



B-173651

Dear Senator Kennedy:

In response to your request of July 14, 1971, we have made an inquiry into U.S. humanitarian aid to Pakistan following the outbreak of civil war in March 1971.

This report covers the assistance program for civil strife victims in East Pakistan. Another report covered the assistance program following the November 1970 cyclone. After the civil strife started, cyclone and civil strife relief assistance to East Pakistan could not be readily separated, and it is discussed as one topic in the report. In another report we are covering the humanitarian aid program for Pakistani refugees in India.

In accordance with discussions with your office, we have not followed the customary practice of obtaining advance agency comment on this report.

We believe that the contents of this report would be of interest to committees and other members of Congress. However, release of the report will be made only upon your agreement or upon public announcement by you concerning its contents.

Sincerely yours,

lunes ( . Ataets

Comptroller General of the United States

 $l^{1/2}$  The Honorable Edward M. Kennedy United States Senate

# Contents

•

|         |                                                                          | Page |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| DIGEST  |                                                                          | 1    |
| CHAPTER | · ·                                                                      |      |
| 1       | INTRODUCTION                                                             | 5    |
|         | Civil strifecauses and effects                                           | 5    |
| 2       | UNITED NATIONS RELIEF ROLE<br>U.N. organization and staffing in East     | 8    |
|         | Pakistan                                                                 | 8    |
|         | U.N. assessment of initial relief re-<br>quirements                      | 9    |
|         | U.N. monitoring activities<br>Operations of U.N. specialized agencies    | 11   |
|         | in East Pakistan<br>Food and Agriculture Organization                    | 13   |
|         | and World Food Program                                                   | 13   |
|         | World Health Organization                                                | 14   |
|         | United Nations Children's Fund<br>U.S. assistance to finance administra- | 15   |
|         | tion of U.N. activities in Pakistan                                      | 15   |
| 3       | U.S. POLICY AND ORGANIZATION FOR RELIEF TO                               |      |
|         | VICTIMS OF CIVIL STRIFE IN EAST PAKISTAN                                 | 16   |
|         | Policies and objectives                                                  | 16   |
|         | Organization                                                             | 16   |
|         | Interdepartmental Working Group                                          |      |
|         | on East Pakistan Disaster Relief<br>Advisory Panel on South Asian Re-    | 17   |
|         | lief Ássistance                                                          | 18   |
|         | AID field activities                                                     | 19   |
|         | Audit responsibilities                                                   | 19   |
| 4       | U.S. FOOD AND PUBLIC WORKS ASSISTANCE                                    | 20   |
|         | Food assistance                                                          | 20   |
|         | World Food Program                                                       | 22   |
|         | UNICEF assistance                                                        | 24   |
|         | Bilateral assistance                                                     | 25   |
|         | Cooperative For American Relief                                          |      |
|         | Everywhere                                                               | 25   |

| CHAPTER |                                      | Page |
|---------|--------------------------------------|------|
|         | Sales versus donations of food       |      |
|         | assistance for East Pakistan         | 26   |
|         | Food grain diversions                | 27   |
|         | Food grain losses and potential      |      |
|         | additional losses                    | 28   |
|         | East Pakistan food supply            | 29   |
|         | Public works assistance              | 31   |
| 5       | U.S. TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE       | 33   |
|         | Coastal vessels and small freighters | 33   |
|         | Tugboats                             | 35   |
|         | Trucks                               | 35   |
| 6       | ASSISTANCE OF OTHER DONORS           | 38   |
|         | Other nations                        | 38   |
|         | Voluntary agencies                   | 39   |

•

.

# APPENDIX

I Letter dated July 14, 1971, from Senator Edward M. Kennedy to the Comptroller General of the United States 41

# ABBREV IAT IONS

| AID    | Agency for International Development       |
|--------|--------------------------------------------|
| CARE   | Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere |
| FAO    | Food and Agriculture Organization          |
| GAO    | General Accounting Office                  |
| GOP    | Government of Pakistan                     |
| GOEP   | Government of East Pakistan                |
| U.N.   | United Nations                             |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund             |
| WFP    | World Food Program                         |
| WHO    | World Health Organization                  |

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT TO THE HONORABLE EDWARD M. KENNEDY UNITED STATES SENATE UNITED STATES HUMANITARIAN AID TO PAKISTAN FOLLOWING THE OUTBREAK OF CIVIL WAR IN MARCH 1971 , Agency for International Development 97 Department of State B-173651 32

# $\underline{D} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{G} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{S} \ \underline{T}$

## WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

Senator Edward M. Kennedy requested the General Accounting Office (GAO) to inquire into the U.S. humanitarian aid program to Pakistan following the outbreak of civil war in March 1971. (See appendix.) GAO's inquiry preceded the outbreak of hostilities between India and Pakistan in December 1971. Accordingly, events occurring as a result of the hostilities are not discussed in this report.

In accordance with discussions with Senator Kennedy's office, GAO has not followed its customary practice of obtaining advance agency comment on this report.

#### BACKGROUND

In March 1971, after political leaders of East and West Pakistan failed to agree on the main provisions of a constitution, the assembly, elected primarily to develop a constitution, was postponed indefinitely by the President of Pakistan. That action led to protest strikes and demonstrations by the East Pakistanis. On March 25, 1971, Pakistani Armed Forces were ordered to reestablish central government authority in East Pakistan amidst charges that East Pakistani political leaders were planning secession. (See pp. 5 to 7.)

After March 25, 1971, East Pakistan was torn by civil strife. East Pakistani political leaders developed a guerrilla movement to fight for an independent country. The military retaliated with acts of violence. Nearly 10 million persons fled to India, and there was considerable movement of an unknown number of persons to the rural areas within East Pakistan. The economy and the civil administration were disrupted, and the internal transportation system was crippled. (See pp. 6 and 7.)

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In May 1971 the United Nations (U.N.) accepted the role of coordinating the international relief efforts for East Pakistan. The U.N. made international appeals for assistance and employed an administrative staff to coordinate relief efforts. The U.N. also had a limited number of monitors and relief specialists to observe field operations.

Tear Sheet

At the time of GAO's review--the late summer and the fall of 1971--the U.N. was recruiting and training field teams to work at certain locations in East Pakistan. The capability of the U.N., however, to assure donors that the relief supplies, donated through the U.N., would reach the intended recipients--the people of East Pakistan--was hampered by the reluctance of the Government of Pakistan to permit U.N. representatives ready access to the field. A status agreement on the role of the U.N. was not concluded with the Government of Pakistan until November 1971. (See pp. 8 to 13.)

According to a September 1971 document prepared by the Department of State, the U.S. policy was to recognize the civil strife as essentially an internal matter. The U.S. objectives were to alleviate human suffering stemming from the dispute and to create conditions conducive to the restoration of normal political and economic conditions by supporting relief efforts within the framework of the U.N. (See p. 16.)

