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**I. Aliens and Human Rights**

**1. The Restriction on Aliens as the Subject of Fundamental Rights under the Current Constitution (ICCPR Article 2)**

The present Constitution of the Republic of Korea refers 'citizens' as the main subject of rights, but the Constitutional Court, which holds the highest authority on interpreting the Constitution, also acknowledges aliens as the subject of fundamental rights to a certain extent. The conventional wisdom and precedent is that aliens' basic rights in the Constitution are limited to rights of ‘human beings’, i.e. some rights to freedon which are further restricted by the principle of reciprocity under Article 6 of the Constitution and social rights are only regarded as the rights of the citizen. There are no existing cases where Constitutional fundamental social rights of aliens were acknowledged. Moreover, it is unclear as to what must be considered as citizens’ rights or rights of human beings, and on what grounds such distinction should be made.

Under these circumstances, aliens, especially migrant workers, are forced to live without fundamental rights despite residing in Korea for a considerable period of time, and it is not desirable to ignore them without defining their Constitutional status. Therefore, questions regarding improvements and solutions on this issue are needed.

**2. The Restriction of Aliens as the Subject of Fundamental Rights in the President’s Amendment Bill in 2018**

We would like to point out the status of aliens mentioned in the President’s amendment bill of the Constitutional in 2018, which the National Assembly has failed to review. If the Constitution is amended, the status of aliens is likely to be included in the revised Constitution. The extent of the status of aliens under the Constitution defined within the President’s bill enables us to understand how the current government of Korea views the status of aliens.

In the amendment bill of the Constitution, it is explicitly stated that the following Constitutional basic rights can only be enjoyed by citizen.

|  |
| --- |
| Article 14 Prohibition on restriction on political rights and retrospective legislation on deprivation of a person’s property rightsArticle 15 Right to freedom of movementArticle 16 Right to freedom of occupation Article 17 Right against the infringement on the privacy of correspondence Article 22 Right to knowArticle 24 Guarantee of the right to property Article 25 Right to vote Article 26 Right to hold a public office Article 28 Right to a fair and speedy trialArticle 30 Right to demand state compensation Article 31 Aid on crime victimArticle 32 Right to education, compulsory education Article 33 Right to work, Right against unfair discrimination in working conditions, work and life balanceArticle 35 Right to have basic standard of human life, right of social security, pregnancy, childbirth, child support, right to housing, right to healthcare Article 37 Right to safety Article 38 Right to live in a healthy and comfortable environment, environmental protection.  |

Among these rights, we have a few questions that focus on the rights that must be guaranteed to aliens under the terms of the ICCPR.

**(1) Article 17 of the Constitutional Amendment Bill, Relating to Privacy of Correspondence (ICCPR Article 17)**

|  |
| --- |
| Article 17 ① The right to privacy of **all people** shall not be infringed.② **All people** shall be free from intrusion into their place of residence. In case of search or seizure in a residence, a warrant issued by a judge upon request of a prosecutor shall be presented. ③ The privacy of correspondence of **all citizens** shall not be infringed. |

The right to privacy and freedom specified under Article 17 of the current Constitution is a fundamental right guaranteed to aliens, as it falls under the fundamental rights of freedom. (Constitutional Court 2005.3.31 Sentencing 2003 Hunma87, Constitutional Court 2011.9.29 Sentencing 2009 Hunma358) This is guaranteed under Article 17.1 of the ICCPR, which also includes regulations on the freedom of correspondence. Considering that the dominant opinion of Constitutional scholars is that the right to privacy of correspondence is derived from the right to privacy and the right to freedom from intrusion of residence, it is highly unusual to classify the right to privacy and the right to freedom from intrusion of residence stated in Article 17.1 and 17.2 of the bill as rights of human beings, whereas the right to privacy of correspondence under Article 17.3 of the bill is classified as the right of citizens,.

Considering the fact that most people own electronic devices, the right to privacy of correspondence is inseparable from the right to privacy. Under these circumstances, aliens residing in Korea, including irregular migrants, cannot be protected under the Constitution from the violation of fundamental rights through illegal surveillance, supervision, eavesdropping, and collecting location information if privacy of correspondence is excluded as aliens’ fundamental rights. Furthermore, it is unfortunate that by denying aliens the freedom of correspondence, a right which used to be acknowledged in the previous and current Constitution, aliens’ fundamental rights has been set back.

