

491 *St. correcting reply to USQ* MAY 7, 1985 *St. correcting reply to USQ* 492
 1085 dt. 26-3-85 re. *Industrial Units lying closed in W.B. and steps to reopen Nationalise them*
 1161 dt. 26-3-85 re *Management of the sick Industries taken over by Govt.*

(a) whether prosecution cases were initiated against some foreign companies for offences committed under the Companies Act during the last three years ;

(b) if so, the number of prosecution cases initiated against such foreign companies during the past three years 1982, 1983 and 1984 as compared to the prosecution cases initiated against such companies in the preceding three years 1979, 1980 and 1981,

(c) the number of such prosecution cases against decided and the total fines imposed on such companies ; and

(d) the number of prosecution cases against such foreign companies pending as on 31st March, 1985 ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN) : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) to (d). The information will be collected and laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT CORRECTING REPLY TO U.S.Q. NO. 1085 GIVEN ON 26-3-1985 RE. INDUSTRIAL UNITS LYING CLOSED IN WEST BENGAL AND STEPS TO REOPEN NATIONALISE THEM

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN) : In answer to part (d) of the Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1085 on the 26th March, 1985 the reply was given as under :

“(d) No such general stipulation has been made. However, whether pre-takeover liabilities of any unit proposed to be nationalised by the State Government have to

be protected by them would depend on the nature of such liabilities.”

In view of the clarification given by Ministry of Finance that the pre-takeover liabilities of banks and financial institutions are to be protected at the time of nationalisation, the answer to part (d) of the Question may please be corrected as under :

“(d) Whether pre-takeover liabilities of any unit proposed to be nationalised by the State Government have to be protected by them would depend on the nature of such liabilities.”

The error is regretted.

STATEMENT CORRECTING REPLY TO U.S.Q. NO. 1161 GIVEN ON 26-3-85 RE. MANAGEMENT OF THE SICK INDUSTRIES TAKEN OVER BY GOVERNMENT

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN) : In answer to part (a) of the Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1161 on the 26th March, 1985 the reply was given as under :

“(a) In principle, pre-takeover liabilities of a taken over industrial undertaking, which are the liabilities of the company, need not be protected by the Government. However, the question as to whether pre-takeover liabilities should or should not be protected in specific case depends on the individual merits of the case, depending on the nature of the liabilities.”

In view of the clarification given by Ministry of Finance that the pre-takeover liabilities of banks and financial institutions are to be protected at the time of nationalisation, the answer to part (a) of

the Question may please be corrected as under :

“(a) The question as to whether pre-takeover liabilities should or should not be protected in specific case depends on the Individual merits of the case, depending on the nature of the liabilities.”

The error is regretted.

— — —

[English]

12.00 hrs.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar) : Sir, in today's newspapers, we have read a news item.

MR. SPEAKER : What is it ?

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : It is a very serious matter.

MR. SPEAKER : What is the matter ?

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : It is a very serious judgment of the Supreme Court and this judgment is a** (*Interruptions*). It has** the whole judicial system. There is an attempt to ** the whole judicial system. Sir, it is a very important matter.** He was appointed during the Janata Party Government. He has been delivering such judgments. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : I have to make it clear.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : He was also appointed by the same process. This House must express concern over this ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I am on my legs. Please sit down. Please take your seat.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Idukki) : Why are you getting angry ?

MR. SPEAKER : I am getting angry because you must sit down when I am on

my legs. I would like to make it clear to the House time and again that there are definite rules and we must pursue them. I must make this clear to you (*Interruption*). Please sit down. Why don't you listen to me ?

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : Sir, why are you talking like a school headmaster ? We are Members of Parliament.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : You can request us and we will always obey you.

MR. SPEAKER : It is because you don't listen to me that I have to shout.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : Don't treat us as school children.

MR. SPEAKER : We are always students throughout our life. I am myself a student. I will always remain a student.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN : So am I.

MR. SPEAKER : You are a Professor. So, you must be a student first and then afterwards you can become a professor. If you don't learn that, you will never become a good professor, either.

