



Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-eighth session
3–14 May 2021

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Singapore*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 27 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies²

2. The International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) recommended that the Government become a party to core international human rights instruments and their Optional Protocols, including the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Convention against Torture (CAT), the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Optional Protocol to the CAT, the Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR aiming at the abolition of the death penalty, and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children child prostitution and child pornography.³

3. JS6 recommended that the Government ratify the International Labour Organization Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105), and the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189).⁴

4. Human Rights Watch (HRW) recommended that the Government ratify the International Labour Organization Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (No. 190).⁵

* The present document is being issued without formal editing.



5. Think Centre (TC) recommended that the Government ratify the International Labour Organization Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100) and the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87).⁶

6. Parliamentarians for Global Action (PGA) and the World Federalist Movement/Institute for Global Policy (WFM/IGP) recommended that the Government ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court.⁷

7. PGA recommended that the Government ratify the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity.⁸

8. JS7 recommended that the Government extend a standing invitation to all UN Special Procedure mandate holders.⁹

B. National human rights framework¹⁰

9. JS7 and JS8 recommended that the Government establish an independent national human rights institution in accordance with the Paris Principles.¹¹

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination¹²

10. JS6 recommended that the Government enact a comprehensive national anti-discrimination legislation to prohibit discrimination on the basis of gender, race or ethnicity, nationality, religion, congenital or acquired disability, age, marital status, sexual orientation and family or caregiving responsibilities. It also recommended that the Government create an independent anti-discrimination commission to implement the legislation.¹³

11. JS2 stated that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) individuals in Singapore continued to experience violence and discrimination in public and private spheres, from State and non-State actors. Deliberate policy, institutional gaps, and a lack of anti-discrimination legislation, based on sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, and sex characteristics (SOGIESC), compounded and contributed to the human rights violations against them.¹⁴

12. JS3 stated that although section 377A of the Penal Code, criminalising consensual sexual behaviour between adult males, had not been enforced since the last universal periodic review of Singapore in 2016, its continued existence permitted the institutionalisation of discriminatory policies against not just gay men, but the whole lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT+) community.¹⁵

13. HRW recommended that the Government abolish section 377A of the Penal Code and that the Government amend or repeal all rules and regulations that restrict positive depictions of LGBT lives, including section 11(d) of the film classification guidelines, which prohibits films that “promote or justify a homosexual lifestyle.”¹⁶

14. JS2 recommended that the Government rectify media codes, policies, and practices that prohibit neutral or positive portrayals of LGBTQ persons.¹⁷

15. JS4 recommended that the Government develop campaigns to increase public awareness and acceptance of LGBTQ persons.¹⁸

16. JS2 stated that violence against LGBTQ persons was often perpetrated by family members, with disproportionate consequences for LGBTQ women and persons assigned female at birth. This was worsened by the high cost of living and inability to move out of family homes, compounded by discriminatory housing policies.¹⁹

17. JS4 stated that transgender people faced numerous challenges in the forms of discrimination in employment, education, marriage, housing and healthcare settings; violence at home and in public spaces; conversion therapy; barriers to reporting; and gaps in service provision.²⁰

18. JS6 stated that trans persons who did not wish to undergo, or could not afford, genital surgery, were unable to change their legal gender.²¹

19. JS2 recommended that the Government enable transgender Singaporeans to change legal sex through a legal declaration of intent to transition and live as their affirmed sex, with reasonable conditions to prevent abuse.²²

2. Civil and political rights

*Right to life, liberty and security of person*²³

20. JS5 stated that Singapore had taken no steps since its second-cycle universal periodic review to legislatively limit the use of the death penalty, and that it had alarmingly stepped up executions since then.²⁴

21. JS6 stated that there was a persistent lack of important factual information on the death penalty, such as the number of individuals on death row, the profiles of death row inmates and impending executions. There was a lack of sufficient notice of the date of execution given to inmates or their families. It noted that no clemency pardon had been granted to death row inmates since 1998.²⁵

22. Amnesty International (AI) was concerned about the requirement, for those found guilty of drug trafficking or importing prohibitive substances over certain amounts, to prove, on a balance of probabilities, that their involvement in the offence was restricted to that of a “courier”; and to obtain a “certificate of substantive assistance” from the prosecution to show that they had rendered assistance to the Central Narcotics Bureau in disrupting drug trafficking activities. AI stated that only when both these conditions were met, could a judge exercise discretion to either impose the death penalty or life imprisonment and 15 strokes of the cane.²⁶

23. AI stated that requiring a “certificate of substantive assistance” from the prosecutor before the judge could exercise discretion whether or not to impose the death penalty violated the right to a fair trial as it placed life and death decisions in the hands of the prosecutor who was neither a judge nor a neutral party in the case. AI noted that if the prosecution did not provide a “certificate of substantive assistance”, the court sentenced the accused to death.²⁷

24. AI recommended that the Government establish an official moratorium on executions with a view to abolishing the death penalty.²⁸