**(2) Right to Know (ICCPR Article 19)**

|  |
| --- |
| Article 22 ① **All citizens** shall have the right to know.② **All people** shall have the right to privacy on ones’ personal information and shall have the right to control how such information shall be processed.③ The state shall strive to prevent and rectify any harm caused by the monopoly and asymmetry of information. |

The current Constitution of the Republic of Korea does not stipulate the right to know. Instead, the academic community interprets that the right to know is derived from the freedom of expression under Article 21, human dignity and freedom under Article 10, and the right to live a life worthy of human beings under Article 34 of the Constitution. At the basis of this interpretation is an understanding that freedom of expression cannot be truly protected unless the right to know is guaranteed. This is valid in the sense that expressing ideas and opinions cannot be freely articulated without information as its foundation.

In this context, the right to freedom of expression along with the freedom to pursue and receive all forms of information and ideas is set forth in Article 19.2 of the ICCPR. Furthermore, the right to know is also a means to ensure the privacy of an individual since it is difficult to know whether one’s information has been compromised.

However, Article 22.1 of the Constitutional bill specifies that the subject of the right to know is limited to ‘citizens.’ Since freedom of expression may not be adequately guaranteed to aliens, this rule could be considered as discriminatory. In addition, this substantial discrimination against aliens can occur not only in regards to freedom of expression, but also concerning the right to privacy.

**(3) Right to a Fair Trial (ICCPR Article 14)**

|  |
| --- |
| Article 28 ① **All people** shall have the right to stand trial by the court in accordance with the Constitution and the relevant law.② People who are not on active military service or who are not employees of the military forces shall not be tried by a court martial within the territory of the Republic of Korea, except in case of crimes as prescribed by Act involving important classified military information, sentinels, sentry posts, the supply of harmful food and beverages, prisoners of war and military Articles and facilities and in the case of a proclamation of extraordinary martial law.③ **All citizens** shall have the right to a speedy trial. The accused shall have the right to a public trial without delay in the absence of justifiable reasons to the contrary. ④ The accused shall be presumed innocent until a judgment of guilt has been pronounced. ⑤ A victim of a crime shall be entitled to make a statement during the proceedings of the trial of the case involved as under the conditions prescribed by Act. |

According to Article 14.1. of the ICCPR, ‘All persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals.’ However, Article 26.3 of the Constitutional bill denies aliens the right to a fair trial, limiting the subject of the right to fair trial as ‘citizens.’ The systematic interpretation, which takes into account that ‘all persons have the right to trial’ under paragraph 1 of the same Article, leaves room for a discriminatory interpretation that there is no problem with aliens’ trial being unfair or undue delay as long as the right to be tried is guaranteed.

However, the number of aliens in South Korea continues to increase, and such trend will probably continue or intensify in the future. Given this situation, the number of aliens tried through the judicial procedures of South Korea will continue to increase (this has been the case over the period).

Therefore, we cannot help but express our concern that if the Constitutional bill proposed by the Korean government does not renounce its discriminatory view towards aliens, there will be a high possibility that aliens will face unjust discrimination during trial.

**[Suggested Questions]**

Q1. Please provide information on which rights include aliens as the subject of fundamental rights under the current Constitution. Please explain why aliens cannot be the subject of fundamental social rights, as fundamental rights are divided into fundamental rights of freedom rights and fundamental social rights. In addition, please explain why aliens are discriminated or excluded from fundamental rights of freedom to national compensation, aid on criminal victims, habeas corpus, and freedom of political expression.

Q2. The privacy of correspondence under Article 17.3, the right to know under Article 22.1 and the right to receive a fair and speedy trial under Article 26.3 of the Constitutional amendment bill proposed by the government of the Republic of Korea do not acknowledge aliens as the subject to these rights.

2.1. Please describe how differently the Republic of Korea is currently treating aliens from Koreans regarding these rights? If there is a legal basis for discrimination, please present both the contents of the Act and its application.