As of November 15, 1971, the United States had authorized about \$109.1 million in assistance--approximately \$98.3 million in food and public works assistance (see p. 20), \$5.3 million in transportation assistance (see p. 33), and \$5.5 million (\$2 million and the equivalent of \$3.5 million in U.S.-owned rupees) for U.N. administrative costs (see p. 15). However, a Public Law 480 food sales agreement, valued at \$44 million (including ocean freight costs), had not been implemented as of late March 1972, and a Public Law 480 food donation agreement valued at \$25.8 million (including ocean freight costs) was never signed. (See pp. 23 and 25.) As of September 30, 1971, \$5.6 million of the remaining \$18 million worth of authorized food assistance had not been scheduled for shipment. (See p. 21.)

Transportation disruptions and port congestion in East Pakistan caused diversions from, and suspensions of, shipments of U.S. food grains for East Pakistan. The politico-military situations relating to the civil strife and the Indo-Pakistan war also may have been contributing factors. Complete and up-to-date information on the extent of diversions or the actual status of the amounts diverted was not available at the time of GAO's review. Of the amounts authorized prior to March 1971, the scheduled shipments of 221,000 metric tons were suspended and the shipments of 113,000 metric tons were diverted by the end of April 1971 to Karachi, West Pakistan, and to other Asian ports. (See pp. 27 and 28.)

The data available indicated that, of 87,000 metric tons of food grains diverted to Karachi, at least 34,000 metric tons subsequently were delivered to East Pakistan. The balance was scheduled to leave Karachi before the end of August 1971. Of 26,000 metric tons diverted to ports other than Karachi, about 9,000 metric tons subsequently were delivered to East Pakistan, about 8,300 metric tons of foods which had deteriorated were disposed of in Manila, and most of the remainder was scheduled for delivery to East Pakistan by the end of September 1971. (See p. 28.)

Exorbitant grain losses and damage caused by insect infestation, rodent destruction, and rough and improper handling were reported in East Pakistan

by a U.N. grain specialist. In addition, evidence of food grain infestation and grain storage losses were found by the Agency for International Development (AID) from samples taken from two central storage depots at the port of Chittagong, East Pakistan. AID estimated that about 16,000 metric tons of wheat, valued at about \$1.4 million, stored in Chittagong had been destroyed. An inadequate receipt and distribution system had allowed a substantial volume of grain stocks, unfit for human consumption but not disposed of, to contaminate newly arrived stocks and to clog the supply system. (See pp. 28 and 29.)

From the beginning of the civil strife in March through mid-November 1971, over \$25.7 million in cash and in kind was contributed or pledged by other donor nations for both cyclone and civil strife victims in East Pakistan with some specified allocations. (See p. 38.)

During the period January through December 15, 1971, U.S. voluntary agencies provided about \$4.7 million in assistance to East Pakistani cyclone and civil strife victims. (See p. 39.)

<u>Tear Sheet</u>

-

.

· ·

## CHAPTER 1

#### INTRODUCTION

This report deals with the U.S. assistance program for civil strife victims in East Pakistan following the outbreak of civil strife in March 1971. Another inquiry and report to Senator Kennedy dealt with U.S. assistance to East Pakistan following the November 1970 cyclone. In certain instances after the civil strife started, cyclone and civil strife relief efforts could not be separated readily, and these efforts are discussed as one topic in this report.

We discussed the assistance with U.S. officials in Washington, D.C.; Islamabad, West Pakistan; and Dacca, East Pakistan; with voluntary agency officials; with U.N. officials; and with private persons who had been in the civil strife areas. We also reviewed Department of State and AID files made available to us and reports of the U.N., the World Bank, the voluntary agencies, and the Government of Pakistan (GOP).

Our review efforts were impeded by Department of State and AID officials. They withheld and summarized records prior to our access and thereby limited information needed for a complete and thorough report. In connection with the GAO review, U.S. Embassy officials in Islamabad were instructed not to make available messages reporting on sensitive discussions with GOP, Government of India, or U.N. agencies or certain sensitive documents relating to development of U.S. policy.

In accordance with discussions with Senator Kennedy's office, we have not followed our usual practice of submitting a report draft to AID or State for review and comment.

## CIVIL STRIFE--CAUSES AND EFFECTS

East and West Pakistan were separated by more than 1,000 miles of Indian territory. The people of Pakistan were divided into numerous ethnic and language groups, which resulted in sharp cultural diversity and social and political disunity. West Pakistan had dominated business, government, and the military. West Pakistan had most of the country's large-scale industries, and East Pakistan had a higher percentage of household-type (cottage) industries.

The desire of the people of East Pakistan for greater autonomy seemed closer to realization in December 1970 when the Awami League of East Pakistan won an overwhelming victory in Pakistan's first general election. The election was held to select delegates to a constituent assembly which was to begin drafting, in March 1971, a constitution for returning Pakistan to civilian rule. The Awami League campaign had been dominated by promises of maximum autonomy for East Pakistan, that is, a constitution which would allow each province of Pakistan, rather than the central government, to control its affairs, except for defense, for certain aspects of foreign relations, and for the economy.

Because political leaders of East and West Pakistan had failed to agree on the main provisions of a constitution, in March 1971 the assembly was postponed by the President of Pakistan for an indefinite period. The postponement led to protest strikes and demonstrations in East Pakistan. Amidst charges that the Awami League was planning secession, the Pakistan Armed Forces, on March 25, 1971, were ordered to reestablish central government authority in East Pakistan; the Awami League was outlawed; and some of its leaders were arrested.

After March 25 East Pakistan was torn by civil war. East Pakistanis, led by Awami League leaders, went underground or into India. They organized a guerrilla force and fought for an independent country--Bangladesh. The military retaliated with persecution of minority segments and with acts of violence. Millions of people fled into India.

The East Pakistan transport system was crippled, and the economy was severely disrupted. At the end of September 1971, the situation remained unsettled. Although the Army was in control of key points, insurgency activity had increased. It was reported that in many areas administration virtually had disappeared and that local officials were isolated, frustrated, and fearful and had no sense of controlling affairs in their respective areas. The economic situation was grim. Industrial labor attendance in September 1971 was about 50 to 55 percent. Road and rail disruptions restricted jute exports and led to cuts in tea production to about one third of normal production. Insurgent attacks on barges and ocean ships, demolition of bridges, and intimidation of country boatowners severely crippled the movement of goods on all modes of transportation.

At mid-November 1971, nearly 10 million persons had fled from East Pakistan to India and there had been considerable movement of an unknown number of persons to the rural areas within Pakistan. GOP granted amnesty to returning refugees. GOP estimated that as of August 6, 1971, 107,000 refugees had returned and that 25,000 of these had been processed through 29 refugee reception centers.

## CHAPTER 2

#### UNITED NATIONS RELIEF ROLE

Efforts by the U.N. to alleviate suffering in East Pakistan began on March 31, 1971, when the Secretary General offered to mobilize an international humanitarian relief effort. The offer was formally repeated in April and was accepted by GOP in May.