25. JS6 recommended that the Government remove the mandatory death penalty for all offences, and give judges full discretion in deciding whether to impose the death sentence, as an interim step towards the full abolition of the death penalty.²⁹

26. TC recommended that the Government establish a Pardons Board supported with a study on best practices.³⁰

27. The Omega Research Foundation (ORF) recommended that the Government ensure that the use of force is strictly regulated in accordance with international human rights standards in all situations, including in places of detention and during public gatherings. It stated that, specifically, the use of lethal force when policing assemblies must be restricted.³¹

28. JS6 stated that torture and cruel, inhuman, degrading treatment and punishment took place routinely and with impunity in State and general hospital psychiatric wards, including the use of restraints, forced or coerced drugging and electroconvulsive therapy, a complete disregard for privacy, and psychological torture.³²

29. JS8 stated that the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act allowed for indefinite detention without trial. Under Section 30 of the Act, the Minister of Home Affairs could

issue detention orders of up to 12 months, which could be extended indefinitely. It recommended that the Government consider repealing the Act.³³

30. JS5 recommended that the Government repeal legislative authorization for use of detention without trial, such as the Internal Security Act and the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act.³⁴

31. TC stated that judicial caning continued to be used in Singapore for both criminal and administrative offences. Caning was also not prohibited in schools and private homes.³⁵

32. HRW stated that corporal punishment remained common in Singapore, and for medically fit males ages 16 to 50, caning was mandatory as an additional punishment for a range of crimes, including drug trafficking, violent crimes (such as armed robbery), and even some immigration offenses.³⁶

33. ICJ stated that since 2016, the Government had not taken any steps towards the abolition of corporal punishment. It recommended that the Government impose an immediate moratorium on the practice of caning as a judicially imposed punishment, with a view to its abolition in law.³⁷

34. TC recommended that the Government abolish the use of caning in public education institutions, and conduct public information and education to limit and reduce the use of caning in private homes.³⁸

35. Conscience and Peace Tax International (CPTI) stated that conscientious objectors had been put on trial before military courts under military law and were routinely sentenced to detention in military penal facilities. It further stated that Singapore now imprisoned more declared conscientious objectors than any other State.³⁹

*Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law*⁴⁰

36. ICJ stated that the authorities continued to give very little notice of execution to death row inmates and their families, about five days to a week's notice, undermining the right of inmates to exercise their right to appeal.⁴¹

37. JS5 recommended that the Government cease prosecution and harassment of attorneys representing defendants in criminal proceedings and human rights defenders expressing opposition to the death penalty.⁴²

38. AI recommended that the Government ensure rigorous compliance in all death penalty cases with international fair trial standards, including by ensuring those facing the death penalty have legal representation from the time of arrest.⁴³

39. JS2 stated that given the general societal lack of understanding of LGBTQ identities and relationships, service providers and law enforcement lacked the training to address reports of violence sensitively, even when victims sought help. There were no State services and few non-State services available for LGBTQ-affirmative intervention and counselling.⁴⁴

40. JS4 stated that the stigma of being LGBTQ, associated with Penal Code Section 377A and media censorship, was a contributing factor in the failure to report or seek help when abused.⁴⁵

*Fundamental freedoms*⁴⁶

41. The European Centre for Law and Justice (ECLJ) expressed concern that under the guise of maintaining religious harmony, Singapore had implemented legal provisions that actually restricted religious speech, infringing on, rather than protect, religious liberty.⁴⁷

42. ADF International stated that the Maintenance of Religious Harmony Act indirectly cast a chilling effect on legitimate forms of expression, including proselytization, as well as other public manifestations of religious beliefs. It also restricted constructive and meaningful dialogue initiatives between faiths, such as those undertaken by Singapore's Inter-Racial and Religious Confidence Circles, which were intended to deepen people's understanding of the various faiths, beliefs and practices. It stated that the absence of clear boundary lines for what constituted acceptable discourse, and the fear of consequences for

peacefully expressing one's deeply-held opinions or beliefs, may fundamentally undermine such efforts. It recommended that the Government amend the Maintenance of Religious Harmony Act so that it is only limited to cases of incitement to violence.⁴⁸

43. ADF International recommended that the Government ensure full respect for the rights to freedom of religion or belief and of expression, in accordance with relevant international human rights norms and standards.⁴⁹

44. Reporters Without Borders (RSF) stated that the press freedom situation in Singapore had further declined in 2020, which has largely been propelled by the adoption of an "anti-fake news" law, the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act. Powerful politicians had been known to use defamation suits to silence critics and political opponents.⁵⁰

45. JS7 stated that the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act required social media companies to remove content or display prominent corrections at the Government's direction on their platforms, or face fines. Correction directions had been issued against opposition politicians, government critics, civil society activists, independent news websites and journalists for their posts online, along with targeted correction directions against social media platforms.⁵¹

