

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE  
(1978-79)**

**(SIXTH LOK SABHA)**

**NINETY-SECOND REPORT**

**RESETTLEMENT OF EX-SERVICEMEN  
NEAR SEIJOSA**

**MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS**

**[Action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their 21st Report (Sixth Lok Sabha) relating to Ministry of Home Affairs.]**



*Presented in Lok Sabha on  
Laid in Rajya Sabha on*

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*November, 1978/Kartika, 1900 (Saka)*

*Price : Rs. 1.45*

**LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA  
SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS**

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.	Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.
<b>ANDHRA PRADESH</b>			10.	M & J Services, Publishers, Representatives Accounts & Law Book Sellers, Bahri Road, Bombay-15.	
1.	Andhra University General Co-operative Stores Ltd., Waltair (Visakhapatnam).		11.	Popular Book Depot, Dr. Bhadkamkar Road, Bombay-400001.	
<b>BIHAR</b>			<b>MYSORE</b>		
2.	M/s. Crown Book Depot, Upper Bazar, Ranchi (Bihar).		12.	M/s. Peoples Book House, Opp. Jaganmohan Palace, Mysore-1.	
<b>GUJARAT</b>			<b>UTTAR PRADESH</b>		
3.	Vijay Stores, Station Road, Anard.		13.	Law Book Company, Sardar Patel Marg, Allahabad-1.	
<b>MADHYA PRADESH</b>			14.	Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P.B. No. 77, Allahabad—U.P.	
4.	Modern Book House, Shiv Volas Palace, Indore City.		<b>WEST BENGAL</b>		
<b>MAHARASHTRA</b>			15.	Granthaloka, 5/1, Ambica Mookherjee Road, Belgharia, 24-Parganas.	
5.	M/s. Sunderdas Gianchand, 601, Girgaum Road, near Princess Street Bombay-2.		16.	W. Newman & Company Ltd., 3, Old Court House Street, Calcutta.	
6.	The International Book House Pvt., 9, Ash Lane, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay-1.		17.	Mrs. Manimala, Buys & Sells, 128, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta-12.	
7.	The International Book Service, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4.		<b>DELHI</b>		
8.	The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-1.		18.	Jain Book Agency, Conaught Place, New Delhi.	
9.	M/s. Usha Book Depot, 585/A, Chira Bazar Khan House, Girgaum Road, Bombay-2.		19.	M/s. Sat Narain & Sons, 3141, Mohd. Ali Bazar, Mori Gate, Delhi.	

Corrigenda to the 92nd Report of the  
Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
Cover-page	5	NINTY-SECOND	NINETY-SECOND
3	7	Scheme	Scheme
6	21	102	1.102
7	5	vide	wide
8	17	detail	detailed
10	35)	KEFA	NEFA
11	4 )		
12	38	each and	cash as
13	10	application	applications
13	25	HEFA	NEFA
15	28	out	but
19	13	proved	provided
23	13	vide	wide
23	17	precurement	procurement
24		After the Heading insert 'Nil'.	

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (1978-79) . . . . .	(iii)
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	(v)
CHAPTER I Report . . . . .	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations/observations which have been accepted by Government . . . . .	8
CHAPTER III Recommendations/observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in the light of the replies of Government . . . . .	19
CHAPTER IV Recommendations/observations replies to which have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration . . . . .	21
CHAPTER V Recommendations/observations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies . . . . .	24
APPENDIX Conclusions and Recommendations . . . . .	25

**PARLIAMENT LIBRARY**  
Library & Reference Service  
General Govt Publications  
Acc. No. B 5/240(2)  
Date 13/2/78

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE**  
**(1978-79)**

**CHAIRMAN**

**Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao**

**MEMBERS**

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Halimuddin Ahmed
3. Shri Balak Ram
4. Shri Brij Raj Singh
5. Shri C. K. Chandrappan
6. Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt
7. Shri K. Gopal
8. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta
9. Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra
10. Shri B. P. Mandal
11. Shri R. K. Mhalgi
12. Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya
13. Shri Gauri Shankar Rai
14. Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao
15. Shri Vasant Sathe

*Rajya Sabha*

16. Shri Devendra Nath Dwivedi
17. Shri M. Kadershah
18. Shri Sita Ram Kesri
19. Dr. Bhai Mahavir
20. Smt. Leela Damodara Menon
21. Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy
22. Shri Gian Chand Totu

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri H. G. Paranjpe—*Joint Secretary.*
2. Shri Bipin Behari—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Ninety-Second Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their Twenty-First Report (6th Lok Sabha) on Paragraph 31 on Resettlement of Ex-servicemen near Seijosa of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1974-75, Union Government (Civil) relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs.

2. On 31 May, 1978 an 'Action Taken Sub-Committee' consisting of the following Members was appointed to scrutinise the replies received from Government in pursuance of the recommendations made by the Committee in their earlier Reports:

1. Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao—*Chairman*.
2. Shri Asoka Krishna Dutt—*Convener*.