At that time GOP requested the U.N. to coordinate international relief in East Pakistan. The U.N. agreed to accept this responsibility and worked out the framework for a U.N. role of coordinating and monitoring an international relief effort. The Secretary General made international appeals for assistance and used his discretionary authority to coordinate assistance efforts, not only of U.N. agencies but also of voluntary agencies and national governments.

## U.N. ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING IN EAST PAKISTAN

According to U.S. officials, the U.N. actions constituted a significant beginning, in view of the constraints of an uncertain legal mandate for the U.N. to establish an international relief effort for East Pakistan, the absence of a capability to administer the relief program in East Pakistan, and the lack of clear assurances of financing for such an effort.

During May and June 1971, the U.N. assigned a number of persons to help plan and monitor a U.N.-guided relief program. The U.N. planned to staff a team of 234 persons to coordinate and monitor all relief supplies reaching East Pakistan from or through the U.N. system. This team was to include staff members to supervise all operations concerning the receipt, storage, inland transportation, and actual distribution of food. U.N. appointments during this period included:

--An envoy to Pakistan.

--A representative in charge of relief coordination and an assistant in Dacca. --A U.N. representative to work at New York and Geneva on the East Pakistan relief program.

--Teams from the

- --World Health Organization, to ascertain health needs;
- --Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Food Program, to determine food requirements; and
- --United Nations Children's Fund, to formulate special feeding programs for mothers and children in conjunction with Pakistan authorities, the World Food Program, and the World Health Organization.

The U.N. reported, at the end of September 1971, that it had 38 of its staff members working in East Pakistan, as required under phase I of its plan. This group consisted of (1) an increased number of staff members for the Office of the Secretary General's Representative in Dacca, (2) an advisory team on agriculture, ports and water transport management, and health and general relief problems, (3) an operations unit, including four area coordinators, and (4) an administrative unit, including finance, transport, and communications personnel.

Under phase II of its plan, the U.N. planned to hire 23 additional employees, 20 of whom were to be monitorsdistrict relief specialists and three of whom were to be administrative employees. During September 1971 the U.N. was recruiting and training phase II field teams to work at nine locations in East Pakistan. Only 10 field employees, however, were in-country as of mid-November 1971. Phase III of the U.N. plan called for 50 additional monitors and several additional administrative employees.

## U.N. ASSESSMENT OF INITIAL RELIEF REQUIREMENTS

A U.N. survey report dated July 15, 1971, indicated that the cost of initial relief operations, excluding food, would range from \$28.2 million to \$32.1 million, as shown below.

|                                              | Amount<br>( <u>millions</u> ) |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Transport:                                   |                               |
| Chartering of coastal and river craft        | \$ 5,0                        |
| 10 motor tugs                                | .5                            |
| 400 trucks and other vehicles                | 4.0                           |
| Cash fund to help returning refugees         | 10.0                          |
| Blankets (if purchased locally)              | 4.6                           |
| Cloth (if purchased locally or in nearby     |                               |
| countries)                                   | 3.0                           |
| Corrugated-iron sheets                       | (a),                          |
| Tents, disaster type (including air freight) | 4.0 <sup>D</sup>              |
| Health and medical needs                     | 1.0                           |
| Total estimated cost                         | \$ <u>32.1</u> <sup>b</sup>   |

<sup>a</sup>No estimate.

<sup>b</sup>As an alternative, consideration was given to the use of heavy-duty polyethlene sheeting at an estimated cost of \$100,000, which would reduce to \$28.2 million the total funds required.

On the basis of the foregoing needs, the U.N. appealed to the international community on July 16, 1971, for contributions of about \$28 million to implement the U.N. East Pakistan relief program.

According to AID \$4 million had been deposited into the U.N. account by August 1971. This amount included \$1 million presented to the Secretary General on August 9, 1971, by the U.S. Government for operational expenses and \$1.2 million presented on August 10, 1971, by the United Kingdom. The critical requirement, according to the U.N., was its need for cash to meet logistical and administrative costs and expenses of urgent relief projects to be undertaken.

As of November 15, 1971, the United States had authorized about \$109.1 million in assistance--approximately \$98.3 million in food and public works assistance (see p. 20), \$5.3 million in transportation assistance (see p. 33), and \$5.5 million (\$2 million and the equivalent of \$3.5 million in U.S.-owned rupees) for U.N. administrative costs (see p. 15). As discussed in chapter 3, most of this assistance, even though authorized, had not been provided or scheduled for shipment.

From the beginning of the civil strife in March through mid-November 1971, over \$25.7 million in cash and in kind (including food) was contributed or pledged by other donor nations for both cyclone and civil strife victims in East Pakistan with some specified allocations. (See p. 38.)

## U.N. MONITORING ACTIVITIES

The capability of the U.N. to assure donors that the relief supplies, donated through the U.N., would reach the intended recipients--the people of East Pakistan--was severely hampered by the reluctance of GOP and GOEP to permit U.N. representatives ready access to the field. A status agreement on the role of the U.N. was not concluded with GOP until November 1971.

The absence from May through November 15, 1971, of a status agreement between the U.N. and GOP outlining the scope of U.N. activities was the result of the U.N. desire for "a charter to provide humanitarian relief to all in East Pakistan."

In June 1971 there was a verbal agreement between the U.N. and GOP that the latter would give its full support to a U.N. operation to enable the U.N. "to give contributors and donors the requisite assurances that the relief provided by and through the United Nations was reaching those for whom it was destined, the people of East Pakistan."

Subsequent to this verbal understanding, the United States, according to the U.S. coordinator for relief for South Asia, decided to provide its relief aid within the framework of a U.N. program. The coordinator emphasized "within the framework" because, he said, the U.N. did not have the capacity to serve as a physical channel for relief flows. This assistance included sales and donations of food, funds for chartering vessels, and trucks. A U.S. official in Dacca reported in November 1971 that the U.N. was aware of (1) its own inability to control the vast quantities of grain, sold to GOP by the United States, which was moving through the GOP commercial system and (2) GOP objections to U.N. monitoring of these distributions. He also stated that the U.N. could not control the relief transport operations of small freighters, coastal vessels, and trucks that were operated by agencies of the Government of East Pakistan (GOEP), the provincial subdivision of GOP.

A U.N. representative stated in December 1971 that most of the food that had arrived "during UN activities" had been sold by the United States to GOP and that therefore the U.N. was hardly in a position to dictate the distribution of the food to the legal owners. With regard to the vessels, the U.N. representative stated that the U.N. was not a party to the chartering of vessels used for food distribution and thus had no legal authority over them.

In November 1971 a U.S. official stated that the U.N. was attempting to define a possible operational role in the absence of a U.N. status agreement and because of GOEP reluctance to allow the U.N. into areas and relationships where it would be feeding persons who were outside GOEP's administrative control.

U.S. officials believed that, because of the foregoing limitations, the view that massive famine was not to be anticipated, and the desire for an efficient operation, the U.N. was moving, in November 1971, to manage only those commodities given directly to it and to concentrate its major efforts on direct feeding in "pockets of need." A U.N. official stated that he never had envisioned U.N. control over food distribution through the GOEP-commercial rationing system which primarily used the food sold by the United States to GOP. He recognized the importance of these stocks, however, and therefore was willing to see them transported in U.N.-marked conveyances, without assuming responsibility for ensuring impartial delivery of the food.