46. JS5 stated that Singapore had applied the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulations Act to persons raising allegations about unlawful methods of execution. It stated that activists and attorneys had also been targets of Government harassment for criticizing the use of the death penalty since Singapore's second-cycle universal periodic review.⁵²

47. JS7 stated that the Infocomm Media Development Authority, which operated under the Ministry of Communications Information, was provided with excessive discretion to suppress independent reporting and broadly controlled all forms of media and journalism. Provisions of the Newspaper and Printing Presses Act, Broadcasting Act and Undesirable Publications Act provided the authorities with wide powers to impose sanctions on broadcasters of content deemed critical of the Government, or offensive to public interest, order, national harmony, good taste and decency.⁵³

48. AI stated that the few independent media outlets in the country had been subjected to ongoing harassment by authorities.⁵⁴

49. RSF stated that self-censorship was widespread in Singapore, including among journalists, particularly those working in the mainstream media.⁵⁵

50. AI stated that the Administration of Justice (Protection) Act had been used to target human rights defenders and other individuals for criticizing the courts or the administration of justice.⁵⁶

51. RSF recommended that the Government amend Article 14 of the Constitution, so that it clearly proclaims press freedom and freedom of expression and information without any restriction.⁵⁷

52. RSF recommended that the Government repeal laws infringing upon press freedom and freedom of speech and criminalizing the exercise of journalism, such as the Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act, the Sedition Act and Sections 298 and 298A of the Penal Code.⁵⁸

53. ICJ recommended that the Government review and amend election-related, defamation and contempt of court provisions in domestic law, including under the Parliamentary Elections Act, the Penal Code and the Administration of Justice (Protection) Act 2016, to bring them in line with international human rights law.⁵⁹

54. HRW recommended that the Government amend the Administration of Justice (Protection) Act to enable full discussion of matters of public interest, including by, inter alia, repealing section 3(1)(a) to abolish the offense of "scandalizing the judiciary."⁶⁰

55. ICJ recommended that the Government repeal all legal provisions criminalizing defamation, including sections 499 to 502 of the Penal Code.⁶¹

56. JS7 recommended that the Government review and amend the Sedition Act, Newspaper and Printing Presses Act, Broadcasting Act and Undesirable Publications Act to ensure that these laws are in line with international human rights law and standards and good practices in the area of the freedom of expression.⁶²

57. AI recommended that the Government end the intimidation and harassment of human rights defenders, social media users and government critics, including through the misuse of the criminal justice system, and ensure human rights defenders can carry out their work without fear of reprisals.⁶³

58. JS7 recommended that the Government adopt a comprehensive framework for the protection of journalists.⁶⁴

59. JS7 recommended that the Government adopt a law on access to information in line with international standards in order to promote the full exercise of the rights to the freedoms of expression and opinion.⁶⁵

60. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) recommended that the Government recognise and fully implement by means of a dedicated legislation the right to conscientious objection on any ground to conscripts, regular servicemen, reservists, also during mobilisation.⁶⁶

61. ADF International recommended that the Government amend the 1967 Law on National Service to guarantee the right to conscientious objection to mandatory military service. It further recommended that the Government allow for a civil service alternative to military service, as well as release immediately those detained for refusing military service on grounds of conscience.⁶⁷

62. CPTI stated that male citizens and permanent residents aged between 13 years and 40 years required an exit permit from the Armed Forces Council to leave or remain outside Singapore. It stated that after ten years of unauthorised absence objectors may be deprived of their citizenship.⁶⁸

63. AI recommended that the Government revise or repeal the Public Order Act and relevant sections of the Penal Code to allow peaceful demonstrations without undue restrictions, and to guarantee the right to peaceful assembly to all people in Singapore, without discrimination.⁶⁹

64. JS8 recommended that the Government refrain from using the Internal Security Act and the Terrorism (Suppression of Financing) Act to restrict the rights to freedom of religion, freedom of opinion and expression, and freedom of peaceful assembly.⁷⁰

65. JS7 recommended that the Government amend the Societies Act to remove undue restrictions on the freedom of association, providing a clear legal basis for denying registration, with an explicit and limited number of justifiable grounds compatible with international human rights law and standards.⁷¹

Prohibition of all forms of slavery⁷²

66. The Global Detention Project (GDP) recommended that the Government ensure that victims of trafficking are protected against detention and deportation by implementing systematic, proactive screening and identification procedures, and providing appropriate shelters for victims.⁷³

Right to privacy and family life⁷⁴

67. JS2 recommended that the Government amend Section 12(1) of the Women's Charter and permit and recognise registration of same-sex marriages and partnerships. It also recommended that the Government enact legislation that recognises and protects the rights and duties of same-sex partners, and of children from same-sex households.⁷⁵

68. JS6 recommended that the Government prohibit polygamy, or make the written consent of existing wives mandatory for future marriages. It also recommended that the Government abolish the requirement of *wali* so adult Muslim women have the unrestricted

right to choose when and whom to marry. It further recommended that the Government ensure that Muslim men and women have equal rights to divorce.⁷⁶