I shout because you just don't listen to me. It is abhorrent to me to shout, but I have to make myself heard. One thing is sure that we must know what the rules are. The President, Governors, Chief Justice or other Justices of the High Courts, whatever they are... (*Interruptions*). I am making it clear so that it will not be difficult to understand each other. I have read that judgment.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : The judgment can be discussed in the House.

MR. SPEAKER : Let me explain. I have read that judgment.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : It is not a judgment, it is only an observation.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, it is not a judgment.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : Before you make your observations, please listen to us also.

MR. SPEAKER : I am not allowing a debate on this. I must understand. You must talk to me first. I think better we have a discussion in my chamber first about what we are discussing, because I will be constrained to refer to an earlier decision, because earlier also when certain points were made by you, I told you that Rashtrapati's name and his office cannot be discussed on the floor of the House. It is so clear.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : Mr. Tewary was referring to some other persons.

MR. SPEAKER : He was referring to certain other people. *(Interruptions)*. Earlier also I said that the name of Rashtrapati cannot be brought into the discussion on the floor of the House. I said that even if a reference is to be made to the person to whom you referred, it has to be found out whether we can discuss that without implicating the President's office. So, I want to make myself clear. I have read those observations. I have read your adjournment motion also, Professor.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I want the conduct of the Government to be discussed in the House.

PROF. N.G. RANGA (Guntur) : Sir, how are we to understand what you are saying when so many members are allowed to interrupt you so often ?

MR. SPEAKER : That is why I wanted to shout. The only thing that I wanted to say is that these observations contain

certain references to Government as well as to certain people who are in the highest places and whose conduct cannot be discussed... That is what I am saying. I have read it. These references or observations by Supreme Court judges refer to certain people also. They are also in the high positions. I cannot delink them. That is why I want to have a conclave in my office ; first we discuss it and then I will see to it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Why do you want to seek our help privately ? Let it be public.

MR. SPEAKER : It cannot be done.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I want to seek clarification of what you have said. Firstly, I fully agree with you ; we have got Rule 353 of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha and Article 121 of the Constitution, and taking all that into account, we cannot cast aspersions, and at the same time persons in the highest authority cannot be discussed, but I will give you a precedent. In the Fifth Lok Sabha when the supersession of judges had taken place, my motion under Rule 193 on the supersession of judges was discussed in this House and the debate went on for six hours. I only want to tell you that the highest judiciary in the country, leave aside others, has cast strictures on the policy of Government with regard to appointment of judges... *(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : I cannot allow you like this. You are not listening to me.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : You do not allow the procedure to be discussed in the House ; it will set up a precedent. I agree with you, but let me complete my submission. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Tewary, now again Shri Kurien will say that I am shouting. What the hell am I to do ?

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : If you sit down, I may reply. Let me hear him, then I shall reply. Why do you interrupt? Now you may sit down.

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : When you have allowed me to seek clarification, please protect me from Shri Tewary of all the Members.

MR. SPEAKER : He is your friend.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Now I am on my legs. Listen to me. Professor Sahib, you are insistent.

(Interruptions)

[English]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I fully agree with you, but let me complete my submission.

I do not want to divert from the main issue. I fully accept your contention; it is consistent with Article 121 of the Constitution and Rule 353 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. My only contention is that though we cannot cast aspersions on persons in the highest authority, we can discuss the failure of the Government to have healthy norms in appointing the judges of the High Courts and Supreme Court, so that freedom of the judiciary can be ensured.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : Do not record; I will give my ruling. I will not allow him to go on record. You do not know what you are doing. Please take your seat. I am giving you the clarification.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Before completing my submission, I want

**Not recorded.

to say two sentences more. I was saying that in the Fifth Lok Sabha, under Rule 193 I had initiated a discussion on the supersession of the judges and the failure of the Government and there was a debate on that. (Interruptions). Allow us a discussion on the failure of the Government in having healthy norms in appointing judges.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : You have not understood. This is what I wanted to discuss with you. There is one point in this observation which I did not want to point out. Now let me say. You have compelled me to say this. You have said that they had stated that it was on someone's recommendation or according to some such policy that such judges had been appointed, they were psychopants or this or that.....(Interruptions).....

MR. SPEAKER : You just listen to me. After all they too must have been appointed by someone. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER : This does not appear proper.

