

by many of the hon. Members in this House, then he should at least agree to this. Let there be a public enquiry into the whole thing. If there is a public enquiry by any duly constituted committee—let it not be a committee of Parliament Members—if that committee goes into the whole thing, it will collect a lot of material. That will focus public attention on the various complaints. That will arm public workers, social

workers, trade union workers, whether they belong to a particular party or not with sufficient facts, with sufficient knowledge of the conditions obtaining there. It will give the Government also sufficient material to prepare some legislation. Sir, I can withdraw this resolution only if a public enquiry is instituted, otherwise not. I am not going to withdraw this resolution only on the assurance that a departmental enquiry would be made, or some standing committee would be appointed for the purpose. I know the standing committees. I know the procedure of these committees. In the standing committees, these things will be taken up in a very circumscribed manner on specific complaints, and the question of all these technicalities will arise there. That will defeat, Sir, the very purpose of this resolution. As I have already said, Sir, I do not ask that all these things should be accepted on their face value, but I have tried to draw the attention of the House and of the Government to the necessity of an enquiry into the whole state of affairs in the plantations, so that things may come to light and steps may be taken accordingly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

“That this House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of members of Parliament should be appointed to enquire into the complaint by certain labour organisations in the plantations about interference by the management with their right of trade union activity.”

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION RE ENFRANCHISEMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS WHO HAVE COME OVER FROM PAKISTAN AFTER 25TH JULY 1949.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then we take up the next resolution. Shri S. N. Dwivedy is not here.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, I have been authorised by Mr. Dwivedy to move the Resolution on his behalf.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVARGIYA (Madhya Bharat): If the mover of the Resolution is not here, let it be taken up afterwards, because other movers are here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: According to the rules, if a Member other than a Minister, when called upon, is absent, any other Member authorised by him in writing in this behalf may, with the permission of the Chair, move the Resolution standing in his name. So, he has been authorised to move it, and I have permitted him to move.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Sir, with your permission, I want to move this Resolution with a small amendment in the date. Where it is said “January, 1950.” I want to substitute “25th July, 1949.”

Sir, on behalf of my friend, Shri Dwivedy, I move the following Resolution:—

“This House is of opinion that Government should immediately take necessary steps for the enfranchisement of displaced persons who have come over to India from Pakistan after 25th July, 1949.”

Sir, I shall not take much time of the House in elaborating this resolution, for the proposal embodied in the resolution is so eminently just that I believe that I have merely to narrate the facts to convince not only you, but the whole House, of the undoubted merit of the case that I am sponsoring today. Now, the position is this. Under article 5

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]
of the Constitution, conditions are laid down in regard to persons who would be considered as citizens from the commencement of the Constitution. And, article 6 refers to certain persons who migrated to India from Pakistan. And it is article 6 which is germane to my purpose. It says as follows:

"6. Notwithstanding anything in article 5, a person who has migrated to the territory of India from the territory now included in Pakistan shall be deemed to be a citizen of India at the commencement of this Constitution if—

(a) he or either of his parents or any of his grand-parents was born in India as defined in the Government of India Act, 1935 (as originally enacted); and

(b) (i) in the case where such person has so migrated before the nineteenth day of July, 1948, he has been ordinarily resident in the territory of India since the date of his migration, or

(ii) in the case where such person has so migrated on or after the nineteenth day of July, 1948, he has been registered as a citizen of India by an officer appointed in that behalf by the Government of the Dominion of India on an application made by him therefor to such officer before the commencement of this Constitution in the form and manner prescribed by that Government:

Provided that no person shall be so registered unless he has been resident in the territory of India for at least six months immediately preceding the date of his application."

Now, Sir, this provision is the reason why I have made this amendment in regard to that date, because the Constitution came into force on the 26th of January 1950, and six months' prior residence was necessary. That is why the migrants who came up to 25th July 1949, could take advantage

of the Constitution and became citizens.