### MEMBERS

3. Shri Gauri Shankar Rai
4. Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao
5. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta
6. Shri Vasant Sathe

3. The Action Taken-Sub-Committee of the Public Accounts Committee (1978-79) considered and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 16 October, 1978. The Report was finally adopted by the Public Accounts Committee (1978-79) on 28 October, 1978.

4. For facility of reference the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report. For the sake of convenience, the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee have also been appended to the Report in a consolidated form.

5. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in this matter by the Comptroller & Auditor General of India.

NEW DELHI;  
November 8, 1978  
Kartika 17, 1900 (S).

P. V. NARASIMHA RAO,  
*Chairman,*  
Public Accounts Committee.

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

1.1. This Report of the Committee deals with the action taken by Government on the Committee's recommendations|observations contained in their 21st Report (Sixth Lok Sabha) on 'Resettlement of Ex-servicemen near Seijosa', commented upon in paragraph 31 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1974-75, Union Government (Civil), relating to the Ministry of Home Affairs.

1.2. The Committee's 21st Report was presented to the Lok Sabha on 22 December, 1977 and contained 18 recommendations|observations. According to the time schedule for furnishing of Action Taken Notes on the Committee's recommendations|observations prescribed in the Committee's 5th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha), the Notes indicating the action taken by Government in pursuance of the recommendations|observations contained in their 21st Report were required to be furnished to the Committee latest by 21 June, 1978. The Ministry of Home Affairs made available to the Committee advance copies of their Action Taken Notes within this time limit. The Ministry furnished vetted copies of their replies in respect of 15 recommendations|observations of the Committee on 5 July, 1978 and requested for further extension of time upto 15 September, 1978 for submitting the vetted copies in respect of the remaining 3 recommendations|observations.

1.3. The Action Taken Notes (vetted as well as non-vetted) received from Government have been broadly categorised as follows:

- (i) Recommendations|observations that have been accepted by Government:  
S. Nos. 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 & 18.
- (ii) Recommendations|observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in the light of the replies received from the Government:  
S. No. 3.
- (iii) Recommendations|observations replies to which have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:  
S. Nos. 1, 5 and 6.

- (iv) Recommendations/observations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies:

NIL

1.4. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by Government on some of their recommendations/observations.

*Ill-Conceived Resettlement Scheme and its dismal failure*  
(Paragraph 1.97 S. No. 1).

1.5. Pointing out that the resettlement scheme near, Seijosa in Arunachal Pradesh on which Government had spent Rs. 24.68 lakhs till March 1974 was ill-conceived *ab-initio*, the Committee, in paragraph 1.97 of their 21st Report, had stated as follows:—

“From a study of the material made available to them and the information gleaned during evidence, the Committee cannot help concluding that the scheme for resettlement near Seijosa in Arunachal Pradesh on which Rs. 24.68 lakhs were spent till March 1974 was ill-conceived *ab initio*. That the scheme ended in a dismal failure is amply proved by the fact that out of a total of 157 families inducted for resettlement in the area, only 36 are left and the rest have deserted. The reasons for the failure cannot be ascribed only to the inertia of the settlers. Government have also to bear, in a sufficient measure, responsibility for the same. Some of the more conspicuous shortcomings and instances of ineptitude displayed by the authorities are discussed in the following paragraphs.”

1.6. In their Action Taken Note dated 5 July, 1978, furnished in response to the above observations, the Ministry of Home Affairs have stated:

“The Committee have come to this conclusion evidently based on the shortcomings and ineptitude referred to by them in the subsequent paragraphs. The considerations which weighed with the Government for formulation of the scheme were very important and duly thought of as brought out in paras 1.24 and 1.25 of the Report.”



1.7. In paragraphs 1.24 and 1.25 of their 21st Report (6th Lok Sabha), the Committee had reproduced the objectives of this Resettlement Scheme and the evidence given by the Home Secretary in this regard. The relevant paragraphs are given below:—

#### “GENESIS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SCHEME

1.24. According to the Ministry of Home Affairs the objectives of the Scheme of Resettlement of ex-servicemen in NEFA were as follows:

“The scheme for rehabilitation of ex-servicemen in Arunachal Pradesh was initiated by the NEFA Administration in October 1967 following earlier high level policy decision after the Chinese aggression in 1962. The scheme was initiated on the following considerations:

- (i) The North East Frontier Agency (now Arunachal Pradesh, as a whole is comparatively thinly populated; the overall density of population being about 11 persons per sq. mile.
- (ii) A population vacuum near the border may result in attempts by hostile neighbour to take advantage of the situation.
- (iii) A settled community along the border will be a positive deterrent against the temptation of infiltration from across the border.
- (iv) The actual presence of a settled community along the border would further reduce the scope of any border dispute.
- (v) A progressive community will boost up the morale of the local inhabitants and inspire greater zeal for accelerated economic progress.
- (vi) The settlement of people belonging to mixed community in NEFA may help towards emotional integration of NEFA people with rest of the country.”

During evidence the representative of the Ministry, while dealing with the objectives of the scheme has stated that “one of the purpose of the scheme was to demonstrate and develop agricultural practices which were not followed in those areas. Shifting cultivation, as we have known over a period of time, is something which must give place to settled cultivation.”