2.2. If there is no discrimination on granting fundamental rights, please explain why alien’s fundamental rights are not recognized in articles of the Constitutional amendment bill. If there is indeed discrimination, please explain why it was needed to be stated in the Constitution despite the terms set forth in the ICCPR.

**II. Disaster and Human Rights**

**1. Protection of persons with disabilities in disaster response (ICCPR Article 2)**

Recently, after some cases such as Pohang earthquake and Gangwon-do forest fire situation, the importance of temporary housing facilities for victims is rising. As a result of Pohang earthquake, Ministry of the Interior and Safety set criteria on the operation of temporary housing facilities by setting up 「The Guideline to Establish Aid Plan against Disasters 2018」 and 「The Operational Guideline on the Temporary Housing Facility for Victims」. However, these guidelines are not sufficient to guarantee the civil and political rights of persons with disabilities who use temporary housing facilities since they provide only a minimum standard for persons with disabilities, such as ‘facilities (washrooms, shower rooms, etc.) within the temporary housing should be located close to persons with disabilities‘, or ‘wheelchairs or assistant aids should be provided’.

<Table> The Comparison of Temporary Housing Facility Guidelines of States for the Disabled[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Korea | U.S.A[[2]](#footnote-2) | Japan |
| Accessibility of Parking area  | N/A | The path from the parking area to temporary housing facilities should be directly connected and the surface of it should be in good condition. | N/A |
| Accessibility of Exit  | N/A | The exit of a building should be connected to the parking lot and loading dock and the width of it should be enough. | A slope should be located near the exit  |
| Accessibility of Washroom | Washroom should be located near facilities | Accessibility of wheelchair or scooter users should be guaranteed. | A route to washroom should be guaranteed  |
| The way of locating beds | N/A | The sleeping area should be located next to a wall and easy to be accessed | The sleeping area should be located near the washrooms and 1st-floor rooms are provided first. |
| Existence of washroom for persons with disabilities | N/A | Easily accessible washroom for persons with disabilities or a stall for family unit should be installed. | Secure washroom for persons with disabilities. |
| Provision of large Housing space | N/A | It should be ensured that a path is secured to allow an easy access  | It should be ensured that the space needed is secured considering its nature. |
| Space for battery charging  | N/A | An area for charging battery for scooters and electric wheelchairs should be provided | N/A |
| Daily life | N/A | A sign language translator and various information delivering methods should be ensured and make sure to acknowledge a means of transportation.  | Locate a sign language interpreter  |

**2. The right to know during preventive procedure against contagious diseases (ICCPR Article 9)**

In 2015, Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) started from one patient. Since then, 186 people were diagnosed with MERS, and 38 people of them died, showing 20% death rate.

One of the reasons MERS broke out in such massive scale is because of the inadequate initial response of the government. At that time, although Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention acknowledged the infection of the first MERS patient, it didn’t disclose the relevant documents such as a list of hospitals the first MERS patient had visited. During this time, the public couldn’t get enough information on medical institutions with proper treatment facilities or even the basic information on MERS, which contributed to the rampant contagion of MERS. Moreover, the failure in establishing and notifying set standards on screening procedure for those to be quarantined before the massive quarantine process of almost 16 thousand people caused much unnecessary confusion.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Victims of disasters, including MERS, have the right to understand the situation they find themselves in, to know which measures are needed depending on the situation, and to request the measures be taken for prevention of recurrences. Afterwards, to ensure these rights the National Assembly partially solved the problem in delivering information about the infectious disease by legislating and amending 『Infectious Disease Control and Prevention Act』, but the problem of separation remains unresolved. One example of it is that persons subject to measures are unable to get accurate and relevant information because isolation and quarantine are not defined specifically or separately. Meanwhile, Article 34 paragraph 4 of the same act was amended so that crisis control measures against infectious diseases shall be prescribed by Presidential Decree.