On November 16, 1971, a status agreement was reached between the GOP and the U.N. to ensure that, among other things, U.N. personnel would have free movement to places where relief supplies were handled under U.N. auspices, unless temporary security restrictions were imposed. We were not able to determine whether this agreement allowed the U.N. to carry out its intended functions, because the Indo-Pakistan conflict and a related withdrawal of U.N. personnel occurred in December 1971.

## OPERATIONS OF U.N. SPECIALIZED AGENCIES IN EAST PAKISTAN

As indicated in the preceding sections of this chapter, the U.N. experienced considerable difficulty in reaching an agreement with GOP that would enable the U.N. to undertake the extensive relief operations required in East Pakistan. Moreover such operations necessitated the expansion of U.N. financial and manpower resources. The U.N., however, did have several specialized agencies, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, World Food Program, World Health Organization, and United Nations Children's Fund, capable of carrying out limited relief operations.

From information available at U.S. agencies, we learned that these U.N. agencies had undertaken, or had planned to undertake, the following relief operations in East Pakistan.

## Food and Agriculture Organization and World Food Program

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the U.N. is an agency for international action to fight poverty, malnutrition, and hunger by gauging the extent and complexity of the world food problem and helping to solve it by providing advice and technical assistance and by helping to mobilize capital backing for development programs.

The World Food Program (WFP), the multilateral food aid organization established in 1962 by FAO and the U.N., provides food, at the request of governments of lessdeveloped countries, to help carry out economic and social development projects and to meet emergency needs.

FAO and WFP representatives surveyed food requirements and the condition of port and storage facilities in East Pakistan. The results of the survey were to be used for scheduling food shipments during the latter part of 1971. FAO advised the U.N. in July 1971 that a staff of four technicians would be needed in East Pakistan--an agriculturalist, an economist, an irrigation engineer, and a rice production specialist. FAO also suggested the possible need for a nutritionist.

WFP planned to start a 5-year project, valued at \$13 million, in October 1971 for the feeding of mothers and children in health centers. WFP was also planning projects, valued at \$3 million, which would provide food and employment in rural areas. WFP was considering a staff of 15 employees in East Pakistan to help implement WFP programs. U.S. assistance to WFP is discussed in chapter 4.

## World Health Organization

The World Health Organization (WHO) assists countries in improving the health of their people by (1) providing worldwide health services and (2) encouraging and coordinating international research through provision of technical guidance, opportunities for technical training, operational research, and teams to start campaigns against widely prevalent diseases. On the basis of a survey that it conducted in July 1971, WHO recommended plans for strengthening East Pakistan's capability to control possible outbreaks of major diseases, such as malaria, smallpox, and cholera. Plans were developed to cope with the problems of medical care and sanitation.

To carry out its plans, WHO intended to assign to East Pakistan a nine-man professional advisory staff on a permanent basis and three consultants on a temporary basis.

In September 1971 about 42 tons of medical supplies were airlifted to Dacca. A second airlift of medical supplies and vegetable seeds arrived in Dacca on September 21. About \$90,000 of the airlift costs were financed from the AID Contingency Fund. A third airlift was scheduled for September 24.

## United Nations Children's Fund

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was created to provide emergency aid to children and to help developing countries build up and strengthen their own permanent services for children.

At the request of GOP, UNICEF undertook a child-feeding program through primary schools. U.S. assistance to this program is discussed in chapter 4.

UNICEF agreed to accelerate health, rural water supply, and education projects in East Pakistan concurrent with undertaking the child-feeding program. According to U.N. officials additional UNICEF assistance was being considered for strengthening and expanding reception centers for refugees returning from India. A total staff of 25 was planned to carry out UNICEF's programs.

## U.S. ASSISTANCE TO FINANCE ADMINISTRATION OF U.N. ACTIVITIES IN PAKISTAN

Early in August 1971 AID authorized a grant of \$2 million to the U.N. to finance the foreign exchange portion of U.N. personnel and administrative costs for the relief assistance programs in Pakistan. On August 9, 1971, \$1 million was given directly to the U.N. As of November 15, 1971, \$90,000 of the balance was used to airlift medicines to East Pakistan, \$42,000 was granted to the U.N. to finance jeeps, and the remainder had not been released.

On August 27, 1971, the United States agreed to provide the equivalent of \$3.5 million in U.S.-owned Pakistani rupees for local administrative costs of the U.N. relief operation. These funds could be granted by the U.N. to its own specialized agencies or cooperating voluntary agencies or could be spent on such things as local staff, office rental, internal transportation, and other related local expenses. At the end of September 1971, the equivalent of \$100,000 in U.S.-owned rupees had been turned over to the U.N.

## CHAPTER 3

## U.S. POLICY AND ORGANIZATION FOR RELIEF TO

## VICTIMS OF CIVIL STRIFE IN EAST PAKISTAN

## POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

Although agency officials did not provide us with formal policy statements that we requested, information we obtained indicated only that the United States recognized the civil strife as essentially an internal matter. The U.S. objectives, according to U.S. officials, were to alleviate human suffering stemming from the dispute in East Pakistan and to create conditions conducive to the restoration of normal political and economic conditions, by supporting relief efforts within the framework of the U.N. The United States urged India and Pakistan to exercise restraint in an attempt to keep tensions between those countries from erupting into open war.

The United States also hoped to prevent any external power from attaining a decisive advantage in South Asia as a result of the crisis. U.S. officials made their views known to GOP that progress would have to be made toward a political accommodation in East Pakistan if conditions were to improve and if a significant number of refugees were to return.

#### ORGANIZATION

Although primary responsibility for policy formulation has been with the White House and the Department of State, a number of Government organizations have been involved in planning and implementing the U.S. program for relief assistance in Pakistan. These have included elements of the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Defense, as well as AID, operating under the direction of the Interdepartmental Working Group on East Pakistan Disaster Relief.

# Interdepartmental Working Group on East Pakistan Disaster Relief

The Interdepartmental Working Group on East Pakistan Disaster Relief was established during November 1970 to determine and coordinate U.S. relief measures for the areas in East Pakistan stricken by the November 1970 cyclone. In August 1971 the responsibilities of this group were expanded to give attention to the increased humanitarian relief needs that resulted from civil strife.

The working group was composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Defense and of AID. According to U.S. officials the functions of each of these agencies were as described below.

## Department of State

The Office of Policy Plans and National Security Council Affairs helped establish overall U.S. policies and plans with regard to relief assistance.

The Office of Country Directorate for Pakistan assessed field reports and evaluated, coordinated, and recommended relief actions after considering the economic and political ramifications.

## Agency for International Development

The office of South Asian Affairs assessed the extent of assistance needed and determined the means of providing such aid.

The Office of Food for Peace determined the composition and quantity of foodstuffs to meet relief needs under Public Law 480.