1.25. Asked to state the consideration which went into this particular scheme, the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, has stated during evidence as follows:

“A number of considerations went into this particular scheme, the state of affairs as it existed, the position of the border the low density of the population in the area, the need for security, the need for the development of the area and the need for bringing emotional integration with the rest of the country. All these considerations were before the persons who formulated the scheme....The points which were under consideration of those who formulated the scheme were that the North East Frontier Agency as a whole was a comparatively thinly populated area, the density of population being only 11 persons per sq. mile and it was felt that there was a population vacuum that existed and that the population vacuum would always attract attention and would also give some cause to the infiltrators into the area. It was felt that in this area which was very thinly populated area where there was a chance of infiltration we must bring in certain progressive persons there, the persons who were aware of the defence requirements, the persons who had worked in the armed forces and the persons who were progressive farmers and who could do cultivation. There was the jhuming type of cultivation there. The purpose was to develop that area on a certain basis. It was also felt that if we bring in a certain number of persons there, that would bring about an emotional integration with the rest of the country. It was felt that the resources and the potential that existed in the area could be fully developed”

1.8. The Committee regret to say that instead of accepting the responsibility for the failure of the Resettlement of Ex-servicemen Scheme near Seijosa, the Ministry of Home Affairs have drawn the attention of the Committee to the considerations which weighed with the Government for formulation of the scheme as brought out in paras 1.24 and 1.25 of their 21st Report (Sixth Lok Sabha). The Committee had nowhere in the Report commented adversely on the objectives of the scheme but at the same time they had expressed their unhappiness over the manner in which this whole scheme was handled by Government, resulting in its dismal failure. The least that the Committee expected was that Government will realise their mistakes and shortcomings in the implementation of the scheme and not repeat them in schemes that might be taken up in future.

*Lack of Planning and human approach to the problem of settlement (Paragraph 1.101—S. No. 5).*

1.9. Pointing out the utter lack of planning and human approach to the problem of settlement in Dibru and Jolly Sectors of this scheme, the Committee had, in paragraph 1.101 of the Report, stated:

“The utter lack of planning and human approach to the problem of settlement is reflected by the fact that in Dibru Sector, the drinking water supply was arranged in June, 1973 i.e. nearly three years after the second batch of settlers arrived for settlement in Dibru and Jolly sectors and no arrangement for supply of water was made for Jolly Sector till May, 1972 by when all the settlers in this sector had deserted. The Committee understand that the delay in arranging water supply was due to inadequate provision of funds and the delay in sanctioning water supply scheme. The Committee are not satisfied with the statement of the representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs during evidence that the settlers could use the water from the springs and rivulets in the area. The Committee feel that Government should have taken care of the need for provision of at least drinking water in the settlement area and make available adequate funds for this purpose. They would like Government to inquire into the reported delay in the sanction of scheme.”

1.10. In their Action Taken Note dated 20 June, 1978, the Ministry of Home Affairs have stated:\*

“A sum of Rs. 19,000 for anticipated number of 190 families was available in the sanctioned scheme for arranging drinking water supply in the settlement area. The Arunachal Pradesh Government have also spent funds from the normal budget for execution of water supply schemes in the area as per details given below:

	Rs.
1968-69 . . . . .	25,128.52
1969-70 . . . . .	3,832.80
1972-73 . . . . .	34,413.69
1973-74 . . . . .	6,098.57
1974-75 . . . . .	6,098.84
1977-78 . . . . .	64,371.00
	1,39,943.51

\*Not vetted by Audit.

In Arunachal Pradesh local people in most of the Villages have been using perennial springs and rivulets as the normal source of drinking water. Even till now not more than 25% of the villages have been covered by water supply schemes."

1.11. The Committee are distressed to note from the reply of the Government that merely 'a sum of Rs. 19000 for anticipated number' of 100 families was available in the sanctioned scheme for arranging drinking water supply in this settlement area' and that no funds were made available for the execution of the water supply schemes during the year 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1975-76. It is amply proved by the Government's above reply that the delay in arranging water supply in Dibru Sector upto June 1973 and non-initiation of any such scheme in Jolly Sector upto May 1972 were due to inadequate provisioning of funds and the delay in the sanctioning of water supply schemes. The Committee would, therefore, like to reiterate their earlier recommendation that the delay in the sanction of water supply schemes and in providing inadequate funds for these schemes should be inquired into for fixing responsibility.

*Delay in the construction of roads linking the various Sectors of settlement (S. No. 6—Para 102).*

1.12. Although the first party of settlers was inducted in this sector in March, 1969, the construction of 4 cause ways and pipe culverts to make the road between upper Seijosa and Sector 'A' negotiable during rainy season could not be taken up till December, 1975. Commenting on the resulting hardships to the settlers, the Committee had, in paragraph 1.102, observed.

