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The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:40 a.m., in room 6226, New Senate Office Building, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Kennedy, Fong, and Mathias.
Also present: Dale S. deHaan, counsel; Jerry M. Tinker, staff consultant; Mrs. Dorothy Parker, assistant to Senator Fong; and Mr. Samuel Goldberg, assistant to Senator Mathias.

Senator Kennedy. The subcommittee will come to order.

Today's hearing opens the subcommittee's public inquiry into world refugee and humanitarian problems, and United States programs of assistance.

All over the world people are on the move. The troubles of our time are taking a rapidly growing toll in the flight of people from conflict and oppression—from famine and natural disaster.

Especially today, we must think of the continuing flow of refugees from East Pakistan into India. The latest official figures put the influx at some 34,000 per day. The cumulative total since early April is at least 7,022,000.* According to press reports, an equal number of Bengalis are displaced within East Pakistan itself. And millions more, by every account, are faced with the threat of starvation and death. Regrettably, there is no end in sight to this tragedy—a nightmare unequaled in modern times.

In Indochina, the flow of refugees and the occurrence of civilian war casualties continues.

In Vietnam, nearly all indicators—including official reports to our Government—document that the situation among the people continues to deteriorate. For them the war is not winding down. The monthly flow of refugees continues at a high level—some 100,000, by official count, moved during the first 5 months of this year. Civilian casualties are also on the increase. Hospital admissions, alone, accounted for at least 10,172 cases during the first 3 months of this year. More than 4,000 of these cases were admitted during March.

In Laos, where heavy warfare has been occurring in many areas, refugee numbers on official rolls have climbed to at least 316,000. No

---

*The total has since increased to 8,544,012, according to Government of India records as of October 25, 1971.
current record is available on civilian casualties. And in Cambodia, the situation also continues to deteriorate.

The regional crises of people in India/Pakistan and in Indochina have been a source of major concern to this subcommittee and the American people.

As if these situations were not enough cause for concern, other “people problems” continue throughout the world. Especially distressing, for example, in Africa, are the long-standing problems of refugees from southern Africa and the Portuguese territories—and the festering problem in southern Sudan. And problems continue, as well, in the Middle East, in Europe, in Latin America, and in Hong Kong. And always interspersed with the special needs of refugees and victims of conflict and oppression, are the emergency needs of those struck by natural disaster—and the long-standing needs of many others who are simply disadvantaged.

By failing to assist the world’s 16 million refugees—and millions more in distress—the United States and the world community compound the difficulties in many countries already in political and social and economic ferment. We undermine their welfare and security as well as our own. The effectiveness of our foreign policy in a given area is often directly related to our leadership in assisting that area’s refugees. Nowhere is this clearer today, than in the routine approach of our Government to the deteriorating situation among the innocent millions affected by the Pakistan civil war.

I firmly believe the refugee situation in 1971—and what we can anticipate over the next several years—requires a greater national concern on the part of all Americans. It requires new approaches by our Government. It requires new methods and kinds of assistance by the international community. It requires new and creative thinking on the part of all.

This hearing—the first in a series—is designed to gather accurate information on the scope of today’s humanitarian problems, and to help determine alternatives open to the United States in better responding to human need throughout the world.

To this end, the subcommittee places great importance on the following items:

First, the creation of a Bureau of Social and Humanitarian Services within the Department of State;

Second, the creation of a United Nations Emergency Service to better mobilize world resources to assist the victims of natural disaster and armed conflict; and

Third, a more forthright national policy of humanitarian concern for all victims of disaster, including those of armed conflict and oppression.

Clearly, our humanitarian traditions must keep pace with the shape of the future. We must reinforce high-sounding official rhetoric with a more active concern that has institutional and program priority within the highest levels of our national leadership.

Senator Fong?

Senator Fong. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This hearing on the general worldwide refugee problem is of particular importance at this time. There are, I understand, almost 15 million refugees scattered throughout the world.
Among these refugees, created by many causes over a varying period of time, are persons from many countries and all walks of life. There are the 7 million who recently fled from East Pakistan to India; 2 million refugees who fled from communism in Europe and China; 1.7 million Palestinian refugees in the Middle East; about 1 million African refugees, as well as over 2 million persons who are refugees within their own country, such as the Vietnamese displaced in South Vietnam. There are Hindus who fled from Pakistan to India since 1963, and Moslems who fled from India or Kashmir to Pakistan in this period. And, let us not forget the unhappy plight of the Soviet Jews.

The scope and magnitude of the problems of these people and the nations giving them refuge are incredible and hard for the mind’s eye to conceive, let alone accept.

The Chairman, Senator Kennedy, should be commended for his humanitarian concern, which we all share, and for his dedication in keeping the image of these unfortunate millions before the public so that we as a nation and as a people do at least our share in the international effort to better the condition of these pawns of fate.

I want to welcome the Under Secretary of State and the other representatives of the Department of State to these hearings.

I look forward to learning from them what part we as a nation have taken in alleviating the suffering of refugees scattered throughout the world.

Senator Kennedy. Thank you very much Senator Fong, I appreciate your generous words.

It is a pleasure to welcome here this morning the Under Secretary of State, John Irwin, accompanied by Mr. Francis Kellogg, Special Assistant for Refugee and Migration Affairs and the other representatives from the executive branch.

We want to welcome you this morning and discuss with you our mutual concern over refugees and humanitarian questions throughout the world.

Mr. Secretary we welcome you. We understand you have traveled on a very brief but important trip abroad and have only recently returned. So we particularly want to express our gratitude for you adjusting your schedule to be with us this morning.

STATEMENT OF JOHN N. IRWIN II, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. Irwin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am happy to be here and to appear before this subcommittee. There is no easy solution to world refugee problems, but I welcome this hearing and its purpose of finding some better means of making the world more bearable for the dispossessed.

As you are well aware, Mr. Chairman, few things bring the imperfection of our world into such sharp focus as does the fact that there are millions upon millions of both old and newly-created refugees in today's world. In April, this subcommittee looked closely at the situation in Indochina where hundreds of thousands of refugees from South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos have been driven from their homes by the ravages of war. In June the subcommittee held hearings on the East Pakistani refugees in India.
Looking at the total refugee picture, it cannot be too often stressed that the alleviation and solution of refugee problems have long been a matter of basic importance to us as a nation—both because of our heritage of humanitarianism and because refugee situations, in their origin and in their solution, are closely related to our fundamental foreign policy objectives. Thus, it is on pragmatic political as well as basic humanitarian grounds that we approach the world’s refugee problems in a manner consistent with our national heritage and purposes, and deal with them in a manner that will help bring about effective and permanent solutions.

These hearings provide a means of bringing home to us all the sad, unhappy lives of so many of our fellow human beings. We cannot transform their situation from one day to the next, but we can try to do better, and we must.

The establishment of the position of Special Assistant to the Secretary for Refugee and Migration Affairs has resulted in improvement in the formulation and coordination of policies and programs for assisting refugees. Through the Special Assistant the Secretary has been able to keep in touch with the world’s refugee problems—great or small, all of them important. The Special Assistant provides overall leadership for U.S. refugee assistance programs, and direct supervision of such programs where, in the judgment of the Secretary and of himself, this is the most effective means of realizing our objectives. In other instances he has furnished guidance to other areas of the Department and Government in policy formulation and in the implementation or coordination of refugee assistance programs.

These arrangements have promoted understanding throughout the Government, and in the private sector (especially with our voluntary agency contractors) of the importance which the administration attaches to the refugee problems; and have enhanced our continuing effort to improve the quality and effectiveness of our humanitarian assistance for refugees.

Refugee problems are nearly always conspicuous and controversial and in recent years, the rapid advances in communications, particularly television, have acted to enlarge both the visibility and the controversy. For example, millions of American television viewers were aware of the recent exodus of East Pakistani refugees into India almost as soon as were the officials of the Government of India.

The neglect or deterioration of refugee problems can lead to exacerbations and distortions in both U.S. domestic and international policy, impeding in many cases the solutions of broader issues. Prompt and effective action, therefore, becomes necessary.

As stated earlier, there is no single, simple formula by which refugee problems can be solved. Each problem presents separate—and sometimes unique—considerations in the development of U.S. policy or action. Thus our overall policy must remain flexible. Others, however, must share in the effort, and we must always bear in mind that the basic responsibility for helping refugees lies with the sovereign government of the country of asylum. No outside assistance can or should be undertaken except upon request of such government and then only to supplement the resources of that country.

