Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If we could begin with

East Asia and Pacific Bureau and——

Ambassador DeTrani could lead off.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have discussed these victims

with the Government of China. We have also discussed with the

other governments in the region the problems of victims who are

trafficked, and looking at areas where we can help them. This

would be, I think, one of the building blocks for expenditures of the

funds which have been authorized under the act.

So trafficking is going to continue to be an important part of our

discussions with all the countries in the region.

The dangers that surround the well-meaning persons who encourage

people to jump into Embassies and the Consulates is of

particular concern, and we discussed that with China in terms of

the steady state which encourages that kind of risk-taking, and

that kind of unscrupulous activity on the part of some traffickers.

It is intolerable and we have to change that steady state, and there

are things that China can do to change that steady state, so this

is central to our discussions particularly with China.

I think, Mr. Chairman, there is a reluctance either

for the United States to set up a processing facility in their countries

or to set up a humanitarian assistance program because of the

visibility it attracts. The fact that there is some discreet activity

which is helpful to those that need to escape going on, and they do

not want to jeopardize that, nor do we want to do any harm in that

respect.

But I think there is a sensitivity associated with their relationship

with North Korea, with Pyongyang, which is intensified by the

appearance that they would be giving any favors to the United

States or doing anything on track with our policies and procedures.

I think this may be one of the central issues.

It does not mean that we accept that as the final word. We can

understand why they are doing it, but it does not mean that that

is the right reason for denying access.

Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Smith. I appreciate

the chance to respond to that.

As far as the countries that we have consulted with, we have not

consulted Vietnam, Cambodia, Russia or Malaysia in depth about

direct USG-funded assistance for North Koreans on their territory.

We surveyed our posts in the countries—the ones that you cited.

I mentioned we are going back because we are not taking this as

the final word. We are looking at ways where we can work with

them, and particularly to get UNHCR access in those countries. To

North Koreans who make their way to those countries, this is absolutely

essential.

And as far as the reaction from the individual countries, I would

be happy to give those reactions to you in a closed environment,

and we will do that at your convenience.

But in terms of getting a fix on those that ought to come to the

United States, I think this involves the mechanisms that I mentioned,

the need to get UNHCR to have access so that they can do

their screen, they can do their referral to the United States or

other countries, or whatever they consider the most appropriate referral

is; and then secondly, as part of that mechanism, to be able

to do the background checks, to have some way to get more information

than we have now or that the United States has direct access

to, as to who these people are because, as you know, we have

to know who everybody is very precisely who comes into the United

States as a refugee, particularly after 911.

As far as Secretary Rice discussions, our understanding is that

those points that we put in her brief were indeed brought up with

the Chinese on her recent visit.

I am sorry. In terms of?

Yes, that is right. Certainly for those for whom it

seems to be—there seems to be a compelling case to come to the

United States and not to do what the bulk of the North Koreans

are doing now, that is, to go to South Korea where they not only

receive immediate citizenship but they have a generous package of

benefits. And we are expecting there will be people in that category,

and that is why we are working so hard to lay the groundwork

and to have the building blocks in place so that they can be—

their applications can be facilitated and that the measures are in

place so that those applications can be acted upon expeditiously.

No, sir.

No. The Republic of Korea has made it clear that because

of the inter-Korea relationship itself, it was a very sensitive

issue. But they come out very clearly opposed to the behavior of the

North Korean Government on human rights issues, and certainly

it has not affected any other country from supporting our initiatives

on human rights issues as it affects North Korea.

I will take the first, the 2006 budget issue. The 2006

budget was put in place earlier, as you know. The request for funds

in that budget depends upon our being able to find places in the

region where we can do this humanitarian work and to find implementing

partners who we can fund to implement this work.

We are not just waiting for those to come knocking at our door.

We are seeking projects as creatively as possible, looking at ways

that funds could be spent in the 2006 budget, and we would hope

that those funds would not only be generously authorized, as has

been the case by the Committee, but that they would also be appropriated.

One of the functions which would be a particularly good target

for those funds is the anti-trafficking in persons function. We

would like to come up with some good projects to spend the money

on that function.

I can only underline and agree with everything you

have cited on the importance of this, and I think it is one of our

priorities to pursue this.

Well, thank you. The first question: Has UNHCR

recognized or given status to anyone in China in my knowledge?

I do not have knowledge that that has been done, and the reason

is that the UNHCR just does not have access to them. And anybody

who might somehow get into Beijing, it is tough to find the

UNHCR office, and that is not by accident. I had a hard time finding

the office on my trips there because there are not any signs,

so there is nothing done to make it easy even if they get to Beijing,

and of course, UNHCR does not have access up at the border area

where the North Koreans are.

The second question with respect to no North Koreans having

been admitted to the United States as refugees in the last 5 years,

this does not mean that we are rejecting the idea. We are recognizing

the idea that most of them go to South Korea, and that is

what most of them want. We do need to get these mechanisms in

place so that we will be ready for those that should come to the

United States for compelling reasons, or to other countries, that

there is some way to make that possible, a way through access to

UNHCR, to be able to—and for us to be able to have a way to determine

their background and to do the security advisory checks

that have to be done.

To the question, Do we need UNHCR? I think there is a big advantage

of having UNHCR for any resettlement program because

they are probably in the best position to determine the best country

of destination for refugees that they refer, and secondly, for the

geopolitical reasons I mentioned. It makes it difficult, even if we

did have direct access. Having that direct access is going to be difficult

to achieve because of the antagonism that the countries in

the region now will receive from Pyongyang if they allow the

United States to do that.

Yes, it is—we do not have to have UNHCR. About

50 percent of the refugees we take in are referred to us by

UNHCR, so it indicates there are other ways to do it. But I think

it is important to continue to insist that UNHCR have this access

for the reasons that I mention.