"The inept planning is also indicated in the delay in the construction of roads linking the various sectors of settlement to Upper Seijosa where the Administration Headquarters school, health unit and market were located. The Committee note that Sector 'A' was about 4 to 5 Kms. from Upper Seijosa. The first party of settlers was inducted in this Sector in March, 1969, but the construction of 4 cause-ways and pipe culverts to make the road between Upper Seijosa and Sector 'A' negotiable during rainy season was approved in February 1971 and the work was not taken up till December, 1975. As a result, the settlers who have not so far deserted continue to face difficulty during monsoon in reaching Upper Seijosa for availing of the various facilities available there."

1.13. In their reply furnished to these observations, in the relevant Acton Taken Note dated 20 June, 1978 the Ministry of Home Affairs have stated:

“Provision for cross bridges etc., was for small streams which are wide and shallow in depth. There is no difficulty in crossing all these small streams throughout the year except during heavy floods. However, the roads were never closed because of absence of cross bridged. Temporary culverts have, however, been provided. The delay in taking up the work was due to difficulty in procurement of cement and hume pipes.”

1.14. The Committee note that the difficulty in procurement of cement and hume pipes has been cited as a reason for not taking up the work of construction of four cause-ways and pipe culverts to make the road between the upper Seijosa and Sector 'A' negotiable during the rainy season. The Committee would like an enquiry to be made as to why this situation was allowed to persist for wellnigh 5 years (1971 to 1975) with a view to fixing responsibility therefor.

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

#### Recommendation

The Committee learn that the Team of Officers which had visited the area in August, 1967 had pointed out the need for detailed soil survey of the area. The Directorate of Resettlement of the Ministry of Defence, however, agreed to the resettlement of ex-servicemen in the area in May 1968 and requested the Ministry of Food and Agriculture to get the necessary soil tests done. In August, 1968, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture undertook soil reconnaissance in the area. In their report (September, 1968), the Soil Reconnaissance Team also pointed out that "the Seijosa soils are not quite suitable for permanent cultivation and reclamation of land by removing the existing shrubs on the surface was likely to result in heavy soil loss". The report had also recommended that "detailed soil survey of the area may be taken up before the lands were allotted". However, in January, 1969 and September, 1970, Government of India sanctioned resettlement of a total of 190 families in the area at an aggregate cost of Rs. 53.06 lakhs, without waiting for the detailed soil survey and the induction of settlers commenced in March 1969. In July 1973, another reconnaissance survey was conducted by the All India Soil and Land Use Survey Organisation of the Government of India, Calcutta Centre, which came to the conclusion that "these soils have very low water holding capacities." that "root penetration is good upto 50 cms., but roots are very few in the sand layer" and, therefore, "the soils are unsuitable for cultivation". The detailed soil survey of August 1975 also did not present a very optimistic picture so far as soil fertility in the area was concerned and had suggested soil conservation measures and irrigation facilities as a pre-requisite for agricultural development of the area. On the face of these findings, the Committee are doubtful whether the site selected for the settlement was really suitable. The fact that numerous representations were made to the Government by the settlers pointing out the poor quality of soil is a clear indication that expectations of the Government in regard to the fertility of the soil, despite the reports of various teams and surveys, did not come out to be true. The Committee, therefore,

cannot but deplore the hasty action taken by Government in inducting the settlers in the area without first making sure that the area was fit for agriculture which was going to be the mainstay of the settlers in the area.

[Serial No. 2 of Appendix 1—Para 1.98 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The scheme was launched in consultation with the then Ministry of Food and Agriculture. The observation of the Committee regarding the need for detailed soil survey before implementing similar schemes in future has been noted and brought to the notice of the U.T. Administration and Ministries of Agriculture and Irrigation, Defence, Finance, Planning Commission and Supply and Rehabilitation.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP Dated 5 July, 1978]

### **Recommendation**

The lack of realism on the part of Government is also reflected by the fact that the logs and stumps left over as a result of the reclamation of land in this area continued to lay scattered in the fields allocated to the settlers, seriously hampering cultivation land by them. The settlers were expected to remove these logs and stumps from their fields as a part of the process of development of land for which they were given a cash grant of Rs. 400 per acre. The Arunachal Pradesh Administration have themselves admitted that this grant was "inadequate to meet the expenses for removal of the stumps lying in the thickly forested plot". No wonder the effort of the settlers to develop their land was demonstrably low. It was as late as in 1975-76 that a scheme costing Rs. 85,800 was drawn up and sanctioned for uprooting the stumps from agricultural plots but the scheme was still-born in view of large-scale desertion of the settlers. The Committee are unable to understand how Government initially expected the settlers with their limited resources to undertake the kind of development of land envisaged and make it fit for cultivation, particularly in such a difficult terrain. In the opinion of the Committee, Government should have themselves cleared the area of logs and stumps as a part of reclamation work before the allotment of land to the settlers.