The Disaster Relief Division determined and coordinated U.S. relief measures for East Pakistan from the outbreak of the March 1971 civil strife until August 1971 when the duties of the Interdepartmental Working Group on East Pakistan Disaster Relief were expanded.

## Department of Agriculture

The Export Marketing Service arranged for the acquisition and shipment of foodstuffs under Public Law 480 to meet relief needs.

## Department of Defense

The Foreign Disaster Relief Coordinator monitored the relief operations and provided liaison among the Department of Defense, the Department of State, AID, and other concerned agencies for logistical purposes.

## Advisory Panel on South Asian Relief Assistance

To help direct U.S. Government relief efforts for those suffering from the dislocation in East Pakistan, the President of the United States, on August 21, 1971, announced the creation of the Advisory Panel on South Asian Relief Assistance. This group was composed of a number of prominent American citizens whose functions were to review all steps previously taken by the Administration, to coordinate U.S. relief efforts with the Interdepartmental Working Group on East Pakistan Disaster Relief and with the Interagency Committee for Pakistan Refugee Relief,<sup>1</sup> to suggest further actions to help avert famine in East Pakistan, and to assist in the relief of East Pakistan refugees in India. The panel was to provide suggestions to ensure that support of U.N. efforts in these areas was both timely and effective.

The panel had held one meeting by the end of September 1971; it had made no resolutions or recommendations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This ad hoc committee was organized to coordinate the activities of all U.S. agencies to meet the needs of the East Pakistani refugees in India.

## AID field activities

AID reported in August 1971 that its Mission in Islamabad had designated six of its employees to work in Dacca on

--supporting U.N. relief efforts,
--the agriculture situation,
--boats and engineering,
--negotiating relief and food agreements,
--food and transport needs, and
--purchasing.

AID officials in Islamabad and Dacca informed us in September 1971 that a formal organization for relief assistance activities had not been established but that Mission employees were working on related aspects of the relief effort. These officials intended to formalize an organization soon.

## Audit responsibilities

At the time of our review, U.S. officials had little information on the effectiveness of U.S. relief assistance. As indicated above, formal organizational elements in Dacca for auditing and reporting on the handling and distribution of relief commodities did not exist. Moreover such information had not been provided by the U.N. (see ch. 2) or by AID's Auditor General's Office and the Department of State's Office of the Inspector General for Foreign Assistance.

During September 1971 the Auditor General's Office stated that it had retained primary audit responsibility for the internal reviews of U.S. humanitarian assistance to East Pakistan. Subsequently, in November 1971, AID's Auditor General planned to perform an audit of AID-financed UNICEF child-feeding programs.

## CHAPTER 4

## U.S. FOOD AND PUBLIC WORKS ASSISTANCE

As of November 15, 1971, the United States had authorized the following food and public works assistance for East Pakistan. The public works assistance and about \$44 million worth of the food assistance was to be provided to GOP on a bilateral basis. As shown on the table on page 21, the remainder of the food assistance was to be provided to the relief programs administered by voluntary and U.N. specialized agencies.

|                                   | Amount<br>(millions) |  |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Food assistance:                  |                      |  |
| Public Law 480title I sales       | \$44.0               |  |
| """ "II grants                    | 42.3                 |  |
| Civil defense biscuits            | .2                   |  |
| Purchase and airlift of vegetable |                      |  |
| seeds                             | .1                   |  |
| Purchase of sugar and flavoring   | <u>1.3</u> \$87.9    |  |
| Public works assistance:          |                      |  |
| Grant of U.Sowned rupees to GOP   | 10.4                 |  |
| Total                             | \$ <u>98.3</u>       |  |

As of November 15, 1971, most of the authorized food assistance had not actually been provided. The status of that assistance is discussed in the following sections of this chapter.

#### FOOD ASSISTANCE

According to AID officials East Pakistan agriculture suffered heavily from the civil strife. It was estimated that, as of May 14, 1971, 100,000 tons of Government food grain had been stolen or destroyed. Private stocks of grain also had been destroyed. In one Hindu area, for example, the Pakistan Army burned at least 750 tons of food which represented 95 percent of the area's recently harvested crop, enough food to feed the area's population for 2-1/2 years. Hundreds of thousands of persons, fearing for their lives, migrated temporarily, if not permanently.

Farm operations were disrupted in nearly all border areas and in some internal areas. The agricultural credit structure was crippled, particularly the cooperative system. The reduced purchasing power of farmers, plus transport and distribution problems, curtailed the use of fertilizer, pesticides, and improved seeds. An AID agricultural official reported in July 1971 that these problems pointed to rather bleak prospects for fiscal year 1972. He stated that rice production for fiscal year 1972 was estimated to be 12 percent below the previous fiscal year and 19 percent below the long-run trend from 1960.

As of November 15, 1971, authorized U.S. food assistance for East Pakistan totaled about 775,000 metric tons valued at \$87.9 million. An analysis of this authorized assistance and the relief organizations to whom it was to have been furnished is shown below.

#### Authorized U.S. Food Assistance for Civil Strife Victims From March to November 15, 1971

| From March to November 15, 19/1            |                           |                       |                                           |  |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------|--|
| Coumodity                                  | Quantity<br>(metric tons) | Source of funds       | Value<br>( <u>000 omitted</u> )           |  |
| Multinational assistance programs:<br>WFP: |                           |                       |                                           |  |
| Wheat                                      | 14,256                    | Pub. L. 480, title II | \$ 1,183 <sup>a</sup>                     |  |
| Edible oil                                 | 713                       | do.                   | 318ª                                      |  |
| Ocean freight                              | -                         | do.                   | 600ª                                      |  |
| Wheat                                      | 23,468                    | do.                   | 1,948 <sup>a</sup>                        |  |
| Edible oil                                 | 1,383                     | do.                   | 616 <sup>a</sup><br>900 <sup>a</sup>      |  |
| Ocean freight                              |                           | do.                   |                                           |  |
| Wheat                                      | 100,000                   | do.                   | 6,300 <sup>b</sup><br>13,500 <sup>b</sup> |  |
| Rice                                       | 75,000                    | do.                   | 6,000 <sup>b</sup>                        |  |
| Ocean freight<br>UNICEF:                   | -                         | -                     | 6,000-                                    |  |
| Corn-soya-milk mix)<br>Wheat-soya blend )  | 35,000                    | Pub. L. 480, title II | 7,544                                     |  |
| Ocean freight                              | -                         | -                     | 3,228                                     |  |
| Local costs (rupee grant)                  | -                         | -                     | 209                                       |  |
| Sugar and flavoring<br>CARE (note c):      | -                         | AID Contingency Fund  | 1,300                                     |  |
| Biscuits                                   | 182                       | Civil defense         |                                           |  |
|                                            | 250,002                   |                       | 43,806                                    |  |
| Bilateral assistance to GOP:               |                           |                       |                                           |  |
| Wheat                                      | 500,000                   | Pub. L. 480, title I  | 31,100 <sup>d</sup>                       |  |
| Edible oil                                 | 25,000                    | do.                   | 9,800 <sup>d</sup>                        |  |
| Ocean freight differential                 | -                         | -                     | 3,100 <sup>d</sup>                        |  |
| Vegetable seeds                            | 7                         | AID Contingency Fund  | 92                                        |  |
|                                            | 525,007                   |                       | 44,092                                    |  |
| Total                                      | 775,009                   |                       | \$ <u>87,898</u>                          |  |

 $^{\rm a}{\rm As}$  of September 30, 1971, no shipments had been made for these authorizations which totaled about \$5.6 million.