Now, Sir, as is well-known, there have been large migrations, particularly from Eastern Pakistan to India. When the Constitution was framed, I believe that the Government had thought at that time that whatever migration had to take place had taken place, and that no large scale migration would take place after that date. That was true in so far as West Pakistan was concerned. All the people came away in one lot. There was a wholesale change of population. But that has not been so in Eastern Pakistan. People have been coming over from time to time. At certain times the flow has been stronger, and at other times it has been weaker. But it is continuing. In 1950, there was a very large migration. Then again there was a very large migration just before the passport was introduced, and it still continues. I think, Sir, that about 35 lakhs of people have come over from East Pakistan. The figures vary, because the Government say sometimes that the number is 25 lakhs, and sometimes they say that it is 30 lakhs. But I believe that it would be near about 35 lakhs, for which some indirect confirmation can be obtained from the census of population in Eastern Pakistan, because as between 1941 and 1951, the number of Hindus has decreased by about 40 lakhs, and taking into account the fact that some must have come between 1941 and 1947, we can say that round about 35 lakhs had come over after partition. In pursuance of the provisions of the Constitution, I believe, only between 10 and 15 lakhs could have taken advantage and become citizens, and the rest of the migrants could not become citizens because of the provisions of the Constitution. Of course, not all of them would be voters, but such of them as would be voters have been denied that privilege. I am sure that it is not the intention of the Government to deny these persons the privilege of exercising their vote. The reason why they are not able to exercise their vote is that under article 11,

no citizenship Act has yet been enacted, because article 11 of the Constitution says as follows:—

“Nothing in the foregoing provisions of this Part shall derogate from the power of Parliament to make any provision with respect to the acquisition and termination of citizenship and all other matters relating to citizenship.”

What I want to plead before this House is this. I do not know when this Citizenship Act will be passed or will be brought before this House. I do not know what the difficulties have been and what the reasons have been for this long delay. If there should be difficulties which have prevented the Government from bringing in that measure, all that I would like to ask of the Government would be to bring in legislation at least with reference to these displaced persons so that they would be enabled to exercise their votes. I do not want on this occasion to refer to the promises which the Congress had made to the people who were left behind in East Pakistan at the time of the partition when the Congress accepted the scheme of dividing India, but I am sure that the case which I am today advocating is eminently just, and I do not believe that the Government would ever argue to the effect that these people do not deserve to be enfranchised. They have come away from East Pakistan under very difficult circumstances. They are in very straightened circumstances in this country. It is a shame to us that we have not been able on the East Pakistan side to rehabilitate them, but let us at least give them the right of citizenship and the right to vote, so that they can choose representatives who will be able to voice their grievances. So, that in a nutshell is my case. I don't have to justify it. As I said at the very outset, the case is so palpably just that I merely have to narrate the facts of the case to convince everybody of its merits and I hope that the Government will accept it. If they are not bringing in a comprehensive Citizen-

ship Bill in the near future, I hope that they will take some steps to enfranchise these unfortunate people who have been forced to leave their properties and their homes in East Pakistan and have come away and are now permanently settled in India.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

“This House is of opinion that Government should immediately take necessary steps for the enfranchisement of displaced persons who have come over to India from Pakistan after 25th July 1949.”

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I don't have very much to say on this Resolution because this resolution is one which requires the support of everyone. There is no controversy about it. These helpless people who have come over from East Pakistan due to no fault of theirs are suffering from various difficulties, and it is a fact that as regards the refugees from East Pakistan, the work of their rehabilitation has not progressed at all satisfactorily. That has been admitted even by the Committee of Ministers and the Fact-finding Committee that went into the whole question. Now, the case of my friend, Mr. Ghose, or rather Mr. Dwivedy, is that these people should have the right to cast their votes, that they should be enfranchised. They had come from East Pakistan on different occasions due to the exigencies of the situation. There may have been difficulties, there may be difficulties, in preparing electoral rolls in the country including all these names, but this difficulty should not stand in the way of enfranchising these people. They have come here and they have been accepted as part and parcel of India. The whole country and the Government have accepted at least on principle the fact that the work of the rehabilitation of these people is a sacred duty entrusted to them. These people are a part and parcel of our country, a part and parcel

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]
of our flesh and blood, and so their disenfranchisement on technical grounds is something which I cannot understand.