69. JS6 stated that the minimum legal age for marriage was 18 years, under the Administration of Muslim Law Act, but religious officials appointed to solemnise Muslim marriages could allow marriages with younger girls if they had attained puberty. It recommended that the Government disallow marriage for girls below the age of 18 in all circumstances.⁷⁷

70. Access Now stated that the right to privacy was not affirmed in Singapore's Constitution.⁷⁸

71. Access Now recommended that the Government make a public commitment to protect the confidentiality of health data and identity of individuals who test positive for COVID-19.⁷⁹

72. Access Now recommended that the Government minimise the amount of and type of data, particularly biometric data, it and associated service providers collect through the digital identity program.⁸⁰

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

*Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work*⁸¹

73. The Disabled People's Association (DPA) stated that despite the limited data on the employment of persons with disabilities, it was widely accepted that persons with disabilities faced significant challenges in securing, retaining and progressing in employment.⁸²

74. JS1 stated that domestic workers continued to be excluded from the Employment Act and the Work Injury Compensation Act. It stated that the protections offered to domestic workers under the Employment of Foreign Manpower Act fell short of international labour rights standards. There were no legal limits within the Act on the number of hours they can be asked to work and it was not mandatory for domestic workers to have a weekly 24-hour day off. Public holidays, paid annual leave, and sick leave were also not legally guaranteed.⁸³

75. The Centre for Domestic Employees (CDE) stated that while foreign domestic workers were not covered under Employment Act, Workplace Safety and Health Act and Work Injury Compensation Act, they were covered by other legislation such as the Employment of Foreign Manpower Act and the Employment Agency Act.⁸⁴

76. JS1 recommended that the Government include domestic work within the scope of the Employment Act.⁸⁵

77. GDP recommended that the Government ensure that migrant domestic workers are included within labour law protections and that employees are held accountable for abuses.⁸⁶

78. JS6 stated that wage discrimination according to nationality was rampant, and that all low-wage migrant workers were paid less than local workers, with low-wage South Asian workers across all sectors of the economy being paid the least. It stated that given that unequal wage structures were not a statutory offence, there remained no legal recourse for the discriminated worker earning low wages.⁸⁷

79. JS6 stated that large recruitment fees were demanded from migrant workers in both source countries and Singapore, and that a substantial amount of these fees were paid to agents, employers and other intermediaries in Singapore. These fees reinforced the economic vulnerability of workers and facilitated exploitative conditions.⁸⁸

80. JS3 recommended that the Government explicitly include SOGIE as protected characteristics under the Tripartite Guidelines for Fair Employment Practices, impose statutory penalties on employers for workplace discrimination on the basis of SOGIE, and amend the Employment Act to prohibit SOGIE discrimination at all levels of employment, including hiring, remuneration and promotion.⁸⁹

81. JS4 recommended that the Government provide avenues for employees to seek redress if they have been subject to discrimination, harassment or abuse at work due to their gender identity or sexual orientation.⁹⁰

82. JS7 recommended that the Government guarantee the effective and independent functioning of autonomous trade unions by removing undue limitations and restrictions in the Trade Unions Act to form, join and register unions and ensure an enabling environment for migrant workers to join and hold positions in trade unions.⁹¹

*Right to social security*⁹²

83. TC stated that the State continued to be reluctant to provide a systematic social safety net in the form of a minimum wage or unemployment benefits to support basic needs. It stated that the Covid-19 pandemic had revealed the lack of institutional social protection measures.⁹³

84. TC recommended that the Government broaden social protection to include workers with informal status and homemakers and caregivers without a stable source of income.⁹⁴

85. TC recommended that the Government institutionalize a universal basic income, and revise the current approach of targeted aid into a systematic social safety net in the form of a minimum living wage and unemployment benefits to support basic needs.⁹⁵

86. JS6 recommended that the Government introduce more forms of, or improve on existing, non-contributory schemes to ensure that everyone attains the Basic Retirement Sum.⁹⁶

87. China Labor Watch (CLW) stated that when a migrant worker was injured at work, they often had to wait for months to receive a disability compensation offer. During this period of time, their work permit was cancelled and they were placed on a special pass.⁹⁷

88. JS1 stated that the Government did not extend subsidies to migrant workers for the cost of healthcare.⁹⁸

*Right to an adequate standard of living*⁹⁹

89. JS6 stated that there was no minimum wage law¹⁰⁰

90. MARUAH stated that Singapore lacked a minimum wage provision and preferred a Progressive Wage Model. It was concerned over the Model's inadequacy to keep up with rising costs.¹⁰¹

91. JS3 stated that it was a common occurrence that upon the landlord's discovery that tenants were from the LGBT+ community, there was either immediate eviction, or the threat of eviction coupled with the option of paying increased rent. Gay male couples and transgender persons were particularly impacted.¹⁰²

*Right to health*¹⁰³

92. JS3 recommended that the Government allocate resources and develop comprehensive LGBT-specific programmes in social service, healthcare and mental health sectors.¹⁰⁴