While our policy approach must be flexible if it is to be effective, it must also have a continuity of purpose if it is to have meaning.
think we can be proud to recall that every administration since the end of World War II has attached high priority to our leadership in helping refugees and that during the same period, the Congress has repeatedly authorized far-reaching programs for assistance to refugees and for their immigration into the United States. This continuity of purpose and policy has been given a firm legislative base by the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-510) which authorizes U.S. action on an indefinite and flexible basis—including participation in international action—in the provision of assistance to refugees. The act is in a sense unusual both in its latitude and in the fact that it is a permanent authorization for effective U.S. action to deal with refugee developments. In addition to providing the continuing authority to request whatever appropriations are required to fund refugee programs, the act also includes a provision for the transfer of up to $10 million in foreign assistance funds in any one fiscal year to provide assistance in the event of an emergency involving unexpected and urgent refugee and migration needs. The act, in effect, is a testament to the continued determination of our Government and our people that we shall continue to assist refugees and help in the solution of their problems.

The United States provides its assistance to refugees both through direct Government programs and through the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations. We give strong support to the program of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, whose office provides legal and political protection for refugees and serves as a catalyst in mobilizing the interest and resources of the international community in assisting asylum countries to meet refugee problems. In the past several years, the major portion of the UNHCR assistance program has been concentrated in the developing countries, particularly in Africa. Our assistance to the Palestine-Arab refugees is channeled through the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. We also support the activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in moving refugees from asylum countries to overseas resettlement destinations. The work of this agency, in expediting the flow of refugees to their ultimate homes and in preventing their accumulation in first-asylum countries, makes it possible for those countries to continue to offer haven to new refugees. Direct U.S. programs provide assistance to refugees from European Communist countries and to Chinese refugees from the People's Republic of China. Additionally we make contributions to some refugee programs through our foreign assistance program—as for example in South Vietnam and in India.

Any discussion of the American role in refugee and humanitarian assistance would be incomplete without a recognition of the large and very important role played by the American voluntary agencies.

The agencies represent the conscience of the American people—reflecting the collective concern of their constituents throughout this country who support and contribute to their work.

A relatively recent example of how the agencies collectively and effectively register their views and influence the Government may be cited in connection with the U.S. accession in 1968 to the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. Eighty-six American agencies interested in assisting refugees abroad and the successful assimilation of
immigrants into American life, including several national labor unions, voiced their support of U.S. accession to that international treaty through petitions sent to the Members of the Congress and to the highest levels of the executive branch. The voice of the voluntary agencies was noted and constructively discussed at the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee shortly before the Senate gave its advice and consent for U.S. accession to the protocol.

In the refugee field, a solid pattern of cooperation and partnership between government and voluntary agencies has developed over the years, and the pattern is being extended rapidly to other fields. From the first day of refugee assistance after World War II, the U.S. Government, both independently and as a participant in international organizations, has called upon the voluntary agencies for refugee assistance. We contribute supplemental financial support through contractual arrangements with several of these agencies.

The voluntary agencies help bridge the no man's land between impersonal bureaucracy and the refugee as an individual and as a human being.

No listing would be complete, of course, without a reference to the significant contributions made by many other governments toward resolving refugee problems. The countries of asylum, especially, have incurred heavy expenses. In some cases, as in Hong Kong, these costs to the local government are staggering, and continue over an indefinite period. Finally, many countries have admitted large numbers of refugees for permanent and resettlement. While Australia and Canada have played a leading role in this respect, along with the United States, many others, including our good neighbors in Latin America, have provided asylum and a new life to refugees.

In speaking of the actions and contributions by other governments it is worth emphasizing that, as noted in the President's Report to the Congress on U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's, the era of American prescriptions and "made in America" solutions is now past—in refugee as well as in other matters. While in most cases our participation, our assistance and our leadership will be necessary to help in resolving the problems, we feel that others must increasingly share in the effort and, especially, in the decisions—individually and through the international community. This is not to indicate a lessening of American interest, attention or assistance to refugees, but rather to emphasize a change in style necessitated in large part by the nature of international developments, with more stress on international participation and on our leadership by example instead of by dominance. By this, we firmly believe everyone, including the refugees, will benefit.

The international relief effort organized in behalf of East Pakistani refugees in India is a good case example. This effort, requested by the Government of India and coordinated by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees is, I believe, the single largest such program mounted since World War II. Its size of course is directly related to the size of the refugee situation itself. According to the Indian Government's latest count there are about seven million refugees from East Pakistan now in India—making it the single largest refugee situation in the world today. Size and numbers aside, I believe it would be relevant to trace briefly the development of this effort and the actions of our Government.
In late March 1971, shortly after the outbreak of violence in East Pakistan and at the first reports that refugees were beginning to flee into India, the Department of State began contingency planning on a refugee program. We encouraged the Government of India to request international assistance. When India did request such assistance and when the United Nations Secretary General made his international appeal for assistance on May 19, our Government was able, literally within hours, to make an immediate cash contribution of $500,000 to the UNHCR to help initiate the international relief effort coordinated by his office. Even before this, in mid-April in fact, U.S. voluntary agencies operating in India—CARE, Catholic Relief Services and Church World Services/Lutheran World Relief—began feeding programs for refugees, using Public Law 480, title II commodities released for this purpose. While the food portion of the U.S. relief assistance is given for refugee feeding, the value of these commodities is credited toward the overall U.S. contribution to the international effort.

The initial U.S. contribution, both in food and nonfood, totaled $2.5 million and was designed as an emergency measure to help insure that food and other necessities would be provided to the refugees while the larger, international relief effort was being mounted. Subsequent authorizations have brought the total of U.S. contributions for East Pakistani refugees to $70.5 million, of which $40 million is in food and $30.5 million in cash grants for urgently needed nonfood items.

As the numbers of refugees in India grew, the Department's contingency planning group became, in mid-May, a formal Interagency Committee on Pakistani Refugee Relief, incorporating elements of the Department, AID, DOD, Agriculture, Peace Corps, OMB, and USIA. This Committee, chaired by Frank Kellogg, the Secretary's Special Assistant for Refugee and Migration Affairs, not only plans and coordinates U.S. relief activities but maintains an active and constant dialog with the Indian and Pakistan Governments, the UNHCR, other international agencies, and other governments in order to help insure that not only U.S. assistance but all assistance is being effectively utilized in relieving the misery and suffering of the refugees.

Mr. Kellogg has personally visited the refugee camps in India where he met with Indian and international officials dealing with the refugee situation. He also visited Pakistan, and in particular East Pakistan, to inspect the situation there in order to assess the longer range prospects for a return of the refugees to their own country.

The relief effort for the East Pakistani refugees is by no means an exclusive U.S. "show." To date, overall contributions to this relief effort from governments and international agencies total over $128 million. We are strongly supporting United Nations efforts to secure additional contributions from the international community and are ourselves prepared to increase our contribution as the need arises.

We believe the High Commissioner, as the U.N. focal point for the relief effort, has done a highly commendable job—particularly since early June when he, in conjunction with the World Health Organization, moved decisively and swiftly to assist the Indian Government in controlling the cholera epidemic which broke out among the refugees.

During the April hearings, Ambassador William E. Colby, testified at length on the refugee situation in Vietnam and I shall not go over
the same ground which he covered. The all important effort to return refugees to their home villages as soon as security conditions permit is continuing. During the first 5 months of 1971, 91,000 refugees have returned to their homes and received all their return-to-village benefits; another 300,000 have also gone home, although benefit payments to them have not yet been completed.

Mr. Chairman, although we should take pride in the fact that our Nation, in conjunction with other free nations and international organizations, has contributed so much in helping refugees during the past 25 some odd years, we are not and must not become complacent or relax our efforts so long as there are still refugees in need and so long as new refugees are being created. I assure you this administration, like past administrations will continue to give a high priority to refugee matters.

As you are aware, the administration has recently introduced legislation on foreign assistance which, among other goals, would further consolidate operational and policy responsibilities in the field of refugee and humanitarian affairs. Your own very constructive suggestions along these lines, Mr. Chairman, have been of great value in our preparation of this proposal.

We believe that the proposed Bureau of Humanitarian and Social Affairs, under an Assistant Secretary of State, will enable our Nation to better and more quickly respond to humanitarian needs throughout the world and to provide the flexible and imaginative leadership necessary to marshal international cooperation in order to reduce the scope and duration of refugee problems.

We would welcome this committee’s support of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Kellogg and I will be happy to answer questions.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you very much. Let me first ask you this: We saw a UPI report this morning, printed in the Washington Post, directing our attention to the question of the India/Pakistan situation, which said that the number of refugees is expected to swell. I was wondering—and the article indicated at the end that no figures were available—whether you could give us the latest information on what you anticipate, in terms of the dimension of that flow of refugees, for the next few weeks or months?