Lastly, there is another aspect also to this matter. Large numbers of people today in our country cannot send as their representatives people from amongst themselves who know their conditions by being with them, by being acquainted with them, who know their sufferings, their appalling condition, their pangs of hunger, to the State Legislatures and to Parliament here, because they have not got the right to vote. Sir, this is a non-controversial question and I think the Resolution should be accepted by the Government.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, everybody must have full sympathy with the contents of this Resolution, and the object and purport that is behind it, but I may inform my hon. friend, the mover of the Resolution, that the Government has not as yet taken any action in this matter for the very simple reason that there is a constitutional difficulty standing in the way. That cannot be removed so easily.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: What is the constitutional difficulty.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I hope my hon. friend will give me time to explain the constitutional difficulty that I am referring to. These people, if you go into their history, were coming to India from Pakistan, then going back to Pakistan, and then coming back and again going back.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: May I interrupt him?

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Now, the stage has been reached when they have decided once for all to settle in India, but they do not become citizens of India by simply taking a decision. They are citizens of Pakistan, and therefore my point is that, unless we pass a Citizenship Act, that difficulty will remain. This was the constitu-

tional difficulty that I was pointing out.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: His statements are not correct. Firstly, they are not coming and going. Now, there is a passport system introduced some time ago. Secondly, they are not citizens of Pakistan any more. They have come over finally.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: But at present they are not citizens of India.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Nobody said that. They could not acquire it because there is no Citizenship Act.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Can he say that he is not a citizen of India?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I said nobody could acquire Indian citizenship today, because there is no Citizenship Act.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can reply to him later on.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am sorry that Mr. Ghose's impatience got the better of him on this occasion; in spite of the fact that I expressed my full sympathy with the object of the Resolution, he thinks that I am standing in the way of the enfranchisement of these unfortunate people with whom everyone of us has got complete sympathy, but the question of enfranchising them is not an easy question. You can't by a stroke of the pen or by an executive order give them the right to vote. So many preliminaries have to be gone through. The question has to be looked at from all angles and then a decision may be arrived at. If it was so easy as that, that might have been done long ago. So far as the correctness of my statements is concerned, I never said that they have been coming and going. I said that they had been coming and going but that they have now settled down in Indian territory permanently. That is the statement that I made. He has read my statement to suit his purpose.

As to the other point that they are not the citizens of Pakistan now, I say that if Pakistan does not own them as her citizens, it is not the fault of India. We have allowed them to stay in India—it was their home but at the same time their right of vote can be granted to them only when certain conditions exist, when the ground has been cleared and that ground has not yet been cleared and it is not the case of the East Pakistan migrants only. There are migrants from West Pakistan also some of whom at least are still coming and therefore they too are not getting any vote. So I don't see any necessity for this Resolution and much less, for its acceptance by the Government. I am very sorry that I have got to oppose this.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, as has been pointed out, this is an essential Resolution. The whole consequences of partition of India were accepted by the Congress and I feel that for our independence, we are greatly indebted to those people, to those Indians who have been left behind in Pakistan. It is the sacrifice of those people who have left their property and their homes in Pakistan that we have got freedom and it is but fair that we do justice to those people who have been left behind in Pakistan. What happened in West Pakistan? You know full well that in a short time, lakhs and lakhs of people had to migrate to India and likewise a smaller number had to go away from India to West Pakistan. All that happened in the first year of independence and therefore all those who came to India, got their enfranchisement. They became citizens of India in their own right. But what happened in East Pakistan? These people continued to stay there and went on suffering for our sake until they were simply squeezed out. When they felt that they could not honourably live in East Pakistan, only then they thought of migrating to India and they quietly came to India from 1950 onwards, in very large numbers so that their figure at present stands at about 35 to 40 lakhs. These