93. JS4 recommended that the Government implement training and awareness-raising programmes for healthcare professionals regarding gender identity issues, with the aim of eliminating discrimination in healthcare access.¹⁰⁵

94. Migrant Workers' Centre (MWC) stated that employers were responsible for their migrant workers' well-being, including ensuring acceptable accommodation, covering the expenses of their workers' medical treatment and purchasing in-patient medical insurance.¹⁰⁶

95. JS1 stated that the Employment of Foreign Manpower Act and the Work Injury Compensation Act required employers to purchase insurance for migrant workers' medical needs. It stated that healthcare providers typically required employers to furnish letters of guarantee before proceeding with surgery or costly diagnostic tests. It had observed many

cases where employers refused to furnish such guarantees, leaving workers without the medical treatment or tests that doctors considered appropriate.¹⁰⁷

96. JS1 recommended that the Government ensure that migrant workers can access healthcare directly using employer-provided insurance without having to seek permission and consent of employers.¹⁰⁸

97. JS3 recommended that the Government implement an evidence-based sexuality education curriculum that is inclusive of LGBT+ diversity, while ensuring consistency and secularity of content.¹⁰⁹

98. DPA recommended that the Government require public hospitals to train some members of their staff in sign language to ensure fewer barriers to accessing healthcare for persons with hearing loss.¹¹⁰

*Right to education*¹¹¹

99. DPA stated that the current curriculum for teachers did not provide adequate training to support children with disabilities in Government schools.¹¹²

100. DPA recommended that the Government ensure that all pre-schools are inclusive and can support both children with and without disabilities in the same environment.¹¹³

101. JS2 stated that LGBTQ children were often targeted by peers for their perceived non-conformity in sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, which could lead to many dropping out of school early or detrimental effects on mental health. It stated that many LGBTQ students feared seeking help, as perpetrators would threaten to disclose their sexual orientation/gender identity to their peers or teachers.¹¹⁴

102. JS3 recommended that the Government develop a National Action Plan to specifically address LGBT+ bullying and mental health in schools, in collaboration with the LGBT+ community and healthcare organisations, to include clear reporting processes for victims.¹¹⁵

103. JS4 recommended that the Government develop a training program for all school counsellors, teachers, administrators and other relevant staff to be educated on issues pertinent to LGBTQ youths.¹¹⁶

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

*Women*¹¹⁷

104. JS6 stated that public understanding of what constituted domestic violence, apart from physical violence, was poor. Migrant spouses of citizens were particularly vulnerable to domestic violence, as they were dependent on the citizen spouse to sponsor their right to reside in the country.¹¹⁸

105. JS6 recommended that the Government intensify public education on all forms of domestic violence, and allow abused migrant spouses to renew their Long-Term Visit Pass independent of the abusive citizen spouse.¹¹⁹

106. JS6 stated that the rate of domestic violence had increased after strict social distancing measures were introduced to curb the spread of Covid-19.¹²⁰

107. MARUAH stated that women in Singapore were still under-represented politically and in the workforce, and recommended that the Government actively push for gender parity.¹²¹

108. JS4 stated that Singapore did not have any policies that prohibited gender-based discrimination at the workplace.¹²²

109. JS6 stated that women were paid less than men for similar work performed, and that sectors where women were concentrated were often lowly-paid. Gender discrimination and the gender wage gap affected women's retirement savings.¹²³

*Children*¹²⁴

110. MARUAH stated that Singapore still had not made much progress with regard to the minimum legal working age of 13 years old and the minimum age of criminal responsibility of 7 years old.¹²⁵

111. IFOR recommended that the Government raise the minimum age for voluntary recruitment into the armed forces to 18 years.¹²⁶

112. JS4 recommended that the Government raise awareness and strengthen capacity among State and non-State actors to conduct LGBTQ-affirmative sensitivity training for teachers, law enforcement officers, family violence service providers, and all agencies in the National Family Violence Networking System to adequately assist, counsel, and support LGBTQ children victim-survivors of violence.¹²⁷

*Persons with disabilities*¹²⁸

113. DPA recommended that the Government include disability as a prohibited ground of discrimination under the Constitution, that the Government enact an anti-discrimination legislation to prohibit discrimination at all stages of employment; remove the reservation on Article 25(e) of the CRPD and prohibit private insurers from discriminating on the basis of disability; and expand and update the Government definition of disability to be inclusive of the entire disability population in Singapore, including persons with psychosocial disabilities, in line with the social model of disability enshrined in the CRPD.¹²⁹

114. DPA recommended that the Government ensure and publicly commit to government-supported skills upgrading courses being accessible to persons with disabilities.¹³⁰

115. JS6 stated that there was a severe shortage of sign-language interpreters, resulting in unequal access to education and employment, among other areas. It recommended that the Government train and make accessible a pool of sign language interpreters to approach the acceptable ratio of one interpreter to every 100 Deaf people in the country.¹³¹