<sup>b</sup>As of January 31, 1972, this proposed title II agreement had not been signed by GOP officials.

<sup>C</sup>Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere.

<sup>d</sup>As of March 20, 1972, this agreement had not been implemented.

#### World Food Program

The United States made two commitments to WFP after the civil strife began. The first, for 14,256 metric tons of wheat and 713 metric tons of vegetable oil, was made on August 25, 1971. The food was to be distributed free to needy persons in areas of special distress in East Pakistan. As of September 30, 1971, this food had not been scheduled for shipment.

The second commitment, for 23,468 metric tons of wheat and 1,383 metric tons of vegetable oil, was made on September 9. 1971. The food was to be used as part payment to workers on projects designed to use unemployed workers, dislocated workers, and others needing food. Unskilled laborers and their families were to be the primary recipients. The recipients were to work on rehabilitation projects and some new construction projects. The work was to include digging irrigation-drainage ditches, building coastal embankments, and repairing and building roads. The projects were to employ about 46,000 workers for 150 days beginning on October 15, 1971. Up to 6,195 metric tons of the wheat was to be available for sale to pay the inland transportation costs of the balance of the donation. As of September 30, 1971, however, WFP had not requested any shipments of the second donation of wheat and vegetable oil.

The United States pledged 100,000 metric tons of wheat and 75,000 metric tons of rice for a free feeding program. The program originated in May 1971 when GOP made a special request to the U.N. for food assistance to distressed areas in East Pakistan. The program was to be administered by WFP under the auspices of the U.N. GOEP was to have direct implementation responsibility. In addition to the United States, other countries contributing to the program were Canada, Australia, Germany, and Japan. As of September 1971, about 310,000 metric tons of food had been pledged for the program.

A WFP official told us in September 1971 that planning discussions among WFP, AID, and GOEP still were being worked out to determine how, to whom, and where the food was to be distributed. He expected that an agreement would be reached any day and that food distribution would begin shortly thereafter. The official foresaw a saturation program, at least at the start, in which people would receive free food without any work or ration cards involved. The official said that he was pressing hard for full participation by U.N. personnel; hopefully, one person would be posted in each subdistrict to see that the food was distributed to the right persons.

At the time of our review, the program was still in the planning stage. An AID official told us that the main negotiating snag concerned distribution controls. He said that GOEP simply was unwilling to let the food be distributed in areas controlled by insurgent forces.

ر ش

The AID official told us that GOEP's Relief Department already had begun distributing free food and charging it against the total WFP food grain pledge, despite the lack of an agreement. The AID official agreed with the Relief Department's contention that it was necessary to distribute the food; however, he indicated that the distribution of food without an agreement was not a normal arrangement but stated that AID was attempting to ensure a prompt agreement between WFP and GOEP.

We were informed by representatives of AID that as of January 31, 1972, the proposed title II agreement relating to the U.S. pledge had not been signed by GOP officials.

The United States has little control over its donations to WFP that are designated for East Pakistan or other countries. The United States was the largest single donor (nearly \$50 million worth of WFP's worldwide commodity shipments) to WFP in fiscal year 1971. AID Missions have no responsibilities relative to control, management, or financial accounting on any WFP project. Commodity distribution, monitoring, and project control are the responsibilities of WFP and the host government. AID Missions, however, have been instructed to be aware of any WFP program commodity management shortcomings or commodity misuse. The standard provisions of the documents which transfer food from the U.S. Government to WFP provide that "upon its request, the USG [U.S. Government] shall be given access to and the right to examine WFP records." Under certain circumstances the United States may have additional review and/or audit rights.

## UNICEF assistance

The United States agreed to supply 35,000 metric tons of special nutrition food for a UNICEF child-feeding program in East Pakistan. The precooked foods--corn-soya-milk mix and wheat-soya blend--can be eaten dry, combined with other foods, or mixed with water to form a gruel or beverage. To make these foods more palatable to the children, AID was also supplying sugar and flavoring at a cost of \$1.3 million.

The program's purposes were (1) in the short run, to help prevent famine by feeding preschool and school-age children and (2) in the long run, to improve nutrition of these age groups, which are most vulnerable to malnutrition. The foods were to supplement traditional foods but they could, for a period, sustain life if consumed alone. The planned program (55,000 metric tons of food) was to feed over 2 million children 3.5 ounces of food a day for 1 year. The first 35,000 metric tons of supplemental food was to feed about 1.6 million children through June 1972. On October 28, 1971, AID granted to UNICEF an equivalent of \$209,000 in U.S.-owned rupees to be used to help pay the local costs of administering the child-feeding program.

The program plans called for the United States to finance the procurement, packing, and ocean freight costs. The AID Mission to Pakistan was to provide UNICEF with U.S.-owned local currency to pay port handling charges, storage charges, and inland transportation costs estimated at about the equivalent of \$742,000. GOEP's Food Department was to move the food from the ports to the school districts, and the schoolmasters were to handle the actual distribution in accordance with procedures set up by UNICEF and GOEP's Department of Education.

The first 6,850 of the 35,000 metric tons of food arrived in Chittagong on September 1, 1971; the remainder was scheduled to arrive by January 1972. On September 27, 1971, the U.S. consulate in Dacca reported that the food had begun to move to or within the six districts selected for the first phase of the program. It reported that UNICEF generally was pleased with the priority that the Food Department had given to the receipt and handling of the initial shipment. The consulate also noted that UNICEF had opened offices in Chittagong and in Khulna, East Pakistan, to oversee porttransport operations and feeding activity.

## Bilateral assistance

On September 10, 1971, the United States agreed to sell to GOP 500,000 metric tons of wheat and 25,000 metric tons of edible oil under Public Law 480, title I. The food, valued at \$44 million--including the ocean transportation cost by a U.S.-flag vessel--was intended for relief and rehabilitation in East Pakistan.

Of the sale proceeds (entirely in Pakistan rupees), 93 percent were to be granted to GOP to finance economic development projects in East Pakistan. These projects were to (1) improve the production, processing, and marketing of agricultural commodities and (2) finance agricultural and public works projects to improve the purchasing power of East Pakistanis. The remaining 7 percent of the sale proceeds were to be set aside for U.S. uses.

U.S. bilateral food grain shipments to Pakistan were to be channeled directly into the GOEP Food Department system for sale through ration shops and/or relief feeding programs. U.S. food grain was not to be handled or routed separately from other imported food grains, and the United States was not to be directly involved in the distribution.