people have come to India and have been staying for five years in our country. What is their status? If they are not Pakistanis, they must be Indians, otherwise how are we permitting them to stay in India? By implication it is meant that they are citizens of India and if they are citizens of India, they have a right to be enfranchised, they have a right of vote. We are not doing as much for the refugees from East Pakistan as has been done for the refugees from West Pakistan. I must say that now every Indian feels happy in his heart of hearts that at least the refugees from West Pakistan are being rehabilitated, that some compensation is being paid to them but the lot of the refugees from East Pakistan is very bad. Therefore when a Resolution of this type is brought in, to say that we don't have a citizenship Bill, that the matter is not really urgent, is to say the least very un-reasonable. You don't think that five years is a short time to bring forward a Bill for enfranchising these people who have migrated from East Pakistan. You cannot imagine the suffering that they are bearing, they are being shunted from one refugee camp to another and kept in such conditions as to be intolerable for human beings. Under these circumstances, if we give some sort of a right of vote, at least they will have a forum for expressing their grievances and when they are settled in India, it is but right to make them Indian citizens. Sir, it has been stated that they have been coming and going. I may point out to you that as far as Hindus are concerned who have once migrated from West Pakistan, they never think of going back. They have not gone back. It may be that in the case of Muslims who went away in the first flush of enthusiasm for Pakistan from Calcutta, that they have come back to India but any man who once comes to India, never wants to leave it. It is our good luck and it is the good administration of our country that when one comes to our country, he does not want to go back. Therefore I submit that the case of these refugees from

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

East Pakistan is very urgent and they should be enfranchised as early as possible without even having a Citizenship Bill by passing a law that all persons who have migrated and settled down permanently in India should be considered to be citizens of India and have the right of voting.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab):
 Sir, I am sorry that a matter like this should be utilized for any propaganda purposes. This is not a matter for propaganda nor a matter for asking hon. Members to shed tears of blood at the suffering of the displaced persons. This is a purely constitutional matter and must therefore be viewed in the cold spirit of a constitutional lawyer, divorced, much as the hon. Members may not like it, from all emotionalism in regard to this matter. Let us be clear as to what my hon. friend really wants in respect of this Resolution. He wants that those displaced persons who have come over to India from Pakistan after the 25th July 1949 should be enfranchised. What apparently he means is this. Enfranchisement carries the meaning that they may have the vote at election times. What he really means is that they should be considered to be citizens of India. As hon. Members have said, we have no citizenship law at present but as you know, Mr. Deputy Chairman, article 11 of our Constitution stipulates that Parliament may at any time, at any suitable time apparently, pass legislation with respect to the acquisition and termination of citizenship and all other matters relating to citizenship. Now obviously we are governed by the Constitution as it is today and by means of a Resolution we certainly cannot change the Constitution as it is. What we can do is to direct Government's attention to the necessity of doing something which may be considered to be desirable. Therefore it is necessary to know what it is that they do wish the Government to do. There are, in my opinion, five categories of persons whose case must be considered by hon. Members in order to come to

a correct conclusion as to what is being demanded today. First of all, there are those who are covered by article 7 of the Constitution i.e., people who migrated from the Indian territory to what later became Pakistan territory and then came back and got themselves a certificate of permanent settlement here. They are considered as Indian citizens in spite of the fact that they migrated from Indian territory and went over to what later became Pakistan. That is one category. They clearly showed an intention of settling down in India. The second category is of those who, after July 1949, came over to India and they are considered to be citizens of India. The third category is the category that my hon. friend, in respect of this Resolution, is talking about. He wants even people after the 25th July 1949 who came over to India to be considered as citizens of India and there is another category—the category of those who are covered by article 8 of the Constitution according to which even persons who remained in a foreign country, would still continue to be Indian citizens if they registered themselves with the Consular or diplomatic authorities of this country in those countries. That applies equally to people in East Pakistan. If they remained and had the intention of remaining Indian citizens and had registered themselves with the Consular Authority in East Pakistan, they would still be considered Indian citizens.