[Serial No. 4 of Appendix 1—Para 1.100 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The observation of the Committee has been noted for future and communicated to the Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP Dated 5 July, 1978]

### **Recommendation**

The second batch of settlers was inducted in the Jolly and Dibru Sectors, which were about 10 to 16 kms. from Upper Seijosa. The second party of settlers was inducted in these sectors in April, May 1970. The Jolly-Upper Seijosa Road, which was started in January, 1969, was not completed till January, 1973 by when all the settlers had deserted that sector. The construction of road connecting Dibru Sector with Upper Seijosa was not completed by January, 1975. No further progress has been made due to the desertion of settlers. The Committee are surprised as to how Government were expecting the settlers in the Dibru and Jolly sectors to avail of the various facilities at Upper Seijosa without proper communication. The Committee regret that no attention whatsoever was paid to this matter.

[Serial No. 7 of Appendix 1—Para 1.103 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The observation has been noted and communicated to the Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP Dated 5 July, 1978]

### **Recommendation**

According to the Audit paragraph, out of 157 families as many as 37 families were settled in the Dibru and Jolly Sectors. Even for availing of the elementary facilities like dispensary, school, post office and the market, the residents of these Sectors were to come to Upper Seijosa. There being no bridge over Dibru river separating these Sectors from Upper Seijosa, the residents of these sectors had to cross the river on elephants provided by the Administration. Realising the hardship of these settlers the then KEFA Administration had approached the Ministry of Home Affairs in September, 1969 for construction of a wide-rope suspension bridge over the Dibru



river and proposed for this purpose the provision of Rs. One Lakh in their budget for the year 1970-71. This proposal along with other proposals were examined by the Ministry in consultation with the Ministry of Finance and KEFA Administration were informed that the Governor of Assam was competent to accord sanction for carrying forward the scheme for 1970-71 and 1971-72 on the approved pattern of the earlier scheme provided the total expenditure did not exceed Rs. 50 lakhs. As the earlier scheme did not contain such provision it was constructed or rejection of the proposal for construction of a suspension bridge.

[Serial No. 8 of Appendix 1—Para 1.104 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The observations have been noted.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP dated 5 July, 1978]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee observe that the reply of the Central Government to proposal from the Arunachal Pradesh Administration was vague and ambiguous and was bound to lead to misunderstanding. The Committee regret that for this reason alone the scheme for the suspension bridge over the Dibru river, which would have been an important part of the life-time for the settlers in the area, could not be proceeded with.

[Serial No. 9 of Appendix 1—Para 1.105 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The observations have been noted.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP dated 5 July, 1978]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee are unable to appreciate the wisdom of concentrating all the facilities for the settlers, such as administrative headquarters, post office, health unit, school and market, at Upper Seijosa, which is about 4 to 5 kms. from Sector 'A' and 10 to 16 Kms from Dibru and Jolly Sectors. The Committee feel that it was too much to expect the sick to march 10 to 15 Kms through inhospitable terrain, crossing Dibru river on elephant back, to reach the health

unit at upper Seijosa and for the children to march 20 to 30 Kms daily to attend school at Upper Seijosa under similar conditions. They feel that Government should have set up these facilities in the Settlement area itself so that the settlers could have freely availed of these facilities. As it is the facilities are well-nigh out of the reach of the settlers.

[Serial No. 10 of Appendix 1—Para 1.106 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The observation of the Committee has been noted and communicated to the A.P. Government. The settlers who were in need of being evacuated for treatment were provided facilities of Govt. Vehicles.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP dated 5 July, 1978]

#### **Recommendation**

According to the Audit paragraph, grants (in cash and kind) to the extent of Rs 4270 were sanctioned to each family for purchase of live stock, tools and implements, seeds, seedlings and household equipment instead of supplying these to them although there was no market nearby where these could be purchased. The Arunachal Pradesh Government have stated that to facilitate the easy procurement for various items and also in consideration of the practical difficulties involved in the selection of required articles by the settlers, erstwhile MEFA Administration constituted a Purchase Board comprising responsible district officers and the representatives of the settlers who were to inspect a few firms of repute at the nearest town of Tezpur and nearby important marketing centres to purchase the items. During evidence, however, the representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs informed the Committee that in response to representations, "individuals were allowed to purchase things of their own likings." He, however, admitted that "marketing facilities is a problem in that entire area" The Committee feel that in view of the marketing problem in the area it would have been better to supply the articles to them rather than to hand out cash to them. If the settlers had been given the goods in kind, Government would not have been confronted with cases of misutilisation of each and reported by the then Adviser to the Governor in his letter to Central Government dated 22nd May 1971.

[Serial No. 11 of Appendix 1—Para 1.107 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The observation has been noted and communicated to A.P. Government. However, the circumstances in which flexibility was introduced in the procedure have been explained in para 1.55 of the report.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP dated  
5 July, 1978]

### **Recommendation**

Another glaring lacuna observed by the Committee is the lack of publicity given to the scheme, while inviting application from the desirous and prospective settlers. The Home Secretary deposed during evidence that 'a very wide publicity was given' to this scheme. However, according to the note furnished to the Committee the media of newspapers and All India Radio were not utilised for giving publicity to the colonisation scheme due to its secret classification and that the Rajya Sainik Boards were expressly informed not to use radio, newspaper or handouts for publicising this scheme. When it was pointed out that 'perhaps the notices were put on the Notice Boards in the Office of the District Boards and nothing happened thereafter the Director General of Resettlement conceded that this could have happened. The Committee, therefore, cannot escape the conclusion that this scheme was not properly publicised particularly in the contiguous areas of Bihar, West Bengal, Assam and other areas where geographical conditions comparable to those prevailing in HEFA existed. Due to this lack of publicity, many potential aspirants from these areas who could have better adjusted to the conditions prevailing in the settlement area, might have been prevented from offering themselves for selection.

