkatasubbaiah to introduce the Delhi Prohibition of eve-Teasing Bill...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): I have an objection, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I sent you my objection and I thought you had accorded your permission to raise it. My objection to this Bill is on two grounds: One is about the powers of Parliament to enact it. My second objection is on the very nomenclature of this Bill. I take serious objection to the nomenclature, 'Delhi Prohibition of Eve-Teasing Bill.' I might refer to the honourable Minister of State for Home as 'Adam' Venkatasubbaiah if man is referred to as Adam. I cannot conceive of why such an enactment should be brought into this House in this manner. It will become a permanent measure on our statute books. My objection is not facetitious. My objection is not light-hearted. I think the word eve-teasing is so derogatory. It has the supposition of all the wrong kind of things that are now attempted to be corrected. It is graceless. It lacks in style. It appears that the whole Bill has been framed or drafted by somebody in a hurry, late in the afternoon, when he was rushing to get back home. I take serious objection to the choice of the word eve-teasing. A much better, a more appropriate word, a much more comprehensive word, is harassment to women. It is only in this country that we keep on using the word eve-teasing? Do you use the word Adam-teasing? This is very substantial objection...

MISS JAYALALITHA (Tamil Nadu): I support the objection raised by Mr. Jaswant Singh...

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): We don't use the words Adam and Eve like this. It is an American slang.

SHRIMATI KANAK MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): I am thankful to Mr. Jaswant Singh that he has raised this objection.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Please reflect on this; Sheilaji is here. Sheilaji, please, even you reflect on this.

MISS JAYALALITHA: I wish to express my gratitude to Mr. Jaswant

[Miss Jayalalitha]

Singh, because he has raised something which we should have raised. He has done it on our behalf. I support his objection.

SHRIMATI KANAK MUKHERJEE: I also support it and the Hon'ble Minister should also support it.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): One point is about the legislative competence of this House. This is a Union Territory Bill and the House is competent to legislate so far as Union Territory matters are concerned.

About the nomenclature, the Metropolitan Council has passed this Bill with this nomenclature.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: We can improve upon it.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: "Eve-Teasing" is very currently used. If the Hon'ble Member can suggest any better name...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I have suggested. Right now I am suggesting that instead of calling it the Delhi Prohibition of Eve-Teasing Bill, why not call it the Delhi Prohibition of Harassment to Women Bill?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: That could be discussed when the matter comes up for consideration.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can give thought to it.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: In the meantime he can also suggest any other suitable word. About harassment we have already passed a Bill. Further it is a wider term. This is only for a limited purpose. If the Hon'ble Member can suggest any better word, we will have no objection to consider it.

SHRI R. MOHANARANGAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, 'harassment' will cover women of even 70 years of age. "Eve-Teasing" will not be applicable to them.

SHRI G. VARADARAJ (Tamil Nadu): What about harassment of men?

THE DELHI PROHIBITION OF EVE-TEASING BILL 1984

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): Sir, I beg to move:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to prohibit eve-teasing in the Union Territory of Delhi and to provide for matters connected therewith."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE COPYRIGHT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1984

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRIES OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Copyright Act, 1957, be taken into consideration."

Copyright protection in India is governed by our Copyright Act, 1957. India is a member of the two International Conventions on Copyright, namely, the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, 1971, and the Universal Copyright Convention, 1952.

Our Copyright Act was amended last year with the specific purposes of—

(a) incorporating a provision of the Paris Act of 1971, concerning grant of compulsory licences for translation and reproduction of foreign works required for educational purposes;

(b) providing adequate protection of authors rights; and

(c) removing the administrative drawbacks and other lacunae experienced in the administration of the Copyright Act, 1957.

During the passage of the Bill, Hon'ble Members had repeatedly drawn my attention to the problem of