I know this is enormously complex and involves all kinds of other considerations; but simply in terms of the information you have now on the flow of refugees, what do you anticipate over the next several months?

Mr. IRWIN. As you say, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to anticipate what will be the flow of refugees. As you know, it was enormous in the early days of the fighting in East Pakistan and has come down to some 45,000 to 50,000 in the past few weeks. I notice that today it is down to perhaps 34,000. Whether it will continue below this depends on the extent of the fighting and its continuation in East Pakistan, and on the degree to which conditions, even after fighting ceases, can be settled in such a way that the refugees will be willing to return. It also depends on the degree to which the United Nations will be able to assist on both sides of the border to facilitate the return.

Pakistan claims 50,000 refugees have already returned. We really have no way of checking that figure or the continued flow figure from
East Pakistan so I am afraid we cannot give you any precise answers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kellogg visited both countries and perhaps he would like to add some thoughts of his own.

Senator Kennedy. We would be very happy to hear from Mr. Kellogg.

Mr. Kellogg. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The latest figures that we have that are similar to your chart on the wall are that the refugee flow from July 12 through July 20 was 21,000, as a daily average.

With regard to the question you asked as to where this may end, I think perhaps I could give you some information which, of course, is not very definitive but it comes from the Government of India officials with whom I personally spoke on my trip. There was a great deal of variation in the numbers that they estimated might continue to come in, but I did hear the figure of 2 million more refugees as an estimate. And this 2 million might come in as the monsoon conditions taper off and make it easier to travel and also if famine conditions occur in East Pakistan.

Senator Kennedy. Can you give us a progress report on the role of the United Nations in responding to the initiatives of the Administration in trying to establish a presence in East Pakistan?

Mr. Irwin. The United Nations sent out its High Commissioner for Refugees to make a visit and assessment in both areas.

The High Commissioner recommended that the United Nations be permitted to put a United Nations presence on both sides of the border. The Pakistan Government has welcomed that suggestion. The Indian Government has not consented to it on the grounds that it would be in their minds equating the Indian position in this whole question with the Pakistani position.

Senator Kennedy. Could you elaborate further on that point, in terms of the response of the Indian Government?

Mr. Irwin. As I understand it, the Indian Government has not consented to the suggestion of the Secretary General to have a U.N. presence on the Indian side of the border, feeling that would imply India was equally at fault for the problem of the refugees and the Indians thought the presence should be on the East Pakistani side but not on the Indian side of the border.

Aside from what the United Nations has tried to initiate on the refugee side, it has put a disaster relief official in East Pakistan with a very small staff to try to coordinate disaster relief.

Perhaps again if I could ask Mr. Kellogg to speak to this he could respond on the basis of his recent trip.

Mr. Kellogg. Going back historically, Mr. Chairman, in late April the United Nations asked the U.N. High Commissioner to send a mission to India to ascertain the extent of the problem and to make a decision with respect to his participation as the "focal point" in India for the relief of the refugees.

The mission returned early in May and on May 19 the Secretary General issued an appeal to the international community to support the High Commissioner in an effort to alleviate the growing refugee problem in India.

Since that time in India the High Commissioner has had a small staff, which is now being augmented, to coordinate the requests of the
Indian Government for food, shelter, medicine, and other requirements. That may have been slow in starting, but I think it is improving daily and it is becoming quite effective. That is on the Indian side.

In East Pakistan there is a slightly different setup. The Secretary General has a representative of the United Nations whose concern and responsibility is for relief assistance. The High Commissioner has just sent an individual to represent his efforts towards the rehabilitation and the return of the refugees from India.

Senator KENNEDY. Has this request of the Secretary General, has it developed into a formal plan? Has he suggested a plan or a program to both the Pakistan Government or to the Indian Government, in terms of establishing some presence?

Mr. IRWIN. I am not certain whether it was a specific program or plan or whether it was a broad based suggestion as to a presence which, if they were agreeable, would be developed into a plan.

Senator KENNEDY. I suppose within that suggestion it provides some description as to the number of people that would be involved, and the kinds of roles that these individuals would have. As I understand it, this would be at the suggestion of the Secretary General, for humanitarian needs, is that not correct?

Mr. IRWIN. That would be our understanding.

Mr. KELLOGG. I believe I could elaborate to a certain degree. In East Pakistan, President Yahya Khan has openly welcomed the High Commissioner's presence and has specifically in a recent public announcement said that he encouraged representatives of the High Commissioner to be at the reception camps which have been established. And he went so far as to say that he visualized the High Commissioner's representatives crossing the border at specific points to encourage the return of Pakistani nationals or refugees to East Pakistan.

As I mentioned before, the High Commissioner has at present a staff in New Delhi and is currently establishing one in Calcutta at this moment on purely the humanitarian or relief effort.

Senator FONG. Mr. Chairman?

Senator KENNEDY. Yes?

Senator FONG. Mr. Secretary, some of the people in Pakistan have talked to me and have propounded some ideas which I would like to present to you. If you wish you may comment on them.

There is a general feeling that there is very poor rapport between Pakistan and India. The figures that have come out on refugees I have been told are strictly Indian figures. These are figures issued by Indian sources and not Pakistan sources. And, these figures have not been verified.

So, whatever numbers that have been stated as refugees actually are from Indian releases. I have been told there is a constant flow of people from India to Pakistan and from Pakistan to India. Many of these people have been counted in the figures as refugees.

Second, I have been told that there are guerrilla camps along the eastern border of India; that there is a feeling that there will be warfare or guerrilla warfare raids by these guerrilla bands across the border. These refugees, knowing the situation and knowing they will be caught in a crossfire should there be this guerrilla fighting, have been reluctant to return.

There is a report that President Yahya Khan is willing to have U.N. representatives in Pakistan to review the situation for the in-
international community; that he is willing to let anyone come in to relate what is happening there; and that many of the stories coming out relative to what is going on concerning the affairs of the East Pakistani refugees have not been verified.

You have just returned from that area. Are you in a position to discuss this matter?

Mr. Kellogg, Senator, may I answer you in the same sequence that you asked your questions.

With respect to the number of refugees, this is obviously almost impossible to check. The Indian Government obtained its figures two different ways. As the refugee crosses from East Pakistan into India, he passes through checkpoints at which the representatives of the Indian Government record statistics about each refugee and, of course, at the same time add him to the total tally.

This represents one method by which they arrive at their figures.

The second count is when they issue ration cards to all refugees in the refugee camps. These ration cards have to be used daily by the refugee to draw the food allowance permitted by the Indian Government.

It is a combination of these two that gives the Indian Government its total. I am not saying for a moment that they are necessarily completely accurate but I can tell you that the Indian Government has complete faith in them and is making all its plans in accordance with these numbers.

On the other side you mentioned the flowback, that is, the return of nationals to East Pakistan. From my own observations I concluded that although the President himself and other Pakistan officials give a figure of about 45,000 to 50,000 returnees, in my own judgment this number is even harder to check than in India because the returnee does not come back by a main road but rather filters across the border at night or along country paths returning directly to his village and home. In my opinion, therefore, Pakistani returnee numbers are even harder to verify than the number of refugees in India.

With respect to the second part of your question, I think there is no doubt but that the continued presence of the army on both sides of the border, and whatever raids may occur, is a very strong deterrent to the return of the refugees.

Third. You mentioned President Yahya Khan's willingness to have the High Commissioner's representative in East Pakistan and this is, of course, a matter of public record.

Senator Fong. Now, this person who saw me goes further. He said that since the world community is helping India with relief for these refugees and since India is receiving sympathy from the world community and opprobrium is heaped upon Pakistan, that India would like to see this continue.

Of course, it would difficult for you to comment on that statement.

Mr. Irwin. I think this would depend a great deal upon the point of view of the speaker, Mr. Senator, though I would say that I would look with skepticism on the thought that the Indian Government wished to see this continue because of the tremendous burden that this number of refugees puts on India.

Senator Fong. Yes, I would subscribe to your opinion that India does not wish to continue having these refugees.
Mr. IRWIN. They anticipate that India will have to spend possibly $600 million or $700 million a year and maybe higher. The rest of the world has given something like $128 million. So whether their figures are accurate or not as to the costs, there is a tremendous burden on the Indian Government and the Indian people far and above the actual amount of help given by other countries.

Senator FONG. As long as there is a possibility or probability that there will be open conflict between the two sides, how are we going to get the refugees to go home, even if Yahya Khan wants them to come home?

Mr. IRWIN. I think under those circumstances, Mr. Senator, probably many of them will not return home.

I think there will have to be a situation that the refugees recognize as one where they can return in peace to East Pakistan.

Senator FONG. So, actually, insofar as the refugees returning to Pakistan is concerned, it will depend largely upon what these two governments do with respect to each other?