[Serial No. 12 of Appendix 1—Para. 1.108 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The Ministry of Defence have decided that wide publicity would be given to the future schemes through the media of newspapers, All India Radio etc. besides circulating the schemes to the concerned Rajya Sainik Boards and Zilla Sainik Boards. Director of Resettlement and Service Headquarters.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP dated  
5 July, 1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee note that the Selection Board which selected the ex-Servicemen for settlement in the area consisted of the Liaison Officer of the Ministry of Defence, Deputy Commissioner of the District from which Ex-Servicemen came, District Agricultural Officer of the concerned district and the Secretary of the DSS&A Board of the concerned district. No officer of Arunachal Pradesh Administration was included in the Selection Board. The Committee feel that it would have been prudent to include in the Selection Board a representative of the Arunachal Pradesh Administration who was fully conversant with the geographical conditions of the area and had experience of district administration. His advice in regard to the fitness of the applicants for settlement in the area would have been in the opinion of the Committee invaluable.

[Serial No. 13 of Appendix 1—Para 1.109 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The Ministry of Defence have decided that the Selection Committee would consist of representatives of the Ministry of Home Affairs, Directorate General of Resettlement, Ministry of Defence and Arunachal Pradesh Govt. if any future settlement is agreed upon, keeping in view the observations of the Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh against Sl. No. 17.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP dated 5 July, 1978]

### **Recommendation**

In this context, it is noteworthy that the area selected for re-settlement was largely slopy where only terrace type of cultivation was possible. The Committee, therefore, fail to understand as to how and on what basis were the people from Punjab and Haryana, who were not expected to have any knowledge and experience of terrace cultivation, selected for settlement and inducted in the area.

[Serial No. 14 of Appendix 1—Para 1.110 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

The Ministry of Defence have revised the procedure for selecting right type of settlers as indicated below:—

- (a) Selection Boards of the concerned States will be given full history of the type of land and areas of resettlement.
- (b) Preference will be given to those who are accustomed to the geographical and climatic conditions of Arunachal Pradesh.
- (c) Ex-Servicemen from the neighbouring States such as Assam, Bihar and West Bengal will be given preference for resettlement.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP Dated 5 July, 1978].

### **Recommendation**

The Committee also observe that it was originally envisaged that an advance party of about 12 persons representing the selected Ex-Servicemen should also visit the settlement site to familiarise themselves with the conditions obtaining in the area. The Committee were informed during evidence that this idea was given up for the reason that "there might be divergent opinions which might create confusion in the minds of other prospective settlers". The prospective settlers were also not given any advance orientation about the conditions of living in the area and the type of cultivation suitable for adoption there. These facts establish beyond doubt that the selection and induction of people for settlement in the area was, to say the least, far from satisfactory and if the settlers ultimately deserted the area it was not the settlers entirely who were to be blamed out the responsibility therefore lies to a greater extent on Government themselves.

[Serial No. 15 of Appendix 1—Para 1.111 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

The Ministry of Defence have decided that in future the settlers could be asked to see the area themselves before executing the bond and the Directorate General of Resettlement will make suitable arrangements for this purpose.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP Dated 5 July, 1978].

### Recommendation

The Committee note that it was decided by Government of India in May, 1973 that the deserters should be asked to refund Rs. 3563 each, being the cost of livestock and household equipment. The Committee are informed that before the settlers went there an undertaking was obtained from them for refund of money if the conditions of settlement in the area were not fulfilled by the settlers. It was, however, conceded during evidence that unless the undertaking was validity executed on bond paper, it would be futile exercise to effect recovery. The Committee consider that Government should have obtained from the settlers the necessary undertakings which could be legally binding on them. They, however, trust that Government will exercise due restraint and caution in this matter so as not to penalise cases of genuine hardship.

[Serial No. 16 of Appendix 1—Para 1.112 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)].

### Action Taken

The observations of the Committee have been communicated to the A.P. Government and the Ministry of Defence for necessary action.

The Ministry of Defence have decided that in future selected settlers will have to execute a bond on Judicial paper in favour of Arunachal Pradesh Administration that they will not leave the settlement and if they desert they will have to refund all grants paid to them.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP Dated 5 July, 1978].