These, Sir, are the categories. The question now arises, when the Constitution lays down these broad bases, how are we to alter these provisions, except by means of the Citizenship Act? I admit that there are cases, for instance, of people who have come and gone and have again come and gone from East Bengal into India and back. Cases of people who have come and gone from West Pakistan would be very, very few. Some few thousands who did not follow the exodus, have come over recently and have been coming over during these years. But the problem is not a

large problem there and the problem is essentially of displaced persons who came from East Bengal. All that we can at the present moment do without violating the Constitution is to bear this matter in mind—and I am quite certain that the wise statesman who sits over there and who leads this House now, that wise statesman will certainly bear this particular thing in mind—and at an early stage bring in legislation under article 11 of the Constitution, to ensure the rights of citizenship and define those rights as far as we are concerned, and at that particular moment it would be pertinent for my hon. friends to urge that these people who, because of *force majeure*, because of nothing that they did, but because of something that was outside their control, had remained in Pakistan and possibly accepted Pakistani citizenship at the time but unfortunately found things difficult and had to migrate into India, they should also be given Indian citizenship. Otherwise, it is quite clear that people who have not accepted Pakistani citizenship in East Bengal so far up to this date, but have registered themselves with our Consular Authority, would still be considered Indian citizens.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: May I point out, Sir, that under article 8, in order to be registered, the person must himself, or either of his parents or any of his grand-parents must have been born in India. But these were born in Pakistan and so they cannot be registered.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: My hon. friend is a clever lawyer and he should

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: No, no, I am not a lawyer.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: He is better than a lawyer and he should read the sentence carefully. Clever lawyers do read their sentences very carefully. Of course, the article says that they should be born in India, but it is India as defined in the Government of India Act of 1935 which

means the whole of India; it does not mean the part of India which was separated at the time of the partition. (*Interruption from Shri B. C. Ghose.*) I do not know, if my hon. friend is satisfied with that explanation. It is not mine, it is the explanation of the law-makers.

I do admit there is a difficulty, but I am quite certain that by passing this Resolution, we do not resolve that difficulty. We do merely, having tabled this Resolution, draw the attention of the Government to this particular difficulty which affects—I do not know what numbers, I have not the figures before me and I do not believe anybody else has got the figures of people who are likely to be affected. But I do hope that at the proper time they will bring in the citizenship legislation which will cover all such hard cases as have been pointed out by my hon. friend.

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT): Sir, I am sorry that one or two speakers quite unnecessarily made an attempt to import heat into this matter which is essentially of a constitutional character. So far as the general question of the displaced persons is concerned, I think the Government can take credit for what it has attempted to do, whether at the Centre or in the States, to alleviate their misery and to rehabilitate them. This is what was due by us and by the people of India. These unfortunate countrymen of ours had been put to unspeakable hardships and privations because of their innate allegiance and great affection for this country and it behoves us all to do whatever we can for their service, for their uplift and for their betterment. We have been acting on that principle.

So far as this particular legislation goes, I would be sorry indeed, if any of the displaced people were denied the right of having their names on the electoral rolls, because of any lacuna in the law. The present position has been stated almost correctly

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]
 by the mover. Under section 20 of the Representation of the People Act, the displaced persons who came to this country before the 25th July 1949, are entitled to exercise the right of vote. There is no provision with regard to such of the dislodged persons as may have come to India after that date. I think, under article 326 of the Constitution, all our elections are to be based on the principle of adult suffrage, that is to say, every citizen who is not otherwise disqualified would be entitled to have his name recorded on the rolls, if he is not below the age of twenty-one. One has to be a citizen in order that he may have this franchise. There is no citizenship law at present and we hope to place a Bill before Parliament shortly. I expect that when that Bill is brought before the House, all misgivings and apprehensions will be dispelled. I have already indicated my desire to do all that may be necessary in order to ensure the exercise of the right of vote by displaced persons who have settled in India permanently. It will be necessary to make a provision in the Citizenship Bill which will entitle the displaced persons to claim the right of citizenship and to be treated as citizens of India. I see no reason why they should not be so treated. As I have said, they have suffered in the process of the liberation of our country and their enfranchisement is essential from the political, from the national as well as from the humanitarian points of view. So, so far as the objective goes, there is no difference between us. So far as the means go there can be no difference too, we have to bring in some sort of legislation. The fear has been expressed that the citizenship law may take too long to get through the Houses of Parliament. If it comes to that, I think it will be necessary to devise some other measures in order to enable these people to record their votes. I am in sympathy with the Resolution. The word "immediately" has been used in it and I think what the mover means is that steps should be taken betimes in order to enable these people to