Mr. IRWIN. Yes, sir. It certainly will. And let me say again it depends somewhat on the interpretation. The Pakistan Government now says that the fighting has ceased but yet there are continued acts. Whether they are purely guerrilla acts or terrorist acts or activities by the Pakistani Army, there are enough rumors or possibilities of them or the actuality of them that not many refugees have now returned.

As Mr. Kellogg says, it is particularly difficult to evaluate even the number of 50,000 that Pakistan estimates have returned home.

Senator FONG. Have you an idea or an evaluation as to how strong these guerrilla bands are, or the number of guerrilla bands, or the possibility of conflict between these bands and the soldiers in Pakistan?

Mr. KELLOGG. Senator Fong, on the basis of my own observations, which were made both on the ground and from the air, by flying over a fairly substantial portion of East Pakistan and traveling along the roads, I saw no direct evidence of open fighting nor did I see any guerrilla activities. There are many rumors and many stories of activities on both sides with both countries at fault. But where the exact truth lies is extremely difficult to judge.

Mr. IRWIN. I think it is impossible really to say, Senator Fong, and I think the fact that Mr. Kellogg has made certain flights and has been certain places cannot really be taken as indicative of what the situation is. There are no observers on either side of the border that can indicate what is happening. So we really have no definite information.

Senator FONG. Would you say you expect that we will be called upon to continue our aid for some indefinite period of time?

Mr. IRWIN. Yes, sir.

Senator KENNEDY. I would like to get back, if I could, to the conditions of potential starvation and famine in that area.

In the early part of July there was a publication concerning the potential danger of starvation. We have had a number of reports and have been following the situation closely; we have been concerned that there are real problems of food, particularly in the areas of the cyclone, and that the World Bank Report has substantiated our concerns.
The Department of State has stated, or it was reported in the newspapers, as saying, that they could find no evidence in the Department's field reports that would bear out the prediction of widespread famine by August 1.

Now I understand that reports have been received—various communications from our field representatives—suggesting that contrary to what the Department has stated publicly, that field reports bear out predictions of famine in East Pakistan. One cable suggests that "perhaps the Department has not been apprised of recent field reports which indicate famine as a real possibility."

It continues, saying they "are taking a hard line with the Government of Pakistan in an attempt to get them to face up to dealing with the possibility of famine. In our view public statements inconsistent with this line might impair the effectiveness of our representations here."

Then it continues further by saying that "further public statements regarding this subject should reflect recent field reports."

In an earlier field report, this was dated July 6, it says, in summary, that "the specter of famine hangs over East Pakistan; the prospects for averting hunger and perhaps starvation are not, repeat not, good. * * * The United Nations is moving far too slowly. * * * The transportation situation is worse than estimated, purchasing power is very limited. * * * It is our view that famine conditions involving widespread hunger and suffering and perhaps starvation will probably prevail in much of East Pakistan over the coming year."

Then it goes on to quote a high government official, they indicate the name but I am not going to mention it, of East Pakistan and he talks about the prospects of famine and starvation. As a consequence of the official attitude, he says there has been "no sense of urgency" about this problem on the official level and "consequently no plans are being made nor action being taken to avert the probability of famine."

He points out that in addition to the problem created by fear, "the Government of East Pakistan's organization and staff dealing with food problems are very weak." The reporter expresses the view that the U.N. role "not helpful to date and the prognosis is not hopeful."

And then the report goes on to say that transportation is a major problem in food distribution, and it points out three elements for meeting the problem: the importation of more food, logistic capabilities to distribute the food, and a system for assuring that needed food can be purchased and made available to the people. It goes into considerable detail about bridges being knocked out and railroads being disrupted, with only a marginal effort to reconstruct these roads and bridges. And it talks about the failure of the rice crop.

All this suggests to me, Mr. Secretary, that there is indeed a very real possibility of famine and starvation and for some reason or another the Governments of East Pakistan and Pakistan are not particularly aware of the nature and dimension of the problem.

I would like to ask Mr. Kellogg, who has been there recently, whether these field reports were substantiated by his own observations? These are from July 6 and 9, 1971.

Mr. Irwin. Mr. Chairman, if I could speak briefly and then turn it over to my more knowledgeable colleague. We share your concern that is expressed in many of the facts that you presented. If one looks
at just the prediction of famine by August 1, I feel there has not been evidence to show that there has been famine to date and will not be within the next week or so. But certainly the potential is there, and all of us share this deep concern that you expressed, and I am sure many others do, not only in our country but elsewhere.

The reason for the danger of famine is not the lack of availability of food, at least that is our impression at the present time. We understand that there may be a very poor rice crop. We think there will be a lesser crop than the East Pakistan Government estimated. We think that its estimates are high so we have that concern too.

On the shipments of food, in the early days of the fighting we diverted 105,000 tons that were scheduled to land in East Pakistan to West Pakistan because there was not the ability to land it at the port in East Pakistan. That is now on its way back to East Pakistan. We have ordered recently 100,000 tons of wheat. We have authorized but deferred, which will be coming in the future, 260,000 tons of grain.

So that is 105,000 tons actually en route there now and 360,000 more tons available that will be shipped in the coming months.

So the belief is that the problem will be more of a distribution one—the ability to distribute in East Pakistan perhaps rather than the actual availability of food. In addition to the figures I gave of just our own help, there will be food made available by other countries who are helping, and there have been shipments already as I understand.

But the bridges are out, the railroads are out, and many of the local boats that were used on the rivers are not available. They are not to be found. The road conditions are difficult. For that reason $2 million of the $6.7 million the United States made available for East Pakistan has gone to charter boats that can use the rivers.

We are doing all we can to urge both the West Pakistan Government and those who are in East Pakistan representing the government to recognize this possibility of famine because of the difficulty of distribution, and we are doing all we can to see to it that they move towards improving the situation so that they can head off the real potential of famine of which you spoke.

Now, I would like to ask Mr. Kellogg or Mr. Rees, both of whom have much more detailed knowledge than I, to add anything they wish.

Mr. Kellogg. Mr. Chairman, I think the Under Secretary has outlined the real concern of the U.S. Government that there is a definite potential for famine. The major problem is twofold. One is to work with and to impress upon a demoralized civilian government the need for quick and immediate action and the fact that the United States and other foreign governments have to play a secondary role, that is to say—

Senator Kennedy. Is there a civilian government there or is it military now?

Mr. Kellogg. The civil government is demoralized and under the control of the army. It is rather skeletal I would call it.

Mr. Irwin. It would be a civilian bureaucracy that remained in East Pakistan that is under the martial law administration.

Senator Kennedy. As pointed out in the USAID report, the transportation of the country is in a shambles; the rails can operate at no
more than 20 percent of capacity, the trucking system can operate at no more than 30 percent, and the available river transportation is totally inadequate.

The reports from the field indicate that there is a very real potential for famine and starvation, and we see little apparently being done to meet the problem. There is no sense of urgency among the military operating in East Pakistan. I am just wondering again what influence we have available, and what steps we are taking, to insure that this prognosis will not happen. Because it seems to me that unless we have this sense of urgency, unless we understand the dimensions of the problem—and I think we are getting fair warning about this—unless we understand this, then I don't know why we are not going to see one of the greatest disasters of modern times—if not by August 1, then sometime in the immediate future.

Mr. IRWIN. We are doing two things, Mr. Chairman. One, as I indicated, we are furnishing grain, large imports of grain as is Canada and some is coming from Europe and some from Japan and some from China. The second part is a more difficult part, as you pointed out. That is the distribution system and includes, as a first step, imparting a greater sense of urgency than perhaps we have seen to date by the East Pakistan administration.

We have urged this upon the Pakistan Government through our ambassador. The President of Pakistan has told our ambassador that he was appointing a special representative to represent him in the East and he would take these reports into account.

But the potential clearly remains. The concern that you expressed remains.

I might ask Mr. Rees who has more detailed knowledge than I to respond. Mr. Rees is from AID.

Senator KENNEDY. Good morning, sir.

Mr. REES. We certainly do share the concern and have been expressing the concern you voiced at all levels. Immediately on the receipt of the report you referred to, another round of representations were made both here and in Islamabad and Dacca. As you put it yourself, there is a real possibility. That is different from making a prediction. We are wary about making predictions.

The World Bank Report, which has been referred to, also declines to make predictions. It makes projections of what might happen unless some things change.

Senator KENNEDY. I thought it said "what will" happen if things don't change, not "what might" happen?

Mr. Rees. What will happen if things do not change, things on the administrative front and such things as the movement of foods from the two ports where an adequate supply continues to be available. The movement of that food into the provinces where the people are is still substantially within the capabilities of the Government of Pakistan if they put the resources that are available to the task.