Considering that the guidelines for infectious diseases management by the Korea Centers for Disease Control and Prevention were revised several times during the MERS outbreak, which caused confusion due to unclear and inconsistent definitions of ‘close contact’, ‘contact distance and duration’, measures should be taken to ensure the right to know in the event of the revision of the subordinate statutes..[[4]](#footnote-4)

**3. The Right to Safety: the right to know and to be rescued in disaster situations (ICCPR Article 9)**

States must provide accurate information on each stage of preventing and responding to disasters and have effective measures for peopleto avoid danger through a quick rescue. For that, it is important to let the affected know the situation by language or methods that is understandable and to seek a warning system for people with special needs and an effective evacuation plan. In the process of rescue, it needs to be considered victims have different conditions and there are those who can evacuate only with other’s help.

The Miryang Sejong hospital fire, which occurred on 26 January 2018, caused 192 casualties. Most of them were the elderly or patients in the intensive care unit, some of the critical patients died because they took off their ventilators while rushing out of the hospital to escape, and some of the patients who died were bound to beds and unable to escape by themselves. At the time, after the fire had occurred, no actions were taken for the first 10-minute-siren alarm, and there was no one there to guide the evacuation process. Since there were only 9 medical staff on call at the time, a swift rescue was practically impossible.

The reason for the scale of damage being magnified to such extent is because information about the situation wasn’t shared properly and because there were no evacuation system or manpower to allow for a safe and swift evacuation even though most patients were those who could not escape by themselves.

『Framework Act on the Management of Disasters and Safety』 defines those vulnerable to disasters as vulnerable groups in safety matters and emphasizes the need to provide for special protection measures. Therefore, considering the various characteristics of the victims, a system should be established, which will allow each victim to be informed of the situation in a fully understandable manner fitted for each individual victim and that will make possible an effective response plan..

**[Suggested Questions]**

Q1.1. Please provide information about how many places entitled a temporary housing facility for victims are set with slopes, washroom for persons with disabilities and braille guide blocks to be accessible to persons with different types of disabilities.

Q1.2. Please provide plans to improve operational guide for temporary housing facilities for disaster victims.

Q2.1. In case of separation from legal communicable disease, please describe specific measures to secure the affected people’s right to know.

Q2.2. Please submit the specific guideline about the quarantine process and plan to promote and implement the guideline.

Q3.1. Please provide information on detailed plans on how it will provide safe and secure evacuation measure to those who cannot be expected to fully grasp the situation and evacuate on their own, such as the elderly, children and persons with disabilities, along with the data showing the current situation.

Q3.2. Please provide information on the number of staff on duty in case of disasters in vulnerable facilities such as a hospital. Please submit the current status data on what effective measures are prepared and managed in case of disasters in facilities such as hospital, where there is a large population of those who are vulnerable in safety matters.

**III. Arbitrary Detention and Investigation of DPRK “Defectors”**

**1. Lack of protection for the procedural rights of the DPRK defectors detained in the Centre for Protection of North Korean Defectors- the right to legal counsel, the right to appeal against a decision on deportation**

The ‘defectors’ from the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (“DPRK”) detained at the Centre for Protection of DPRK Defectors (“Centre”) are deprived of any opportunity to exercise their fundamental procedural rights such as the right to legal counsel or the right to appeal against a decision on compulsory deportation. The National Intelligence Services (“NIS”) has been condemned by the civil society for hindering the detainees at the Centre (formerly known as the Joint Interrogation Centre, “JIC”) from accessing the legal counsellors.

Upon the recognition of such criticisms, the NIS appointed human rights officers in 2014 whose responsibilities include investigating whether any human rights violation has been committed within the Centre, demanding corrective measures to be taken accordingly, and suggesting institutional improvements, as well as taking full charge of legal counselling as an attorney.[[5]](#footnote-5) However, given that, firstly, it is the NIS that holds the right to appoint those officers, which may deter the officers from performing their duties freely, secondly, that the right of the detainees to an attorney, other than the officers, is still unguaranteed, and lastly, that the actual tasks of the attorney appointed by those officers have undertaken thus far are limited only to non-legal psychological counselling[[6]](#footnote-6), it is highly dubious whether the NIS has a will to actually secure the right to counsel of the detainees and whether the human rights officers are a mere paper tiger. Furthermore, there was no notification given by the Centre to the detainees advising them of their fundamental rights including the right to legal counsel and the right to remain silent during the time of detention.