As of March 20, 1972, this agreement had not been implemented. The purchase authorization relating to the agreement expired on January 31, 1972, and, according to AID officials, was not to be renewed.

The United States also spent \$92,000 to purchase and airlift over 16,000 pounds of vegetable seeds for East Pakistan. The seeds arrived there in September 1971 and were slated for free distribution by the GOEP Agriculture Department to increase the food supply.

# Cooperative For American Relief Everywhere

From March 11, 1971, the United States had donated 182 metric tons of civil defense biscuits, valued at about \$160,000, for both civil strife and cyclone victims. CARE was authorized to ship and distribute the biscuits.

# <u>Sales versus donations of food assistance</u> for East Pakistan

As discussed in this report and in our report on assistance following the November 1970 cyclone, the United States agreed to provide food assistance as sales to GOP under title I and as donations to GOP under title II of Public Law 480. Shipments of title I foods were channeled into the GOEP Food Department's system for sale through ration shops and/or for relief feeding programs.

We inquired whether it was appropriate in those instances to provide food under title I, rather than under title II, because we understood that food provided under title II normally was used to feed the needy in emergency and disaster situations and because there were no assurances that foods provided under title I could be acquired or purchased immediately by the destitute.

In response to our inquiry as to whether the foods sold were intended for relief purposes or for other assistance to GOP, AID officials told us that food assistance under these title I agreements was to be considered relief assistance to disaster victims. They took the position that food assistance for relief purposes could be provided to GOP under either title I or title II of Public Law 480. They said that food assistance under both titles could be used to further the purposes set forth in section 2 of the act. The purposes described in section 2 of the act include the use of U.S. agricultural commodities to combat hunger and malnutrition.

We were told also that the people of the area needed food to avert hunger, that many were able to pay for food if it was available at reasonable prices, and that the sale proceeds were to be granted to Pakistan and earmarked for labor-intensive projects to provide purchasing power to many who otherwise could not buy food in the market.

The AID Deputy Administrator, who was acting U.S. Coordinator for Relief in South Asia, told us that two factors were considered in determining the choice of title under which to supply food to persons in danger of hunger or malnutrition. He said that: "The first of these is whether the recipients can be expected to pay for the food or whether free distribution is required and is feasible. Although exceptions are permitted, after Congressional consultation, the general rule is that Title II is used when free distribution is needed and can be implemented, but not when market sale of the commodity is intended. This condition was present in the case of the Title II authorization of November 17, 1970 for cyclone relief, and again in the case of the authorization of September 18, 1971 in which instance, for the first time, the UN was prepared to and able to supervise free distribution. The need and conditions for free distribution were not present to a controlling degree in the cases of the several Title I agreements." (Underscoring supplied.)

"A second consideration in choice of title is that of budgetary impact. Full ocean transport costs are borne by the U.S. under Title II while only the premium cost of shipment of 50% of the food on U.S. flag vessels is charged to the U.S. under Title I. This consideration was not controlling, but it appropriately entered into the decision. In cases where the balance suggested that Pakistan could and should share in the cost of the food aid, all other things being equal, Title I is preferred."

## Food grain diversions

Transportation disruptions and port congestion in East Pakistan caused diversions from, and suspensions of, shipments of U.S. food grain for East Pakistan. The politicomilitary situations relating to the civil strife and the Indo-Pakistan war also may have been contributing factors.

Complete and up-to-date information on the total extent of diversions or the actual status of the shipments diverted was not available at the time of our review. In September 1971 a U.S. official in Islamabad told us that he had not been able to obtain data on any title I shipments after November 1970 because of GOP's slowness in providing such information as the date, location, and amount of grain received. Similar information on title II shipments was neither complete nor current.

Available AID documents showed that, of the shipments authorized prior to March 1971 for cyclone relief and other purposes and intended for East Pakistan, shipments of about 113,000 metric tons of food grain had been diverted, by the end of April 1971, to Karachi and other Asian ports. Also scheduled shipments of 221,000 metric tons of food grain from the United States had been suspended. We noted that, during the same period that shipments were being diverted, AID reports stated that GOP military forces had moved large amounts of grain from GOEP warehouses to cantonments in Dacca and in Comilla, East Pakistan.

The data available indicated that, of 87,000 metric tons of food grain diverted to Karachi, at least 34,000 metric tons subsequently were delivered to East Pakistan-during May, June, and July 1971. GOP assured AID that the balance would leave Karachi before the end of August. Of the 26,000 metric tons diverted to other ports, at least 9,000 metric tons were delivered to East Pakistan during July and about 8,300 metric tons of deteriorating food grain were disposed of in Manila by GOP. An additional 456 metric tons diverted to Hong Kong, China, were sold there locally to be used for animal feed because it had been dam-The remaining food grain diverted to other aged by water. ports was scheduled for subsequent delivery to East Pakistan by the end of September 1971.

# Food grain losses and potential additional losses

At the time of our review, a U.N. grain storage specialist visited four of 12 central supply depots (three in Dacca and one in Barisal, East Pakistan) and found warehousing conditions to be deplorable. He reported that grain losses and damage of exorbitant proportions had been caused by insect infestation, rodent destruction, and rough and improper handling. In addition, he stated that substantial quantities of grain stocks, unfit for human consumption but not disposed of, were contaminating newly arrived stocks and were clogging the supply system. Also AID found evidence of food grain infestation and grain storage losses in 36 samples taken from two central storage depots at the port of Chittagong. AID estimated that as much as 16,000 metric tons of wheat stored there had been destroyed and that the resulting loss was approximately \$1.4 million. An AID official projected that, with continuing neglect of this problem, this loss figure might well exceed \$2 million or even \$3 million.

AID reported that the infestation problem was further compounded by an inadequate system for moving accelerated food grain arrivals through the congested port facilities and by inadequate controls for ensuring movement of food grains on a first in, first out basis.

## East Pakistan food supply

Early in July 1971 the U.S. consulate in Dacca reported that famine conditions, involving widespread hunger, suffering, and perhaps starvation, might prevail in East Pakistan in the coming year. The consulate reported also that crop prospects were poor, that purchasing power was limited, and that the transport situation was worse than previously estimated by U.S. officials. Later in July the consulate reported further that food stocks were very unevenly distributed and estimated that about 60 percent of all food stocks in East Pakistan were located in the port districts of Chittagong and Khulna.

On October 27, 1971, a U.S. official reported that a major famine threat in East Pakistan had been averted. He cited the relief program, the population loss, and a normal harvest as factors and noted that famine was unlikely to become a reason for the continuing flow of refugees into India. He stated that enough food was moving into the country to ensure reasonably adequate supplies during the winter period in all but limited pockets of acute need.

The official stated also that the major factor to averting large-scale starvation had been the movement of about nine million Pakistanis into India. He also noted that many more millions of persons had gone to India than had been thought likely by AID last July. He also reported that the United States was making a substantial contribution toward averting starvation, noting that it was delivering about one million tons of food grain to East Pakistan during fiscal year 1972. He stated further that the flow of blackmarket rice from East Pakistan to India--historically about one million tons a year--had been largely interrupted by border tension.