The Ryan Report that was referred to suggests ways and means both by using equipment and by streamlined procedures and a little bit more of an urgent administrative approach that would enable Pakistan to move more food into the interior of the provinces monthly than is now being used in the public distribution systems so that some stocks would be built up.
Now, our belief is that in the short run a good deal more than that should be moved in because of the potential of further crop reductions in the coming crop this fall. The projections of what might happen to that crop and what therefore might be the gap that is needed to be filled by imports could be as much as twice the normal load and if in December and January and next spring the rails and roads are not functioning at full efficiency, water transportation would have to take a much larger role than it has to date.

Senator Kennedy. Based upon these steps which have been taken, and I think most of them are over a more generous time period than is necessary, how would you categorize the response that you are getting now from the Government of East Pakistan, and the Government of Pakistan, in responding to these initiatives—to attempt to insure that famine won’t happen?

Mr. Irwin. I would say that they have concern, that they wish to try to improve their transportation system. They were appreciative of the $2 million for chartering boats, et cetera, but we do feel that they have had an unrealistic assessment of their ability to distribute and an unrealistic assessment of the crops that they expect. And we feel that they have not had the sense of urgency that you and the Department have.

Senator Kennedy. Have they had similar difficulty in moving military equipment around in East Pakistan?

Mr. Kellogg. I don’t believe I could answer that, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of personal observation. I did see the army, of course, along the border but I did not observe the army moving equipment on the roads from my air trips.

Senator Kennedy. Do any of these reports indicate that any of the troops of the army are in danger of either starvation or famine? Do any of your field reports indicate that?

Mr. Irwin. No reports would indicate that and I think the big difference, of course, is that it is a well organized institution versus a pretty disorganized countryside.

Senator Kennedy. Yes. But the question that has to come is that if they are sufficiently organized to move military equipment, couldn’t at least some of that governmental structure be utilized to insure or protect the people against the dangers of famine and starvation?

Mr. Irwin. I am sure it could be. I imagine at least in the early time period that the military would have to take a major part in the distribution.

Senator Fong. Mr. Secretary, as I understand it, East Pakistan is no larger in size than North Carolina, is that correct?

Mr. Irwin. That is a comparison I haven’t heard, Mr. Senator.

Senator Fong. East Pakistan is about as large as North Carolina, with about 75 million people, and bordered on three sides by India, is that correct?

Mr. Irwin. Yes, sir.

Senator Fong. Then when we talk about starvation or possible starvation, what part of this territory are we talking about? Do you have any idea as to what part of East Pakistan we are talking about or if we are talking about the whole of East Pakistan?

Mr. Irwin. We are talking about the whole of East Pakistan but the distribution concern would be more with the countryside rather than, of course, the port cities or the capital.
Senator Fong. Is it very difficult to get into the interior of this small country? It is a small country in area, correct?

Mr. Irwin. Yes, sir.

Mr. Rees. Senator, perhaps I can offer some information. Transportation throughout East Pakistan is quite difficult. It is a delta area and is divided by winding rivers with tidal action quite a long way up, and roads and railroads are few and far between even when they are functioning.

As an area it has generally a deficit in food grain of about one and a half million tons in the past. In recent normal years this is filled in part by the movement of grain from West Pakistan and by imports from elsewhere around the world. That grain generally goes to the middle part of East Pakistan which is the area in which there is the largest concentration of the growing of cash crops, jute being the predominant cash crop.

Those imports of about one and a half million tons of grain feed effectively something like 8 million people. The rest of East Pakistan including the cyclone area, and may I digress there to indicate food has been moving into the cyclone area. The last report we have is only through June 22. We have not received any reports since, but we have the assurance by the Government of Pakistan that they are moving food there.

As I was saying, the rest of East Pakistan, other than the center core of the province, is a food surplus area and tends to produce enough to market some to the Dacca area. At the present time we have reports that this is not the case. There is another problem created by the movement of people out of the northwestern part of the province. This is where probably the largest flow of refugees that has moved to India had originated and we have reports of large acreage not planted or from the last crop not harvested because the people are no longer there. And this, since it had been a surplus area, will make the problem that much more difficult.

Senator Fong. How much in the way of relief have we provided for East Pakistan?

Mr. Rees. In relief food that the Secretary just referred to that is now moving to East Pakistan or is available to move, might be estimated to be worth $27 to $30 million, just below $30 million in value.

Senator Fong. For East Pakistan?

Mr. Rees. For East Pakistan. We have authorized $2 million for the charter of coastal vessels. These are vessels in the 600-, 800- or 900-ton range with shallow draft so they can navigate the main rivers.

This $2 million will result in the charter of 17 such vessels the first one of which is expected in East Pakistan momentarily.

In addition we have authorized $4.7 million for the construction of cyclone shelters, cyclone proof houses and repair of the coastal embankments in the cyclone area.

Senator Fong. The total relief effort to East Pakistan to date is approximately $40 million?

Mr. Rees. $35 to $40 million.

Senator Fong. Is that sufficient as far as food is concerned to stave off starvation?

Mr. Rees. Yes, at this time with the delivery of the 100,000 that has been ordered shipped. The reason we did not authorize more
than 100,000 from the 360,000 that has been deferred is that the ports cannot receive any more than that amount because they are full. The storage in the two port areas is almost completely jammed. This is, of course, desirable in the sense that there is 6 to 8 weeks food there on hand on the ground in East Pakistan at any one time.

So, we are phasing our 360,000-ton movement just as fast as the ports can handle it. The first 100,000 tons of that will arrive in East Pakistan in late September or October. We expect within the next 2 weeks to make a decision on further shipments as the port situation becomes clear.

Senator Fong. And you expect to continue to actively furnish supplies from America?

Mr. Rees. Yes.

Senator Fong. So, if there is any problem, it is an internal problem of distribution?

Mr. Rees. That is absolutely correct.

Senator Fong. Do you know what problems they are facing?

Mr. Rees. Well, they are facing——

Senator Fong. Before you answer that question may I ask you, what is the area of your responsibility? You know this committee's concern when the suffering people of East Pakistan are involved. Do you feel that that is within your province?

Mr. Rees. It is very much within the concern or should be within the concern of the United States. We are interested in the welfare of the people and this is an area of poverty that we have been seeking to assist in helping out of that poverty. It has now twice in a 6-month period been afflicted by a tremendous tragedy and we wish to not see a third one added on top.

Senator Fong. So, we are assuming responsibility for helping?

How much are we able to do with the present distribution system in East Pakistan?

Mr. Rees. Well, I won't say that we have taken the responsibility for the security and peace of the area within East Pakistan.

As far as the transportation in East Pakistan, yes bridges are out but also the roads themselves are insecure, there is mining and blowing up of trucks on the roads. This is something that we can't do anything about. Even with the bridges out, a good deal of road traffic could go forward using ferries or some other method to cross the waterways but our responsibility, it appears to me, can only go as far as making every assurance that the supplies are available, making every assurance that the intelligence and perspective that we can bring to the problem are pressed on the officials of Pakistan and then standing ready with others to provide equipment such as the coastal vessels that would help Pakistan meet its problems.

Senator Fong. Do you know of any other nation that has contributed in the amount that we have contributed to East Pakistan?

Mr. Rees. No, sir. No other nation has done as much. We have reports of seven other nations that have made contributions for, in part, East Pakistan. The only significant one is the United Kingdom which has made a cash grant of 1 million pounds to the United Nations. We have the belief that many other nations were withholding or awaiting the report of the United Nations on the relief operation in East Pakistan and the formation of an effective group by the United Nations.
in East Pakistan to assure that relief goods would be addressed to the purpose intended.

The Secretary General did last Friday issue a report on the U.N. teams that have examined the situation in East Pakistan and has endorsed a number of requirements including things that we are already doing, food and coastal vessels, and has made a general appeal to the other nations of the world for support.

We have every expectation that that now will bring forth increased contributions.

Senator Fong. As of now, the United Kingdom has supplied around two and a half million dollars?

Mr. Rees. Yes, sir.

Senator Fong. And it is the largest contributor outside of the United States?

Mr. Rees. Yes.

Senator Fong. What has the Soviet Union contributed?

Mr. Rees. Nothing to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. Irwin. I think we should make clear that the Soviet Union has given money to the refugee problem in India.

Senator Fong. Yes, but I was talking about East Pakistan. What has Communist China contributed to East Pakistan's relief?

Mr. Rees. Some of the grain now moving into East Pakistan ports is rice from China. We don't know the terms of the arrangements between China and Pakistan but an average of 12,000 to 14,000 tons of grain this month and next month are expected from China.