exercise their franchise at the next General Elections.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Yes.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Nothing more can be intended. Well, I agree to that principle. We should do that. I have no difference with the mover or with his supporters. I was, however, somewhat sorry to hear that the Congress was responsible for partition. Well, it can be said that certain people had been opposed to the great war of Independence that was conducted in a non-violent manner in this country while the second World War was in progress. So, if they mean to remind us that the Congress alone had the privilege of winning Independence for India, I am prepared to accept that tribute from them but perhaps they did not mean to indicate that much but that is the inevitable implication of what they said. However, that is beside the point. I am glad that the lacuna in the Resolution has been removed. It had referred to those who had come after the 26th January 1950. That would have left out the people who had come between the 26th July 1949 and the 26th January 1950.

I have explained my position. I have no objection to accepting this Resolution in the sense in which I have interpreted it. I imagine that I have not misinterpreted the intentions of the mover. If he agrees with me, the Resolution can be accepted; if he does not agree with me, then he has to explain his position as to where he differs. So far as I can see, I have left no room for giving him any cause for unnecessarily or wantonly disagreeing with me.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Sir, I entirely agree with what the hon. Home Minister has said. He has more correctly interpreted me than I could probably have done myself; but, there has been one confusion in his mind which I should like to remove and which has no relation to the content of the Reso-

lution. I believe I also stated that the Congress was responsible for the partition of India and I meant that then the Congress was the only organisation or party which could take a decision.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: You were in the Congress then. We were sailing in the same boat.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I was in the Congress then and I can say that I was one of the persons responsible for the partition of Bengal because I voted in favour of partition.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: And I hope you will also come in now.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I did so because I was a Member of the Congress Party. When I said 'Congress' I meant the country because the Congress represented the country then.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What about the Resolution?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: He has accepted his interpretation.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): I think the hon. Member may make that very clear.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: It can be accepted as it is.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I have accepted his interpretation of "immediately".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You accept the Resolution as it is?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that Government should immediately take necessary steps for the enfranchisement of displaced persons who have come over to India from Pakistan after the 25th July, 1949".

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE MEMORIAL TO KALIDASA

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय (मध्य भारत) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं हिन्दी में बोलूंगा ।

श्री उपसभ्यपति : जरूर ।

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Better speak in Sanskrit.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought that you will speak in Sanskrit.

श्री गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय : जो प्रस्ताव में नाम पर है उसको असल में मैंने हिन्दी में ही पेश किया था लेकिन उसका ट्रांसलेशन ही सरकारलेट किया गया है इसलिये जितना हिस्सा अंग्रेजी में सरकारलेट किया गया है उसका ही अंग्रेजी में पढ़ूंगा । प्रस्ताव जो मैं पेश कर रहा हूँ वह यह है :

"This House is of opinion that, with a view to commemorate Mahakavi Kalidasa and his immortal contributions to world literature, Government should—

(i) declare Kartika Shukla Eka-dasi as 'Kalidasa Memorial Day' to be celebrated throughout the country;

(ii) erect a Kalidasa Memorial Temple at Avantī (Ujjain), and take steps for the setting up of a Kalidasa Academy at that temple for the collection of all works of Kalidasa, their publication in the different languages of the world and the promotion of research therein; and

(iii) found a Kalidasa stage.

इसमें अनुवाद करने में कुछ थोड़ी सी गलत हुई है । यह जो "Temple" शब्द इसमें इस्तेमाल हुआ है उसकी जगह हिन्दी में "मंदिर" है