116. DPA recommended that the Government allocate more resources towards the development and recognition of Braille and Singapore Sign Language as official languages in Singapore, so as to enhance inclusivity and accessibility for those who use them.¹³²

117. DPA recommended that the Government ensure consistent accessibility in television broadcasts by encouraging service providers to adopt closed-captioning as well as sign language interpreters across both free-to-air and paid television channels.¹³³

*Migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers*¹³⁴

118. GDP recommended that the Government ensure that immigration detention is only used as a measure of last resort, when it is necessary and proportionate.¹³⁵

119. GDP stated that civil society organisations had long highlighted challenges faced by migrant workers, including lack of job mobility, non-payment of salary, exploitative recruitment agencies charging high fees for arranging employment contracts, lack of access to medical care and food, unreasonable salary deductions, as well as arbitrary termination.¹³⁶

120. JS1 stated that at the root of migrant workers' vulnerability to exploitation and abuse lied the requirement that work permits be tied to employers, who could cancel the permits at will at any time. Once cancelled, workers also lost their right to residency, nor did they have a right to seek another job without first being repatriated. This exacerbated the vulnerability of migrant workers to, inter alia, salary abuses, contract substitution, long working hours and restrictions on movement.¹³⁷

121. JS1 stated that migrant workers who were out of work but have salary, injury or other claims pending did not have a guaranteed right to stay to the conclusion of their cases. Generally, such workers were issued with Special Passes under the Immigration Act, which forbade the pass holder from taking paid employment.¹³⁸

122. JS1 recommended that the Government allow migrant workers to switch employers, and allow those who had resigned or lost their jobs a generous period of time to find new employment without being repatriated.¹³⁹

123. TC stated that migrant workers residing in purpose-built dormitories operated by for-profit operators had suffered the most during the Covid-19 pandemic. Nearly 300,000 migrant workers were housed in cramped dormitories which made safe distancing practice difficult.¹⁴⁰

124. MWC stated that during the height of the COVID-19 crisis, many migrant workers living in dormitories were on movement restrictions to reduce the spread of Covid-19 and could not leave their dormitories to go to work or for leisure. MWC's 24-hour helpline had experienced a three to four fold increase in calls, many of which involved migrant workers who were facing emotional stress and anguish.¹⁴¹

125. JS6 stated that the public, independent journalists and human rights groups had struggled to gain access to information about what was happening in migrant worker dormitories over the many months that workers were locked down. It stated that the fear of being censured by a new "fake news" law hung over every effort to uncover and publish information not provided through Government sources.¹⁴²

Notes

- ¹ The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Individual submissions:

Access Now	Access Now, New York (United States of America);
ADF International	Alliance Defending Freedom, Geneva (Switzerland);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
CDE	Centre for Domestic Employees, Singapore (Singapore);
CLW	China Labor Watch, New York (United States of America);
CPTI	Conscience and Peace Tax International, Geneva (Switzerland);
DPA	Disabled People's Association, Singapore (Singapore);
ECLJ	European Centre for Law and Justice, Strasbourg (France);
GDP	Global Detention Project, Geneva (Switzerland);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, Geneva (Switzerland);
ICJ	International Commission of Jurists, Geneva (Switzerland);
IFOR	International Fellowship of Reconciliation, Utrecht (the Netherlands);
MARUAH	MARUAH, Singapore (Singapore);
MWC	Migrant Workers' Centre, Singapore (Singapore);
ORF	Omega Research Foundation, Manchester (United Kingdom);
PGA	Parliamentarians for Global Action, New York (United States of America);
RSF	Reporters Without Borders, Paris (France);
TC	Think Centre, Singapore (Singapore);
WFM/IGP	World Federalist Movement/Institute for Global Policy, the Hague (the Netherlands).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: Humanitarian Organisation for Migration Economics, Singapore (Singapore); Transient Workers Count Too, Singapore (Singapore);
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: Indignation, Singapore (Singapore); Prout, Singapore (Singapore); Sayoni, Singapore (Singapore); The Healing Circle, Singapore (Singapore); TransgenderSG, Singapore (Singapore); Young Out Here, Singapore (Singapore);
JS3	Joint submission 3 submitted by: Oogachaga, Singapore (Singapore); Pink Dot SG, Singapore (Singapore);
JS4	Joint submission 4 submitted by: TransgenderSG, Singapore