[English]

This is a negative approach... (Interruptions)...

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Then nothing will be done anywhere. People have elected us. Someone has to appoint someone. Someone must have appointed someone else. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Neither have Government parachuted down from above, nor have they themselves come down by parachutes. They are the sons of this land and we too are the sons of the same land. There is no point in it. They have not come from the skies.

[English]

There is nothing separate for them. (Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
Sir, you do not realise what you have said. You cannot describe judiciary like that. You cannot equate judiciary with...
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I have not said anything. (*Interruptions*) I am not equating anything. I am only saying that the people of India have not parachuted down from above. We are all born of mothers and we are all equally good.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : If the Government commits some blunder, we can have a judicial review. We can go to the Supreme Court. Supreme Court is on a higher pedestal.....

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : (*Interruptions*)...
When did I say so. I have not said so.

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
As far as Government is concerned,
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I have never challenged the authority of the Supreme Court. I have always kept them on a very high pedestal. That is what I have always said.... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
Kindly go through the record.

MR. SPEAKER : I will see if there is anything wrong. I have never said any intention. I only said that if one judge can be..... (*Interruptions*) That is what I said, because you asked me. I am stating this. (*Interruptions*) I am checking it. I will check it up. There is no problem. I have only said that all are human beings. They are prone to be erratic certain times and they can be prone to making mistakes because to err is human... (*Interruptions*) There is no problem.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
You said that they have not parachuted down from the heavens. You said that. To say that the judiciary has not parachuted down from the heaven is casting aspersions.

MR. SPEAKER : I am telling about all. That is what I have said.

(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : I have not said about anybody in particular.

...(*Interruptions*) ..

[*English*]

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Do not say about the judiciary.

MR. SPEAKER : I have not said that. I have said that nobody has come down. We are all people of this land. We are all equally good and equally bad. No question of casting aspersions... (*Interruptions*) Please listen to me. I am the last person to cast aspersions on a judiciary of which we must be proud. I am the last person to do it. I have always held that we are complimentary and supplementary to each other. These are my observations always.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
When you go through the record.....
(*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : Listen, someone has appointed them. They say that sycophants have been appointed as judges. They too have been appointed by someone. It can apply to any one. It does not appear to be proper.

[*English*]

No problem. I will go through it...
...(*Interruptions*)...

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER : If you had discussed the matter with me, the issue could have been settled.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER : That is what I said. I do not want this thing to be done... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing to go on record which is objectionable.

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : In the Fifth Lok Sabha, we have discussed the failure of the Government. We want it to be discussed.

MR. SPEAKER : That is why I asked you to come to me... (*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : We should be allowed to discuss the failure of the Government... (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : You can come to me... (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

If you could have discussed the matter with me the issue could have been settled. (*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

SHRI AMAL DATTA : (Diamond Harbour) : You must not have preconceived notions that we are going to discuss the Supreme Court and the judiciary.

MR. SPEAKER : I would like you to discuss it with me first. If I am satisfied, I will consider.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : We will discuss it. Don't disallow it.

MR. SPEAKER : I always keep things open.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I take it that without reference to the higher authority, discussion on the merits of the matter is not ruled out.

[*Translation*].

MR. SPEAKER : It has never been that way, there is nothing new to-day.

[*English*]

It is always done. No problem.

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ (Bara-mulla) : Despite a peaceful *bandh*... (*Interruptions*)**

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed. Irrelevant. Now one by one.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA (Bankura) : I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : What is your point of order ?

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : A senior scientist of Defence is missing for the last six months. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Order please. We will see to it. You give me notice. No problem.

(*Interruptions*)**

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed. Not allowed. Don't shout like this. It is all right. You give it to me.

(*Interruptions*)**

SHRI S. M. BHATTAM (Vishakapatnam) : I have to make a submission to you. When you have allowed other people to talk, why don't you allow me to talk ? I am not prepared to sit. Either you allow me to talk, or I will record my protest. You cannot shut out the main Opposition from speaking.

Why do you do that ? (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you getting agitated ? You will get your chance.

SHRI S. M. BHATTAM : Please give me chance.

MR. SPEAKER : If you are going to do like this, then I am not going to call you. I told you. I am coming to you.