Senator Fong. Now, how much has the United Nations contributed to East Pakistan?

Mr. Rees. It has contributed the organization on the ground to study the problem. There are currently representatives of the Secretary General and of UNICEF, a total of 11 people now in East Pakistan but the United Nations has also had two specialized teams visit and recently report.

One, a team from the World Health Organization and a second from the Food and Agriculture Organization and World Food program.

Senator Fong. How much has been contributed or appropriated for East Pakistan assistance?

Mr. Rees. They have no direct UN appropriations other than, of course, providing and taking care of the salaries of personnel.

Senator Fong. So as of now, the United States is almost the sole nation that has spent some money in East Pakistan outside of Great Britain's two and a half million dollars?

Mr. Rees. Yes, sir.

Senator Fong. As far as India refugee relief is concerned, you have stated we spent $70 million already, is that correct?

Mr. Irwin. We have authorized $70.5 million to date. How does it break down in actual expenditures?

Mr. Kellogg. I believe I can supply that figure, sir. The value of goods and services delivered amounts to just over $3.5 million and the value of goods and services in the pipeline amounts to approximately over $2.5 million for a total of $6,100,000. In addition pending, that is to say obligated but awaiting an expenditure plan, is an additional $5 million. At this moment uncommitted is $19,400,000 for a total of $30.5 million.
That is the cash portion of our assistance program as it currently stands for East Pakistan refugee relief in India. In addition, $40 million has been made available for food for the refugees. This grant is feeding at the present time approximately half of the refugees in India.

Senator Fong. Out of the $40 million, how much has been expended?
Mr. Kellogg. The entire amount has been allocated to the relief of refugees in India. The Indian Government therefore knows that it has grains and food stocks which will arrive now or in the future and consequently it can use an equivalent amount from its own stocks on hand knowing that they are going to be replaced.

Senator Fong. This is an outright grant, is that correct?
Mr. Kellogg. That is correct.

Senator Fong. Now, the figure is $128 million contributed by all donors, how much did the Soviet Union contribute?
Mr. Irwin. If my memory serves me correctly, it is something like $11 million to date but I would like to get more exact figures.
Mr. Kellogg. The current figure for the U.S.S.R. is $11 million.

Senator Fong. And Communist China?
Mr. Kellogg. Nothing, sir.

Senator Fong. The United Kingdom?
Senator Kennedy. Could we get all of this for the record? I would like you to submit all of what the other countries contributed.

Mr. Irwin. Yes.

(Subsequently, the following information was received:)

**Contributions of Countries and International Agencies to Relief for Pakistani Refugees in India (denominated in U.S. dollars) as of July 30, 1971**

**Australia:**
- Government .................................................................................................................. 1,176,000
- Voluntary agencies ........................................................................................................... 669,600

**Austria:**
- Government .................................................................................................................. 100,000

**Belgium:**
- Government .................................................................................................................. 11,383
- Government .................................................................................................................. 250,000

**Botswana:**
- Government .................................................................................................................. 7,000

**Canada:**
- Food, medicine, and cash to UNHCR including 8,000 tons of rapeseed .................................. 2,000,000
- British Columbia ........................................................................................................ 125,000
- Ontario, 4 ambulances, shipping, etc. ........................................................................ 100,000
- Saskatchewan, 642 tons of rapeseed ........................................................................ 100,000
- Voluntary agencies ........................................................................................................ 144,000

**Ceylon:**
- Clothing valued at ......................................................................................................... 326,100

**Chile:** $6,000 for relief of refugees and in East Pakistan ..................................................... 3,000

**Cyprus:**
- .................................................................................................................................. 4,800

**Denmark:** 5 million kr. cash to UNHCR and 2,575,000 kr. reserved for Government for refugees in India or repatriation .................................................. 1,010,000

**Finland:** $475,000 in cash and $60,800 through the Finnish Red Cross and other channels .................................................. 555,800

**France:** 10,000,000 fr ...................................................................................................... 2,000,000

**Germany:**
- Caritas ............................................................................................................................ 1,665,600
- Malteser Hilfsdienst ....................................................................................................... 42,700

**Greece:** Through Greek Red Cross, tents, canned meat, bandages ................................ 170,000

**Guatemala:** Rice valued at ............................................................................................ 5,000

**Iceland:** .......................................................................................................................... 2,850

**Iran:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>250,000 to be divided: £10,000 to Irish Red Cross, £20,000 to UNICEF, £20,000 to UNHCR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica (through WHO)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Milk powder (61 t.), vitamin tablets (10,000,000), Rice; 18,000 tons through WFP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Medicines valued at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>1,600,000 gilders, half to UNHCR, half to ICRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Norwegian Red Cross—stockfish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1,000 tons of sugar, plus $493 in cash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Swedish Red Cross—6.5 tons of medicines, 245 tents, 8,400 sweaters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Govt. $4.5 million through UNHCR and $500,000 to Red Cross and Swedish Church Aid for LICROSS and World Council of Churches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>6,123 tons of wheat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>Portion of 100,000,000 doses smallpox vaccine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000 tons of rice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
<td>1 million units of cholera vaccine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>CAFOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Govt. £750,000 in food through WFP and other supplies valued at £250,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government £2,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil and military air transport £48,500.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government donation to volags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volag donations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1,109,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet-Nam</td>
<td>20,000 doses of cholera vaccine valued at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Tents, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas International</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICROSS</td>
<td>Red Cross Societies of Japan, Sweden, Denmark, Canada, Switzerland, Australia, Italy, Finland, USA, UK, Austria, Norway, West Germany—cash and food, medical supplies, clothing, tents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lutheran World Federation: Member churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medico International: Food concentrates, tonics, antibiotics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXFAM</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Oxfam and War on Want: 35 tons, mainly tents and medicines: 120,000
Pope Paul VI: 20,000
UNHCR: 500,000
UNICEF: Drugs, food supplements, other supplies and domestic air freight, plus 41 jeeps: 600,000
World Council of Churches: 775,200
World Food Program:
Existing stocks of oil and NFDM turned over to GOI: 1,100,000
To UNHCR: 2,000,000
World Health Organization: 155,000
Other donors: 102,200
Total: 128,194,412

1 Approximate value.
2 To the UNHCR.

Senator Fong. I want to know are we the largest donor to Indian relief?
Mr. Kellogg. By far.
Senator Fong. So we are the largest contributor to both India and Pakistan relief?
Mr. Kellogg. That is correct.
Senator Fong. Are we committed to see to it that there is no starvation?
Mr. Kellogg. That is correct.
Senator Fong. That would be correct?
Mr. Kellogg. Yes.
Senator Fong. Has the administration the funds or the authority to transfer whatever money there is to help in this regard?
Mr. Irwin. We would do our best within the two frameworks: one, of making food grains available and, two, of doing all we could to influence the East Pakistan Government in their distribution operations and helping, to the extent we can, by such means as furnishing equipment or, as has been brought out, furnishing boats.
Senator Fong. In our plan, has there been a fault?
Mr. Irwin. Pardon?
Senator Fong. Where in our plan, in our proposals, in what we project for the Indian refugees or for the East Pakistan displaced persons is there any weakness? Where is the food not really getting to the people or where will they be faced with possible starvation or where will we not be able to do the humanitarian things we would like to?
Mr. Irwin. Well, as I think we have tried to bring out, and as you and the chairman have brought out, the one weakness is the distribution system in East Pakistan. I think that seems to be the principal weakness.
Another weakness is the extent to which the Government of Pakistan feels it might rely on the rice crop in East Pakistan and that might not be up to what it anticipates.
On the Indian side, taking care of the 7 million refugees, if that is the correct figure and we have no reason to doubt it, I think the weakness is just that that is a tremendous number of people. It will take a great amount of money over a period of time, and it will obviously be sometime before the problem is solved, even if the best of worlds existed and no matter how quickly conditions improve in East Pakistan.
If it does cost $600 or $700 million a year, as the Indians believe it will, then it means that a great deal of funds will have to be made available and food will have to be made available from not only the United States but many other countries of the world.

So, it is a persistent problem, I think, and not a weakness. It will require persistence on the part of the rest of the world in assistance to India.

Senator Fong. Do you contemplate that you will come back to Congress for more money?

Mr. Irwin. We might well.

Senator Fong. What will you do as far as the transportation system is concerned in order to get these provisions to the areas they are not now reaching?

Are you doing anything to solve this problem? Are you trying to get the Pakistan Government to do something on that score?

Mr. Rees. Yes; we are sir. We do hope that Pakistan will divert back to civil use more of the equipment that had previously been used in normal times for movement of civil cargoes and foods and we are urging that they do so as soon as they can. We are expressing the possibility in support of that that we are prepared to provide additional funds if needed for additional rivercraft.