- (Singapore); Sayoni, Singapore (Singapore); Asia Pacific Transgender Network, Bangkok (Thailand);
- JS5 **Joint submission 5 submitted by:** Advocates for Human Rights, Minneapolis (United States of America); World Coalition Against the Death Penalty, Montreuil (France), Think Centre, Singapore (Singapore); Anti-Death Penalty Asia Network;
- JS6 **Joint submission 6 submitted by:** Association of Women for Action and Research, Singapore (Singapore); Freedom of Information Singapore, Singapore (Singapore); Humanitarian Organization for Migration Economics, Singapore (Singapore); Sayoni, Singapore (Singapore); SG Climate Rally, Singapore (Singapore); We Believe in Second Chances, Singapore (Singapore); We Who Witness, Singapore (Singapore); Women and Law in Islam, Singapore (Singapore);
- JS7 **Joint submission 7 submitted by:** CIVICUS; World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg (South Africa); Forum Asia, Bangkok (Thailand);
- JS8 **Joint submission 8 submitted by:** International Federation for Human Rights, Paris (France); Function 8, Singapore (Singapore).
- ² For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.1–166.14, 166.16–166.20, 166.22–166.32, 166.34–166.56, 166.63, 166.125–166.127 and 166.146.
- ³ ICJ, para. 50. See also JS5, para. 24; JS8, para. 27; Access Now, para. 35; AI, p. 5; CLW, p. 3; ECLJ, para. 14; HRW, para. 19; IFOR, para. 17; ORF, para. 17.
- ⁴ JS6, p. 18.
- ⁵ HRW, para. 19.
- ⁶ TC, p. 8.
- ⁷ PGA, paras. 11–12; WFM/IGP, para. 4.1. See also HRW, para. 25.
- ⁸ PGA, para. 13.
- ⁹ JS7, para. 6.5.
- ¹⁰ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.57–166.59, 166.62, 166.64, 166.66, 166.97, 166.99–166.106, 166.121–166.124 and 166.236.
- ¹¹ JS7, para. 6.2; JS8, para. 27. See also JS6, p. 14; AI, p. 5; ORF, para. 16; TC, p. 6.
- ¹² For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.60, 166.68–166.78, 166.109, 166.112, 166.115–166.118, 166.128, 166.152, 166.155, 166.216 and 166.220.
- ¹³ JS6, p. 13. See also JS2, p. 2; MARUAH, para. 24.
- ¹⁴ JS2, p. 1.
- ¹⁵ JS3, paras. 1.1–1.2.
- ¹⁶ HRW, para. 23. See also JS2, p. 1; JS6, p. 14, MARUAH, para. 24.
- ¹⁷ JS2, p. 2. See also JS3, para. 4.13 (a)–(c); JS6, p. 6.
- ¹⁸ JS4, para. 76.
- ¹⁹ JS2, pp. 10–11. See also JS4, paras. 36 and 38.
- ²⁰ JS4, para. 2.
- ²¹ JS6, p. 9.
- ²² JS2, pp. 12 and 14. See also JS4, paras. 10–12 and 51; JS6, p. 14.
- ²³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.21, 166.33, 166.80, 166.156–166.172 and 166.195.
- ²⁴ JS5, paras. 14 and 17.
- ²⁵ JS6, p. 5. See also TC, paras. 12–13.
- ²⁶ AI, para. 8.
- ²⁷ AI, para. 9.
- ²⁸ AI, p. 5. See also JS5, para. 24; HRW, para. 15; ICJ, para. 42; TC, p. 7.
- ²⁹ JS6, p. 5. See also JS5, para. 24; AI, p. 5; TC, p. 7.
- ³⁰ TC, p. 7.
- ³¹ ORF, para. 13.
- ³² JS6, p. 12.
- ³³ JS8, paras. 15 and 27.
- ³⁴ JS5, para. 24. See also JS8, para. 27.
- ³⁵ TC, para. 16.
- ³⁶ HRW, para. 14.