### Recommendation

The Committee note that in his letter of May 1971, the then Adviser to the Governor of Assam had, *inter alia* mentioned that the settlement of ex-servicemen in the Seijosa area had created "new political and social tensions". It is also learnt that the NEFA Tribal students of the Gauhati University had also represented against the policies of the Administration of settling ex-servicemen in the NEFA area. During evidence the Deputy Zonal Direc-

tor, Tribal Development however ~~disagreed~~ with the views expressed by the then Adviser to the Governor of Assam and stated that the place of resettlement of Ex-Servicemen was selected very carefully by the Arunachal Pradesh Administration taking into account what the feelings of the local inhabitants would be and that in this particular area there had been no discontentment. The representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs also confirmed that as far as the resettlement of ex-servicemen in the Seijosa area was concerned, there were no reactions. He, however, assured the Committee that any future policy of settlement in this particular area would be worked out after taking into confidence the views of the Administration and involving people's representatives. The Committee hope that in accordance with the assurance given to them, Govt. will actively associate the local inhabitants in formulating policies in regard to the settlement of outsiders in the area so that the feeling of the local population are not unnecessarily exacerbated and the development of the area is carried out in harmonious social atmosphere.

[Serial No. 17 of Appendix 1—Para 1.113 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha).]

#### **Action Taken**

The Govt. of Arunachal Pradesh have informed that according to the present policy, future settlement schemes for outside settlers in Arunachal Pradesh have to be undertaken with prior approval of their local Cabinet and after consulting peoples representatives.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP dated 5 July, 1978]

#### **Recommendation**

Considering all the aspects of the scheme for resettlement in the Seijosa area of NEFA, as discussed in the earlier paragraphs, the Committee regret that a sum of Rs. 24.68 lakhs spent on the schemes till March 1974 has been rendered largely infructuous. The Committee hope that Government will learn a lesson from this ill-fated scheme and while formulating any new proposals for resettlement in remote areas try to avoid the lacunae and mistake which led to the failure of this scheme.

[Serial No. 18 of Appendix 1—Para 1.114 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)].

**Action Taken**

The observations of the Committee have been noted and also communicated to the UT Administration and Ministries of Agriculture and Irrigation, Defence, Finance, Planning Commission and Supply and Rehabilitation.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP dated  
5 July, 1978]



## **CHAPTER III**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE REPLIES FROM GOVERNMENT.**

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee note that out of 500 acres of land in Sector 'A' irrigation facilities were provided to 105 acres only—60 acres in September, 1972 and 45 acres in March 1973—and that no irrigation facilities were provided in the Jolly and Dibru Sectors. During evidence, the Committee have been given different reasons for the delay in providing the irrigation facilities. According to the representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs, it was never intended that the irrigation facilities would be proved to the settlers immediately. He informed the committee that the Arunachal Pradesh Administration had advised that settlers should first raise two or three crops and then only it could be decided as to what type of irrigation facilities were needed by them. The Arunachal Pradesh Administration had, however, informed the Committee that the delay was due to inadequate provision of funds for irrigation. According to the Administration, the provisions of Rs. 500 per family for the irrigation facilities was "deplorably short of requirement". The Committee are surprised that this prerequisite for the success of the settlement scheme pointed out by the Team of Officers as far back as 1967, and re-emphasised in subsequent survey of the area, has remained neglected for considerably long time after the settlers were inducted in the area. The Committee would like Government to inquire as to what extent the delay was due to shortage of funds and why funds could not be released to the Arunachal Pradesh Administration in time.

[Serial No. 3 of Appendix 1—Para 1.99 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)].

#### **Action Taken**

The Government of Arunachal Pradesh have intimated that they had informed the Directorate of Resettlement, Ministry of Defence

in advance that settlers on arrival would have to undertake Jhum cultivation and as per local practice, development and irrigation facilities were to follow after one or two such crops. Thus the provision of irrigation facilities in 1971 was considered appropriate as per usual practice. The provision of irrigation facilities was not held up for want of funds as the U.T. Govt. have confirmed that they had spent about Rs. 1 lakh from the normal budget during 1971-72 and 1972-73, in addition to the provision of Rs. 500 per family in the Scheme.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP dated  
5 July, 1978]

## CHAPTER IV

### RECOMMENDATIONS|OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND WHICH REQUIRE REITERATION.

#### Recommendation

From a study of the material made available to them and the information gleaned during evidence, the Committee cannot help concluding that the scheme for resettlement near Seijosa in Arunachal Pradesh on which Rs. 24,68 lakhs were spent till March 1974 was ill-conceived *ab initio*. That the scheme ended in a dismal failure is amply proved by the fact that out of a total of 157 families induced for resettlement in the area, only 36 are left and the rest have deserted. The reasons for the failure cannot be ascribed only to the *inertia* of the settlers. Government have also to bear, in a sufficient measure, responsibility for the same. Some of the more conspicuous shortcomings and instances of ineptitude displayed by the authorities are discussed in the following paragraphs.

[Serial No. 1 of Appendix 1-Para 1.97 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)].