We have been suggesting to other nations that they do the same. We have not received any formal word that others are going to but with the U.N. report now out and the urging by the Secretary General that others join, we have every expectation that some other nations will also charter rivercraft for use in East Pakistan.

Senator Fong. Mr. Secretary, I would like to commend you and your staff for a very fine program for the humanitarian relief of all of these suffering people.

I think you have done a good job. Of course, much more has to be done. The other nations and the United Nations should be called upon to contribute more. It seems that we are carrying the largest part of the burden; a much larger part of the burden than our share. I think the other nations should be asked to contribute and help. But, I feel that we have done a very fine job and hope we continue.

Senator Kennedy. Mr. Secretary, I have a couple of final questions on Pakistan.

There have been some reports of requests for USAID Public Safety Teams to go to East Pakistan.

Can you tell us what the attitude of the administration is on this? Are you familiar with it? Is there any possibility of it?

Mr. Rees. Our personnel who have been engaged in public safety training activities in East Pakistan obviously were withdrawn. We are considering the suggestion for a temporary visit by an experienced person there to attempt, from prior contacts, to establish some factual basis for our understanding of the condition of things and the shape and the nature of the present public safety forces in East Pakistan.

Senator Kennedy. Well, let me just get it a little clearer if we could. Is the Department considering sending public safety teams into East Pakistan?

Mr. Rees. No, there is no such consideration. As I said, it was the suggestion of sending, on temporary duty, a man who had previously been stationed there.
Senator Kennedy. Why would you send a person if there is no request? Has there been such a request?

Mr. Rees. No.

Senator Kennedy. Is this an initiative by the Department?

Mr. Rees. This is an initiative on our part to ascertain, if nothing else, the present state of the grant equipment that we had previously provided in the earlier program.

Senator Kennedy. Well, do you need a public safety expert to go over and review what grant equipment was provided under earlier programs?

Do you foresee any possibility that public safety teams would be sent?

Mr. Rees. No, I do not.

Senator Kennedy. Do you, Mr. Ambassador?

Mr. Irwin. I am not familiar with it, Mr. Chairman. But I would be glad to furnish anything further we have for the record.

Senator Kennedy. Could you do that?

(Subsequently, the following information was provided)

The Department of State has no further information. There are no plans for public safety teams to go to East Pakistan.

Mr. Irwin. I think in the past there have been public safety programs in Pakistan.

Senator Kennedy. There was one in Vietnam too, a long time ago. If you could let us know what the thinking is on this.

Would you consider sending over a nutritional team to follow up on the work that has been done by the Ryan Report? We have had such teams elsewhere—doctors that went over to Vietnam on civilian war casualty needs, social welfare teams, and the Department sent a nutritional team at the end of the Biafran War. I am just wondering what the current thinking is on getting a distinguished group of experts that would go and give us some kind of evaluation on the nutritional needs and deficiencies of Pakistan.

I think it has been noted that there is probably food in the various harbors, but the obvious difficulty is getting it distributed. So it would be important to have this kind of evaluation also.

Mr. Rees. Mr. Chairman, the World Health Organization Team that has just finished its report on East Pakistan made a special effort to look at the nutritional situation.

Senator Kennedy. Do you have that report?

Mr. Rees. No; we have not gotten it yet.

Senator Kennedy. Has it been filed yet?

Mr. Rees. I am not sure. We have a cable summary of their verbal account as they were leaving. It does stress the very point that you are making.

I don't know whether they had nutritionists on the team. The FAO World Food Program Team is also attempting to take a look at nutritional aspects. We have been moving with UNICEF and with our mission to think through food fortification and use of processed food of high food value in part because of the nutritional impact, and in part in view of the logistics problem, the high density foods may be easier to move around.

The first shipment of such high density food is due to be on the water this week.
Senator Kennedy. We have a vote, Mr. Secretary, we'll recess briefly and then I just have one or two more questions.

Senator Mathias, do you have any more questions?

Senator Mathias. I would be willing to forego questions on this, Mr. Chairman, rather than call the Secretary back and if I have any questions in looking over the transcript, we can submit them.

Senator Kennedy. Will you excuse us briefly, Mr. Secretary?

(Recess.)

Senator Kennedy (continuing). The subcommittee will come to order. I had hoped, Mr. Ambassador and Mr. Secretary, to stay in touch in terms of the development of a nutritional team.

As I said, I was unfamiliar with the team that was being sent to the World Health and the FAO and I was unaware of their makeup and their complexion.

I think it would be of enormous value to all of us who are trying to follow this closely to have the input of a trained nutritionist.

But we are not interested at the taxpayer's expense to duplicate the work of these international organizations, the World Health and the others; they have, of course, very great resources in terms of trained people, but I hope that we could continue a dialog on that issue because I think it could be extremely helpful.

Mr. Irwin. Mr. Chairman, we would be very happy to keep a dial­

It started with India asking the United Nations as far as the Indian side of it is concerned. So, I would just like to emphasize that, while we are anxious to move ahead, we are part of an international effort. It may be that we have given most of the money and time. Perhaps because of our wealth and size we always will give the most. But it is an international effort in which we are trying to engage all of the other nations, at least insofar as we can.

Senator Kennedy. I would like to ask you finally has the Defense Department had a role in terms of the refugees and if so, could you tell us about it?

Mr. Irwin. The Defense Department has not had any sort of a gen­

Therefore, there was almost one refugee to one local resident, and this caused tremendous dislocations and pressures. As a result, the Interagency Committee, which I chair, approved the airlift and the U.S. Air Force sent an original C-130 to test the possibilities and
capabilities as well as the technological problems. The initial run proved that it was indeed feasible, and the airlift was approved for a 2-week period and subsequently for an additional 2 weeks.

What it accomplished was a very tangible evidence of the concern of the U.S. people and the U.S. Government's interest in the refugees' plight and it also demonstrated to the local population that the U.S. Government was trying to move refugees out of an overcrowded area.

While the numbers moved were small in relation to the total, the airlift was a definite recognition of the problem caused by the tremendous influx of refugees. In addition, and I think this is important to stress, the airlift on its return trips from Assam to Tripura carried a very substantial load of rice.

This was a vital effort because the rice transported by the four airplanes provided the refugees one-half of the food that they were consuming. The difficulty here was that the rail terminated some 400 or 500 miles away from the refugee camps and there was only one road, a single dirt strip, and in the monsoon it becomes almost impassable; so without the airlift the refugees would have had a very serious problem with respect to food.

Senator KENNEDY. You have no other plans to utilize them other than for transportation?

Mr. IRWIN. There have been no other plans at least to date.

Senator KENNEDY. Senator Mathias?

Senator MATHIAS. I have no questions on this, Mr. Chairman.

Senator KENNEDY. Could we then move to Southeast Asia, Mr. Secretary?

We had some hearings on April 21 and 22 in terms of some of the refugees' problems in Southeast Asia and I see Mr. Doolin of the Defense Department.

I wrote to the Secretary of Defense on May 10. In this letter [see text in Appendix V] we included an exchange before the subcommittee with Mr. Doolin; he indicated that the Department would prepare a report on the rules of engagement guiding U.S. Forces in Southeast Asia. We have had no reply thus far.

I also want to welcome Mr. Sullivan here. It is like old home week.

During the time of the hearings, Mr. Secretary, we had several different exchanges with Mr. Sullivan and expressed different views on the creation of refugees in Laos—and we spent some time in expressing our different views on this question.

Now, I see a report that was prepared by a young IVS volunteer, Walter Haney, on the creation of refugees in Laos. It is one of the most complete and thorough reports I have seen. He has gone into considerable detail. He has pictures of different families, names, villages, dates, and I understand it has been made available to the U.S. Embassy in Vientiane.

He got a nice note back from them, but I would like to submit this to you, Mr. Secretary, and perhaps to Mr. Sullivan, to get the Department's reactions to it. The principal conclusion was that aerial bombardment by the United States was the primary cause of refugees from the Plain of Jars in 1969.

I would be terribly interested if you could take it and have your people review it and have Mr. Sullivan, who is familiar with it, review it. This young IVS volunteer spoke fluent Lao and spent a
great deal of time in the development and preparation of this report. I must say it is an enormously thorough effort on his part. It is very well documented. [See Appendix II for complete text and the Department’s reply.]

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with it but perhaps Mr. Sullivan is.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I have read the report and Walter Haney came in to see me and I have sent it out for comment to Laos.

The preliminary comment I have received is that this group of refugees he interviewed, and I think as you say extremely well, constituted the same group that had been the subject of the investigation that we had carried out through our mission because they were people that did represent an extraordinary experience; people who had been in our judgment subject to some action by Air Force planes or by air action as rather an exception than the rule.