Despite the Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee (“HRC”) on the Fourth Periodic Report of the Republic of Korea that the detainees should be given access to an attorney during the entire time of their detention, the Ministry of Unification and the Centre has refused the request of the attorneys to have an audience with the detainees[[7]](#footnote-7), with hardly any solid legal grounds, which may amount to a breach of the article 2(3)(b) and the article 9(4) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (“ICCPR”).

The HRC has also expressed its concerns about the possibility that the DPRK defectors may be deported to third countries without any independent review in its Concluding Observations. However, as witnessed in the Korean Bar Association Report on the result of a visit to the Centre of 2017[[8]](#footnote-8), after the publication of the aforementioned Concluding Observations, the Centre, even though it affirms that a detainee can withdraw one’s request for protection at any time as an objection against the interrogations of the Centre, does not in fact provide any other way to express such an objection than to completely renounce entry to the country itself. The absence of any concrete standards to treat the DPRK defectors after they withdraw their request for protection or to secure their livings reveals that the Centre barely puts any effort to eliminate the risk of exposing them to torture which may occur when the DPRK defectors are deported to third countries or the DPRK. Condoning such compulsory deportation without any independent review process to guarantee the right to appeal of the detainees may amount to a breach of the principle of non-refoulement. The Concluding Observations of the Committee Against Torture (“CAT”) on the combined Third to Fifth Periodic Reports of the Republic of Korea, while expressing their concerns that the DPRK defectors may be deported to third countries where they risk torture if they do not qualify for protection without enjoying the right to an independent review and to appeal the decision regarding deportation, have also prompted the State party to adopt clear and transparent procedures ensuring the right to appeal with suspensive effect of decisions concerning the deportation of DPRK defectors while they are being reviewed; however, the Centre has yet taken any responsive measures.

**2. Unclear improvements on the former practices of inhumane interrogations, lack of differentiation between administrative investigation and criminal investigation, and the remaining position of the NIS as the primary investigation agency**

It has been reported that, during the interrogation procedures at the JIC, several de facto torture and cruel treatments, accompanying the acts such as physical violence, threats on the sentence, verbal abuse, appeasement, modification or restriction of statements, sleep and sensory deprivation, solitary confinement, and total isolation from the outer world including families and attorneys, have been frequently committed. Such torturous acts were, even, occasionally used to serve the purpose of fabricating evidence and confessions about espionage.[[9]](#footnote-9) The torture and cruel treatments taken place at the Centre amount to a breach of Article 7 of the ICCPR which stipulates the ban of torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. Particularly, concerns about the dangers of solitary confinement were shared in the CAT's Concluding Observations in 2017. In this regard, the Concluding Observations of the 4th HRC and the Concluding Observations on the third and fifth regular report on South Korea of the CAT both stated that the State party should ensure that the methods of interrogation and conditions of detention comply with international human rights standards. However, due to the secretive tendency of the Centre and the NIS, it is impossible to grasp the actual conditions of interrogation and whether any measures have been put in place in order to tackle the human rights violation in the course of such interrogations.

One of the main reasons behind such inhumane interrogations is because the administrative investigation process at the Centre to decide on protection for DPRK defectors regarding settlement has been practically converted into criminal investigation process in order to hunt down spies under the control of the NIS. Therefore, the relevant human rights violation cannot be solved without differentiating the administrative investigation process from the criminal investigation process as the aforementioned Concluding Observations on the third and fifth regular report of the CAT has stated, and transferring the position of primary agency of this administrative investigation process from the NIS to other bodies such as the Ministry of Unification. Although the Centre has claimed, during the visit of the Korean Bar Association, that administrative and criminal investigation processes are differentiated, yet again due to the secretive tendency of the NIS, the authenticity of the Centre’s claim can hardly be verified. Thus, the measures to provide information and prevent the recurrence are urgently called for.[[10]](#footnote-10)