#### Action Taken

The Committee have come to this conclusion evidently based on the shortcomings and ineptitude referred to by them in the subsequent paragraphs. The considerations which weighed with the Govt. for formulation of the scheme were very important and duly thought of as brought out in paras 1.24 and 1.25 of the Report.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O. M. No. 15029|3|77-AP Dated 5 July, 1978)]

#### Recommendation

The utter lack of planning and human approach to the problem of settlement is reflected by the fact that in Dibru sector, the drinking water supply was arranged in June, 1973 i.e. nearly three years after

the second batch of settlers arrived for settlement in Dibru and Jolly sectors and no arrangement for supply of water was made for Jolly Sectors till May, 1972 by when all the settlers in this Sector had deserted. The Committee understand that the delay in arranging water supply was due to inadequate provision of funds and the delay in sanctioning water supply scheme. The Committee are not satisfied with the statement of the representative of the Ministry of Home Affairs during evidence that the settlers could use the water from the springs and rivulets in the area. The Committee feel that Government should have taken care of the need for provision of at least drinking water in the settlement area and made available adequate funds for this purpose. They would like Government to inquire into the reported delay in the sanction of scheme.

[Serial No. 5 of Appendix I Para 1.101 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

A sum of Rs. 19,000 for anticipated number of 190 families was available in the sanctioned scheme for arranging drinking water supply in the settlement area. The Arunachal Pradesh Govt. have also spent funds from the normal budget for execution of water supply schemes in the area as per details given below:—

	Rs.
1968-69 . . . . .	25,128.52
1969-70 . . . . .	3,832.89
1972-73 . . . . .	34,413.69
1973-74 . . . . .	6,098.57
1974-75 . . . . .	6,098.84
1977-78 . . . . .	64,371.00
	1,39,943.51

In Arunachal Pradesh local people in most of the villages have been using perennial springs and rivulets as the normal source of drinking water. Even till now not more than 25 per cent of the villages have been covered by water supply schemes.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15029/3/77-AP Dated 20-8-1978]

#### **Recommendation**

The inept planning is also indicated in the delay in the construction of roads linking the various sectors of settlement to Upper Seijosa where the Administration Headquarter school, health unit and market were located. The Committee note that Sector 'A' was about

4 to 5 Kms. from Upper Seijosa. The first party of settlers was inducted in this Sector in March, 1969, but the construction of 4 cause ways and pipe culverts to make the road between Upper Seijosa and Sector 'A' negotiable during rainy season, was approved in February, 1971 and the work was not taken up till December, 1975. As a result, the settlers, who have not so far deserted continue to face difficulty during monsoon in reaching Upper Seijosa for availing of the various facilities available there.

[Serial No. 6 of Appendix 1, Para 1.102 of 21st Report of Public Accounts Committee (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

Provision for cross bridges etc, was for small streams which are wide and shallow in depth. There is no difficulty in crossing all these small streams throughout the year except during heavy floods. However, the roads were never closed because of absence of cross bridges. Temporary culverts have, however, been provided. The delay in taking up the work was due to difficulty in procurement of cement and hume pipes.

[Ministry of Home Affairs O.M. No. 15028/3/77-AP Dated  
5 July, 1978]

**CHAPTER V**

**RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH  
GOVERNMENT HAVE FURNISHED INTERIM REPLIES.**

**NEW DELHI:**  
**November 8, 1978**  
**Kartika 17, 1900 (s)**

**P. V. NARASIMHA RAO,**  
**Chairman,**  
**Public Accounts Committee.**

**APPENDIX**  
**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

S. No.	Para No.	Ministry/Deptt. concerned	Recommendation
1	2	3	4
1	1-8	Ministry of Home Affairs	<p>The Committee regret to say that instead of accepting the responsibility for the failure of the Resettlement of Ex-servicemen Scheme near Seijosa, the Ministry of Home Affairs have drawn the attention of the Committee to the considerations which weighed with the Government for formulation of the scheme as brought out in paras 1.24 and 1.25 of their 21st Report (Sixth Lok Sabha). The Committee had nowhere in the Report commented adversely on the objectives of the scheme but at the same time they had expressed their unhappiness over the manner in which this whole scheme was handled by Government, resulting in its dismal failure. The least that the Committee expected was that Government will realise their mistakes and shortcomings in the implementation of the scheme and not repeat them in schemes that might be taken up in future.</p>
2	1-11	--do--	<p>The Committee are distressed to note from the reply of the Government that merely 'a sum of Rs. 19,000/- for anticipated number of 190 families was available in the sanctioned scheme for arranging drinking water supply in this settlement area' and that no funds</p>

---

1

2

3

4

---

were made available for the execution of the water supply scheme during the years 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1975-76. It is amply proved by the Government's above reply that the delay in arranging water supply in Dibru Sector upto June 1973 and non-initiation of any such schemes in Jolly Sector upto May 1972 were due to inadequate provisioning of funds and the delay in the sanctioning of water supply schemes. The Committee would therefore like to reiterate their earlier recommendation that the delay in the sanction of water supply schemes and in providing inadequate funds for these schemes should be inquired into for fixing responsibility.

3

114

Ministry of Home Affairs

The Committee note that the difficulty in procurement of cement and hume pipes has been cited as a reason for not taking up the work of construction of four cause-ways and pipe culverts to make the road between the Upper Seijosa and Sector. 'A' negotiable during the rainy season. The Committee would like an enquiry to be made as to why this situation was allowed to persist for wellnigh 5 years (1971 to 1975) with a view to fixing responsibility therefor.