SHRI S M BHATTAM : Why do you shut me out ? You have not allowed me. I have given you a Motion. You should give me an opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER : It does not matter. What do you mean by shouting ? What do you get by shouting ? I have already told you that I am coming one by one. You are becoming irresponsible.

SHRI S. M. BHATTAM : I am very responsible.

MR. SPEAKER : Then behave responsibly.

SHRI S. M. BHATTAM : You cannot shut out the Opposition Members who have been duly elected.

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you doing like this ? I told you : I am coming to you. I do not understand what this man is doing. He seems to be a reasonable person. It is he who is shouting. Not I. People do not realize it : if you can threaten the Chair, you can threaten anybody and that too, in a most irresponsible manner. I am not going to stand any threat from anybody whatsoever. I can respect your rights. I am listening to you, and I am coming to you. I have told you that after Mr. Reddy, I am going to call you.

SHRI S. M. BHATTAM : I am waiting from the beginning.

MR. SPEAKER : It does not matter.

SHRI S.M. BHATTAM : I am waiting from the beginning.

MR. SPEAKER : What does it matter ? Mr. Bhattam, you must realize on thing. You must take it for granted once and for all. I am not going to stand any threat whatsoever, even to my life. You are an hon. Member ; you are a friend. But if you threaten me, threaten my life, I damn care about it because life is God-given. Just understand it. I never stood any threat in my life. The hon. Member is doing it ; he is threatening me. I am an honourable person. I am telling you that I am coming to you; one by one. I am coming to you. I said that after Mr. Reddy, I would come to you.

Yes, Mr Bhattam. Now I call you

SHRI S M. BHATTAM : The point is this. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Bhattam is a new-comer.

PROR. K.K. TEWARY (Buxar) : May be a new-comer. But he should learn the rules of the House. (*Interruptions*) He is getting ** He is suffering from ** Some sensible person from that side should get up and apologize to you on his behalf.

SHRI S.M. BHATTAM : The point is very clear. I make a submission.

I saw you, I presented a motion and it is before you. This morning I presented my point of view also. You permitted Mr. Tewary to raise a point and not only that ; he was also permitted**

He went on saying something. This is a matter which I strongly

**Not recorded.

protest and we should not allow this forum to be used to condemn the judiciary.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Bhattam, You are going on...I said, we will discuss.

This man is going on...

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Now, listen to me. You did not hear what I have recorded here. I have said that anything objectionable is not form part of the record. That is what it is, if you have listened to it.

SHRI S.M. BHATTAM : Is it objectionable or is it not ?

MR. SPEAKER : You were furious, a few minutes ago, and if that was to go on record...?

SHRI AMAL DATTA : What he has said is Correct there is nothing wrong in it.

MR. SPEAKER : When I say it, why should you got agitated ?

When I said I have closed the subject, I was to talk to you in the Chamber. I was going to talk to you in the Chamber. That is what we decided.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I am the only person to listen. You are thirty persons who are speaking. I am the only person on the one side and there are thirty people on the other side.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE : The Speaker will always be one.

MR. SPEAKER : I am always one.

SHRI S.M. BHATTAM : Does it go out of the record ? Is it expunged or is it not expunged, I want to know.

MR. SPEAKER : How many times do I have to explain that if there is anything objectionable it will not go on record ?

SHRI S.M. BHATTAM : Is it found objectionable or is it not found objectionable ?

MR. SPEAKER : I will see that is what I have said.

SHRI S.M. BHATTAM : You reserve your ruling.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Mr. Speaker, this man is dictating terms to you. Just by throwing a few tantrums he cannot dictate terms to you.

MR. SPEAKER : Nobody can dictate terms to me.

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : He is ** He is trying to be.....

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Tewary, nobody on earth can threaten me. I am fearful only of the Almighty. Nobody can threaten me in my life. I have never stood that thing from anybody.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY (Kurnool) : The unfortunate tempo of this discussion was created by Prof. Tewary himself.

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you bringing it again ?

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : I coming to the point.

He said that a particular judgement of the Supreme Court was ..

MR. SPEAKER : I have already closed the subject.

It is irrelevant.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Irrelevant. I have already discussed everything. It is alright. We will discuss it.