**3. Possibility of indefinite “legal” detention**

The Concluding Observations of the HRC on the Fourth Periodic Reports and the Concluding Observations of the CAT on the combined Third to Fifth Periodic Reports of the Republic of Korea have expressed concerns about the reports suggesting that the DPRK “defectors” may be detained for up to six months and that they can be detained indefinitely by the NIS, and demanded the State party to ensure that the duration of detention should stay at the shortest possible period and not beyond the established legal maximum. Due to the amendment of the relevant enforcement ordinance, it seems that the legal maximum of detention period has decreased to 90 days with an exceptional extension of additional maximum 30 days. However, there still is uncertainty concerning whether this newly stipulated duration counts as yet the “shortest possible period”. Furthermore, according to the articles 15(1) and (2) of the enforcement ordinance(Enforcement Decree of the North Korean Defectors Protection and Settlement Support Act), which remain unrevised, the decision on the qualification for protection of the NIS Director and the Minister of Unification can be indefinitely postponed under “unavoidable circumstances”, which may lead to de facto indefinite detention. Therefore, this amendment inevitably stays highly incomplete in terms of its effectivity as long as little is known about how often the extension of up to 30 days or even indefinite detention takes place in reality under the name of ‘unavoidable circumstances’, a phrase stipulated nowhere.

**4. Lack of information about persons under investigation**

The Concluding Observation of the CAT urged the State party to provide updated information on the number of the DPRK defectors including those in detention. The Centre has consistently maintained their secrecy policy against any request on information about persons under investigation. Therefore, very little has been known of who has been investigated or who has failed the qualification test for protection and what happens to them afterwards. The DPRK defectors are forced to maintain confidentiality about the investigation even after they are released from the Centre and are under constant surveillance of the police and Hanawon, the Settlement Support Centre for North Korean Defectors, even past their stays at Hanawon. Above all, the access to the DPRK defectors itself is not easy, which makes it hard to conduct any systematic research on the current state of their situations.[[11]](#footnote-11) In addition, since the NIS never releases any information for the sake of security concerns based on its monopoly of information, it is difficult to seek legal remedies before court.[[12]](#footnote-12) Therefore, it is necessary to take measures to enable the provision of comprehensive information in order to grasp the actual condition of the detention and to prevent the human rights violation of the DPRK defectors.

**[Suggested Questions]**

Q1.1. Please provide information on the right to legal counsel of the DPRK defectors detained at the Centre by allowing the access to attorneys other than the human rights officers, transfer the authority to appoint the human rights officers from the NIS to other national institutions, and please describe the details of activities of the human rights officers.

Q1.2. Please provide information on the right to appeal of the detainees against the interrogation procedures regarding deportation by providing measures other than withdrawal of request for protection, and please describe detailed solutions to secure the whereabouts and the livings of the DPRK defectors when they decide to withdraw their requests for protection.

Q2.1. Please provide sufficient data to verify the Centre’s claim that the Centre, since its reform from the JIC, has been strictly focusing on the administrative investigation tasks to decide on the qualification for protection, excluding any criminal investigative element, and set up a watchdog system for the constant scrutiny.

Q2.2. Please provide information to prove that cruel treatments committed in the past at the JIC do not recur in the course of the interrogations at the Centre, devise a solution to prevent the recurrence of such treatments, and introduce a channel through which the substantial checks and surveillance can be made from the outside of the Centre.

Q3.1 Please provide information on ways to transfer the position of primary agency of the interrogation at the Centre from the NIS to other bodies including the Ministry of Unification.

Q3.2. Please provide information to confirm what is “the shortest possible period”.

Q3.3Pelase describe the meaning of “unavoidable circumstances” which may justify the indefinite extension of detention, and restrictions to prevent the indefinite extension of detention even under such unavoidable circumstances.

Q4.1. Please explain whether there have been any undisclosed spy fabrication cases or human rights violation cases at the Centre (including its former body of the JIC), and if yes, please report the factual grounds of each case.

Q4.2. Please disclose data regarding the interrogation, such as protocols of examination, with an exception of highly classified information, so that persons who went through the Centre’s investigation can seek a proper remedy on any damage that was caused.

Q4.3. Please provide statistical data about persons who were investigated at the Centre, including the JIC, which then should form a foundation for further remedies and prevention of recurrence.
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