- ³⁷ ICJ, paras. 29 and 47. See also HRW, para. 15; TC, p. 7.
- ³⁸ TC, p. 7.
- ³⁹ CPTI, paras. 4-5.
- ⁴⁰ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.173, 166.191, 166.193–166.194 and 166.196.
- ⁴¹ ICJ, para. 25.
- ⁴² JS5, para. 24.
- ⁴³ AI, p. 5.
- ⁴⁴ JS2, p. 11.
- ⁴⁵ JS4, para. 47.
- ⁴⁶ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.86-166.92, 166.111, 166.113, 166.119–166.120, 166.154, 166.198–166.205 and 166.207.
- ⁴⁷ ECLJ, para. 5.
- ⁴⁸ ADF International, paras. 18 and 23 (e).
- ⁴⁹ ADF International, para. 23 (a).
- ⁵⁰ RSF, p. 1.
- ⁵¹ JS7, paras. 1.7 and 4.10. See also AI, para. 3.
- ⁵² JS5, para. 11.
- ⁵³ JS7, paras. 4.6-4.7. See also RSF, pp. 1-2.
- ⁵⁴ AI, para. 13.
- ⁵⁵ RSF, p. 2.
- ⁵⁶ AI, para. 3. See also Access Now, para. 10; TC, para. 9.
- ⁵⁷ RSF, p. 4.
- ⁵⁸ RSF, p. 4. See also JS6, p. 5; ADF International, para. 23 (d); HRW, para. 12; ICJ, para. 36.
- ⁵⁹ ICJ, para. 38.
- ⁶⁰ HRW, para. 12.
- ⁶¹ ICJ, para. 39. See also JS7, para. 6.3; TC, p. 7.
- ⁶² JS7, para. 6.3. See also AI, p. 5; RSF, p. 4.
- ⁶³ AI, p. 5. See also JS7, para. 6.2-6.3; Access Now, para. 36; RSF, p. 4.
- ⁶⁴ JS7, para. 6.3.
- ⁶⁵ JS7, para. 6.3. See also Access Now, para. 38; TC, p. 6.
- ⁶⁶ IFOR, para. 17.
- ⁶⁷ ADF International, para. 23 (h), (i) and (j). See also CPTI, para. 31.
- ⁶⁸ CPTI, para. 8.
- ⁶⁹ AI, p. 5. See also JS2, p. 4; JS7, para. 6.4; HRW, para. 12.
- ⁷⁰ JS8, para. 27.
- ⁷¹ JS7, para. 6.1. See also JS2, p. 3; JS3, para. 2.7 (a).
- ⁷² For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.178, 166.180–166.190.
- ⁷³ GDP, p. 7.
- ⁷⁴ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.65, 166.192 and 166.197.
- ⁷⁵ JS2, p. 10.
- ⁷⁶ JS6, p. 13.
- ⁷⁷ JS6, pp. 8 and 13.
- ⁷⁸ Access Now, para. 26.
- ⁷⁹ Access Now, para. 45.
- ⁸⁰ Access Now, para. 40.
- ⁸¹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.211 and 166.213.
- ⁸² DPA, p. 2.
- ⁸³ JS1, para. 2.01.1.
- ⁸⁴ CDE, para. 2.1.
- ⁸⁵ JS1, p. 13. See also GDP, para. 4; HRW, para. 19.
- ⁸⁶ GDP, p. 7. See also JS6, p. 18; CLW, p. 3.
- ⁸⁷ JS6, p. 17.
- ⁸⁸ JS6, p. 17. See also JS1, paras. 2.02.1 and 2.02.3.
- ⁸⁹ JS3, para. 6.10. See also JS2, p. 6; JS4, para. 63.
- ⁹⁰ JS4, para. 64.
- ⁹¹ JS7, para. 6.1.
- ⁹² For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.214, 166.217 and 166.221.
- ⁹³ TC, paras. 24-25.
- ⁹⁴ TC, p. 8.
- ⁹⁵ TC, p. 8.
- ⁹⁶ JS6, p. 13.

- ⁹⁷ CLW, p. 3.
⁹⁸ JS1, para. 2.13.3.
⁹⁹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.212 and 166.215.
¹⁰⁰ JS6, p. 17.
¹⁰¹ MARUAH, para. 30.
¹⁰² JS3, para. 7.8.
¹⁰³ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.218–166.219.
¹⁰⁴ JS3, para. 8.19.
¹⁰⁵ JS4, para. 66.
¹⁰⁶ MWC, para. 4.1.
¹⁰⁷ JS1, para. 2.13.2.
¹⁰⁸ JS1, p. 13.
¹⁰⁹ JS3, para. 5.13 (c).
¹¹⁰ DPA, p. 9.
¹¹¹ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.222–166.224 and 166.231.
¹¹² DPA, p. 4.
¹¹³ DPA, p. 6.
¹¹⁴ JS2, p. 4.
¹¹⁵ JS3, paras. 5.2 and 5.13(a). See also JS4, para. 13.
¹¹⁶ JS4, para. 57.
¹¹⁷ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.67, 166.81-166.85, 166.141–166.151 and 166.208-166.210.
¹¹⁸ JS6, p. 8.
¹¹⁹ JS6, p. 13.
¹²⁰ JS6, p. 8.
¹²¹ MARUAH, paras. 28-29.
¹²² JS4, para. 23.
¹²³ JS6, pp. 6-7.
¹²⁴ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.98, 166.108, 166.174–166.177 and 166.179.
¹²⁵ MARUAH, para. 18.
¹²⁶ IFOR, para. 18. See also CPTI, para. 31 (d).
¹²⁷ JS4, para. 74 (a).
¹²⁸ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.114, 166.129, 166.225–166.229, 166.230 and 166.232.
¹²⁹ DPA, p. 4.
¹³⁰ DPA, p. 6.
¹³¹ JS6, pp. 13-14.
¹³² DPA, p. 6.
¹³³ DPA, p. 10.
¹³⁴ For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/32/17, paras. 166.61, 166.79, 166.93–166.95, 166.130–166.140 and 166.233.
¹³⁵ GDP, para. 4.
¹³⁶ GDP, para. 1.1.4.
¹³⁷ JS1, para. 2.11.1.
¹³⁸ JS1, para. 2.08.1.
¹³⁹ JS1, p. 13. See also JS6, p. 18; CLW, p. 3.
¹⁴⁰ TC, para. 20.
¹⁴¹ MWC, para. 4.4. See also TC, para. 20.
¹⁴² JS6, p. 1.
-