Although the overall food situation late in October 1971 was brighter than U.S. officials had any reason to expect 6 months earlier, the situation remained grim. The U.S. consul general in Dacca anticipated that an increased intensity of insurgent activity and the corresponding Pakistan Army response would make relief efforts more difficult in the coming months. He stated that an already weak local administrative capability in East Pakistan was almost certain to deteriorate further as the conflict increased.

Late in October 1971 an AID official reported that there were areas in East Pakistan containing about seven million people where food stocks were low or nonexistent; that about one third of the area of East Pakistan was beyond Government administration; and that, even where food was being made available through various programs, supplies were below normal, stocks were short, and transportation was difficult.

GOP agreed with AID's findings but attributed this situation to "intensive rebel action" and stated that fewer problems existed in those places where Pakistan police forces were effective.

In mid-November a U.N. official stated that, although the GOEP grain distribution system was adequate for commercial distribution and for a limited-price maintenance system, it did not lend itself to free distribution. He considered this situation serious because he believed that destitution threatened between 20 and 50 percent of the population.

Late in November 1971 a U.N. official reported that relief efforts to provide food to destitute people on Bhola Island, East Pakistan, were being thwarted by the military who were destroying private stocks and ration shops and refusing to allow food grain releases from local supply depots. The U.N. official reported that he unsuccessfully had requested the commander of the military to reopen the food distribution system.

Over the long term, according to AID officials in Dacca, East Pakistan faced serious food grain shortages. AID officials stated in October 1971 that widespread food shortage could be critical as early as March 1972 when stocks would be low. Port congestion and inland transportation continued as major operational problems. In addition, seven shipping lines had indefinitely suspended service to East Pakistan because of attacks on ships. These cancellations represented about 25 percent of normal shipping service. An AID official told us early in November that port congestion was again becoming a problem and that further diversion of food grain to Karachi was being considered.

U.S. officials estimated that East Pakistan should produce about 8.5 million metric tons of available marketable food grain for consumption in the year which began November 1, 1971. According to these officials, the distribution of about 1.7 million metric tons of imported food grain, plus the 8.5 million metric tons of available marketable food grain, should provide an average 14 ounces per day per person for 1 year for 72 million persons in East Pakistan. The 14 ounces is considered a bare minimum consumption level, and this is below the 10-year average availability of 15.4 ounces a day.

Even the 14-ounce figure may be optimistic. Although the U.S. consulate in Dacca reported that the 1.7 million metric ton figure was reasonable, an earlier report by an AID agricultural official stated that the maximum import of food grains in any previous year had been 1.5 million metric tons. The official stated that heroic efforts would be needed to get much more than that through the system in fiscal year 1972, considering the problem of transport and distribution.

## PUBLIC WORKS ASSISTANCE

On October 8, 1971, AID granted GOP 50 million U.S.owned rupees (the equivalent of about \$10 million) to help pay workers in GOP-sponsored works programs. AID stated that the grant was designed to create employment and to ensure that the rural population had money to purchase delivered food.

The work was to include repairing roads and embankments and cutting water plants that clogged rivers. At the time of our review, we learned that in one sector of East Pakistan approximately 5,000 to 6,000 laborers were engaged in military defense works--constructing and digging entrenchments, constructing embankments, and carving bamboo punja stakes and other military-oriented work projects--in return for 3 rupees (about \$0.60 at the official exchange rate) a day to buy food to sustain themselves.

Because most of the projects carried out under this grant included building defense works along the India-East Pakistan border, AID decided against considering further assistance of this type.

# BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

## CHAPTER 5

## U.S. TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE

One of the most critical problems brought about by civil disruptions was the breakdown of transportation. There were severe shortages of coastal and river vessels, barges, ferries, country boats, and trucks; the rail and road systems were disrupted. Consequently the distribution of food and other supplies to civil strife victims was severely hampered.

As of the end of October 1971, AID officials believed that inland transportation would continue as a major operational problem. They stated that U.S.-financed vessels helped take the place of destroyed rail and road facilities. As shown below, during the period March 25 to September 30, 1971, the United States granted funds to finance the chartering of vessels and provided trucks.

| Date of <u>grant</u>             | Item                    | Quantity | Capacity<br>per unit<br>( <u>tons</u> ) | Amounts<br>granted<br>( <u>millions</u> ) |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| June 1971                        | Coastal vessels         | 8        | 700                                     | \$1.0 <sup>a</sup>                        |
| August 1971                      | Small freighters        | 9        | 3,000                                   | 2.0                                       |
| September 1971<br>September 1971 | Tugboats<br>Trucks (and | 2        | -                                       | .3                                        |
| -                                | spare parts)            | 200      | 2-1/2                                   | 2.0                                       |
|                                  |                         |          |                                         | \$ <u>5,3</u>                             |

<sup>a</sup>In addition to this amount, \$1 million of cyclone relief funds were used to finance the chartering of nine additional coastal vessels.

This equipment was provided for the relief effort under the auspices of the U.N. GOEP's Food Department and/or its Inland Water Transportation Authority was to be responsible for the operation of the equipment.

#### COASTAL VESSELS AND SMALL FREIGHTERS

AID granted \$3 million to GOP for the chartering of eight coastal vessels and nine small freighters for a period of 180 days. The grant agreements specified that the vessels could be used throughout East Pakistan. We were informed that the nine coastal vessels financed for cyclone assistance could be used interchangeably with these vessels.

GOP agreed that the vessels would carry only humanitarian relief commodities, such as food, medicine, fertilizers, and seed. The grant agreements also gave AID officials the authority to review the vessels' logs and to request such information as needed to monitor their movements. The AID Mission in Dacca received weekly reports, prepared by GOEP's Inland Water Transportation Authority, showing the trips made by the vessels and cargoes they carried.

Available AID records showed that by mid-November 1971 four of the eight coastal vessels had arrived in East Pakistan and had made eight trips carrying about 4,800 metric tons of food grain. AID records also revealed that at that time eight of the nine small freighters had made 51 trips and had transported about 84,500 metric tons of food grain.

On August 2, 1971, a GOP official cautioned that the establishment and maintenance of law and order in East Pakistan was, and must remain, the primary concern and stated that it was to be anticipated that the military would use equipment such as assault boats (discussed in our report on "U.S. Disaster Relief to Pakistan Following the November 1970 Cyclone in East Pakistan" (B-173651, Feb. 23, 1971), to the extent to which the military considered it necessary.

As early as May 1971, AID officials recognized the need for inland water transport vessels for East Pakistan and reported that many Pakistani boats had been diverted to military use.

Mission officials reported in November 1971 that, as a result of the U.S.-provided grain shipment capability, it appeared that Pakistani vessels, previously engaged in food shipment, were being assigned to carry other cargoes. AID officials reported that Pakistani vessels carried much less food grain during October 1971. We noted that during October 1,488 metric tons were carried, compared with an average 18,425 metric tons in each of the 3 prior months.