SHRI K.V. SHANKARAGOWDA (Mandya) : Sir I have got one submission to make. When we go wrong you have the right to stop us. When we make any unparliamentary remarks you have the right to chastise us. But whenever we get up to speak something, I do not understand the meaning of so many people from the Treasury Benches getting up all together and shouting.

MR. SPEAKER : You also talk to them. They are your friends.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You all have to understand one thing : That nothing is debarred from discussion from the floor of the House That is only a question of making this sort of thing for ten or fifteen minutes and... (Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHURY (Katwar) : Are you going to allow a discussion ?

MR. SPEAKER : I am keeping it under consideration. That is what I say. My mind is open, as it is always.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM PYARE PANIKA (Robertsganj) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have given notice of a Motion on a very important matter.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall look into it.

SHRI RAM PYARE PANIKA : At present There is a dangerous matter which relates to the tribals.

MR. SPEAKER : That is under my consideration. (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : It is not a subject for discussion here. We will see to it. No problem. This is not to be discussion like this. Not allowed. I am not going to allow any discussion like this. First I will see and then I will allow it.

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum) : I am on a point of order. Is it the right of the Government or the judiciary to take decisions on matters of policy ? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I have to see to it. We are going to thrash it out.

SHRI KAMAL NATH (Chhindwara) : Two days ago, there was a report in the press that the United States Congress wanted to again discuss an internal matter of ours. We have discussed this matter under rule 193...

MR. SPEAKER : What do you want me to do ?

SHRI KAMAL NATH : I do not think you have read it.

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : If some Tom, Dick and Harry say it, are we going to care for that ?

(Interruptions)**

SHRI THAMPAN THOMAS (Mavelikara) : Some uranium was found in Calcutta...

MR. SPEAKER : We will find out. These things are not to be done like this here. You have taken a wrong conception of this time. All of us must realise that there are certain norms. All this calling attention motions to be discussed and asked by the hon. Members to be

explained by me here—is it proper? You must be aware that calling attention motions are to be discussed. If they are important, you are always welcome to discuss and say that is important. I can realise the importance of each subject. I have never debarred any subject from discussion the floor of the House. The only question is availability of time. How much have we done? Every subject which you have mentioned, has been discussed. If 10 or 15 Members stand up and say: "My calling attention, my calling attention", that only means catching the eye of the press. That is what it is. There is a proper procedure laid down for this.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Whenever you ask anyone to make a statement, all others should keep quiet and maintain silence. That will solve the problem...

MR. SPEAKER : If that be done, I will also be saved?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : When you were in power they raised the same question. I cannot intervene in matters of State. You know it fully well. When you were in power, they were saying that rigging had taken place. Now, you are saying that it is anti-democratic. What can I do about it?

[Translation]

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ (Baramula): If we cannot raise the matter here then where else can we raise it?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : You cannot say.

[Translation]

PROF. SAIFUDDIN SOZ : At least during the zero hour...

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : There is no such thing as zero hour.

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER : Not a single word to go on record. Mr. Bhagat, you want to say something

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT) : Sir, with great respect I request the hon. Members, through you, to listen to me. I have observed during the last few days that the zero hour is turning into an angry hour. I read in a journal recently that the stars are so poised that the year 1985 is going to be the year of *krodhana* when people, nations, friends neighbours will be very angry with each other, and the advice was that the people should not be angry. When I found Prof. Madhu Dandavate also getting angry, I thought... (Interruptions). Only sometimes, no aspersion on you... (Interruptions). I would appeal to all sections of the House that they can raise matters but not in an angry manner which causes unnecessary strain to the Members of the House, to the Speaker. That is my appeal to all sections of the House.

MR. SPEAKER : Neither I get angry, nor Professor gets angry. It is only our misfortune that we have to shout at the top of our voice to make it heard. That is all. I have to make it heard, that is all. And I think my lung power has gone up quite a bit by that.

PROF. K K. TEWARY : Only angry postures, not angry... (Interruptions).

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura) : Sir, the appeal is very good, but the other day, in the presence of the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, Mr. Tewary went on interrupting during a Call Attention Motion... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : Now, papers to be laid.