This was the group on which I testified earlier——

Senator KENNEDY. I remember your report very well. My initial impression was that it is more broadly based than the USIS report, but if you could submit whatever reaction that you do have, it would be extremely helpful.

I would like to, if I could, since Mr. Sullivan is here, to ask if there is anything new in terms of the Cambodian situation.

I remember your testimony last time was of rather modest dimensions on the Cambodia refugee problem, and you hadn’t any specific figures.

We have some independent evaluations in terms of newspaper reports about a significant increase of refugees.

I was wondering if there is anything new on that, Mr. Sullivan?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Since those hearings, Secretary Irwin and I have been out to Cambodia and one of the things that we sought to clarify was the statistics concerning refugees. I have just told Mr. deHaan that I think we have to admit a fairly complete failure to elicit an exact figure on what the refugee statistics are.

The figures that are available through all of the Cambodian Government agencies are pretty vague and they don’t give us anything in the way of a firm foundation for a clear understanding of the problem. However, we did look at the actual situation in Phnom Penh and there are only a few thousand still in a refugee status.

We found a great deal of difficulty in getting any clarification of the numbers of refugees that have actually come into Phnom Penh itself or of any increases in the size of the population of the city. In fact, we couldn’t really get a clear picture of what the population in the city was. We did go up, or at least I did, to some of the places where the fighting had taken place and it is quite clear a number of those towns along Route 66 and Route 7 have been demolished.

Therefore, the people obviously have moved out. The mission has compiled what it considers the best estimate of refugees somewhere in the range of 500,000; 210,000 of these being Vietnamese that have moved out of Cambodia into Vietnam, the rest being very largely around Phnom Penh; but also in the provincial cities such as Battambang and also in the areas under Communist control.

There clearly have been people who have moved into the population centers from the countryside. There does not appear to be cur-
rently a humanitarian problem. The people who are displaced have been taken care of except for this small group of people who are encamped in the outskirts of Phnom Penh itself.

Senator KENNEDY. Do we have any program to help assist them at the present time?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have no specific refugee program. There have not been any demands as yet from Cambodians for assistance in this field. However, in our AID program we are including foods and certain other items such as public health equipment which we think would be of value to them.

Senator KENNEDY. So the official total number of refugees in Cambodia is 500,000; 200,000 returned to South Vietnam and approximately 300,000 others?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Senator KENNEDY. And those 300,000, except for a very small percentage, have been resettled?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Resettled perhaps is not the word. Of course in the social system of a country like Cambodia with the extended family group, a great many of them have just been taken in by their relatives and by their family friends. They are not resettled to the extent of having reestablished villages. I think that they would still be people who would want to go back to the villages they came from once the security permits.

Senator KENNEDY. Do you have anything, while we are talking about it, on the Laotian refugee situation?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, sir. When we testified last we had a total of 280,000. It is now about 316,000. These additional refugees came very largely in the south. As you will recall, in the late spring of this year the North Vietnamese moved over from the areas east of Bolovens Plateau and actually took control of the Bolovens Plateau and two or three population centers, Pakson, particularly, which have been emptied out. These people have come into the area of the Mekong Valley down in Pakse. So there has been an increase from the time we testified of about 8,000. Eight thousand refugees.

Senator KENNEDY. Would you want to comment on the Vietnamese refugee situation? The situation, according to figures I have, is that there were nearly 100,000 during the first quarter of this year, during the first 5 months of this year. Are those your figures?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is correct, sir.

Senator KENNEDY. This, as I understand it, is about comparable to recent years in terms of the numbers of new refugees that have been created.

I was wondering why this is so, given the apparent reduction in fighting.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, about 80,000 of those are accounted for by two distinct actions. One was the movement by the South Vietnamese armed forces into the U Minh Forest, which is down in the very tip of the Delta. That area has long been a Communist stronghold and this is the first time that the South Vietnamese armed forces have been able successfully to go in and penetrate the area and try to clean it up.

In doing this, they pulled out a great number of the people who resided in that area and put them in refugee camps while they continued their military action in the forest itself.
That is one of the main causes and I think that is the cause of somewhere around 30,000.

Senator Kennedy. How much movement was there? This movement last spring, this enforced relocation of Montagnards; is it still continuing?

Mr. Sullivan. That is the point I was going to address myself to now. The larger group has been a movement in military region 2 of Montagnard tribesmen upward of 45,000 who were moved out forcefully and forcefully relocated by a new regional military commander.

This movement in the judgment of our people and also ultimately in the judgment of the Government in Vietnam was contrary to the policy of the government. It was stopped at the Saigon level. There have been no further enforced movements.

In other words, the policy is now bringing security to the people, rather than bringing the people out of the places considered insecure. These people were moved from the areas near Fire Bases 5 and 6 which, you may recall, came under heavy attack in the spring. This is in the area adjacent to the Cambodian border. There was a real security problem but we did not consider that this was the way to treat it and neither did the government in Saigon which eventually ordered the displacement to stop.

But nearly 47,000, I believe, were moved in that movement. So, those two movements from the U Minh Forest and from the Montagnards account for 80,000 of 100,000 which have been registered as new refugees in the first 6 months of this year.

Consequently, those who have been generated as the result of your correct analysis of diminishing military action were about 20,000 over that period if you set these two aside.

Senator Kennedy. Could you tell us what you know of other planned relocations of people? Can we expect this will continue, or were these exceptions?

Mr. Sullivan. As I said, both of these—not the U Minh movement because that was something else, but movement in the second military region, are contrary to established governmental policy.

The policy of the Government is not to relocate people. Now, the absolute guarantee that this won't happen again, of course is very difficult to give but I can say with some confidence this is the way in which they will conduct themselves. As our forces diminish, particularly in the first military region, up until now we have had nearly three U.S. divisions. There may be deterioration of security since we note that the North Vietnamese are appearing to be making preparations in and through and south of the demilitarized zone to bring pressure on that area.

Now, whether this will result in population movements, it is too early to judge. Our hope would be instead of having any population movement there would be military security to screen the population from these attacks.

Senator Kennedy. Is there a corresponding increase in civilian casualties? Would you say hospital admissions were 10,732 for January and February and March of this year?

I am wondering if—

Mr. Sullivan. This is another one of these statistical problems we have been having difficulty getting an actual firm fix on. We have
some serious effort going on to try to reconcile all of the statistics that are available to us.

Senator Kennedy. That is right. They are comparable to 1968, which I believe, was the year of the highest civilian casualties. I mean we have always had problems about how we are going to figure them out, but just using the same figures we have been using all along—and these aren't subcommittee figures, they are yours—it is, as I understand it, the highest figure since June 1970.

Mr. Sullivan. Our hospital admissions figures counting civilian casualties in the first few months of this year have been at a rate that is, I think, less. I will have to get these for you accurately. I think it is less than they were certainly in 1970. The rate in 1968 was 6,391 on a monthly average. The rate is in 1970 about 3,853 on a monthly average.

I believe the current rate is somewhat below 3,300.

Senator Kennedy. Well, in March it was 4,100. I was just wondering why they had gone up?

Mr. Sullivan. Well, Mr. Chairman, March was a period of extremely intensive heavy fighting up there as you recall in military region 1 particularly.

So there was an increase, a spurt in that month, that particular month was the one that raised the monthly average for the first quarter of this year.

We expect the average when we have a few more months of statistics to be considerably lower than it was in 1970 and I think you will find that it is less than half of what it was in 1968.

Senator Kennedy. Just in terms of a report I saw this morning in the Times which tells of gains by the enemy in a survey by Saigon, telling of declining security in the Delta area.

Do you think if this was accurate and true, do you think this would mean there would probably be more fighting and more civilian casualties?

Mr. Sullivan. I think Tad Szulc seems to have gotten his copy of that cable before I got mine.

But in the previous month there has been some deterioration in the security situation in Binh Dinh and Phu Yen Province largely because these have been areas from which we have withdrawn U.S. forces. With less density of security forces in the area there is, of course, a reduction in the immediate security and some increase in the Vietcong terrorism and assassinations.

This sort of infliction of civilian casualties certainly is something that we feel is probably going to go up. That is to say, individuals are going to be killed by assassination, booby traps are going to be placed in areas where civilians innocently wander, and we do fear that there will be increases in civilian casualties in these areas where government security cannot be provided against this sort of indiscriminate attack.

Senator Kennedy. There was a report of a meeting in May in which those familiar with the situation are predicting large scale urban violence before the end of the year, spearheaded by returning veterans. The report concludes that something new and different is called for to provide social order.