



General Assembly

Distr.: General
6 November 2015

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-fourth session
18-29 January 2016

Summary prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21

Singapore*

The present report is a summary of 22 stakeholders' submissions¹ to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.



I. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Background and framework

Scope of international obligations²

1. Amnesty International (AI) noted that Singapore was yet to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Optional Protocols, and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol, as recommended in the previous UPR.³

2. International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) expressed concern that Singapore-based or Singapore-registered companies are engaged in projects with significant human rights concerns within a regional neighbouring country. The Kyaukphyu SEZ, a planned special economic zone in the Rakhine State of Myanmar, is being developed by a Singapore-led consortium of private companies. According to ICJ's research, the Kyaukphyu SEZ is displacing local communities without proper compensation or accountability for loss of land and livelihoods. Villagers are pressured to sell the land for the SEZ at unfair prices, and no access to remedy exists.⁴ ICJ recommended that Singapore review government policies concerning business obligations towards human rights, including obligations for businesses operating in the region with the objective of ensuring Singapore-based or – registered companies are not complicit in human rights violations.⁵

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

Cooperation with special procedures

3. Joint Submission 6 (JS6) recommended that Singapore extend a standing invitation to special procedures mandate holders, in particular to the special rapporteurs on human rights defenders, on freedom of expression, on freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, and on the independence of judges and lawyers.⁶

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations

1. Equality and non-discrimination

4. Joint Submission 5 (JS5) stated that Singapore had avoided to enact specific legislation that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.⁷

5. JS5 stated that most Lesbian, Gay, Bi-Sexual, Trans-sexual and Inter-sex (LGBTI) people found obstacles to get employment in the civil service. It also stated that there were clear examples of active discrimination within State departments. JS5 recommended that Singapore eliminate all policies that actively discriminate against LGBTI persons, in particular those which require that people declare their sexual orientation in public and private fields.⁸

6. Joint Submission 3 (JS3) stated that although unmarried mothers did enjoy some benefits, they were excluded from baby bonuses, 16 weeks of maternity leave, the parenthood tax rebate, various forms of child relief, family housing grants and housing priority for families.⁹

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

7. AI noted that the death penalty remained applicable for a range of offences under the Penal Code and other laws, including the Misuse of Drugs Act, the Terrorism (Suppression of Bombings) Act, the Arms Offences Act and the Singapore Armed Forces Act. AI expressed concern that some of these offences do not meet the threshold of “the most serious crimes,” for which the death penalty can be imposed under international law.¹⁰

8. AI welcomed the initial progress made on the 2011 UPR recommendations to impose a moratorium on executions¹¹ while reviewing the Misuse of Drugs Act 2012 and the Penal Code Act 2012. AI, however, noted that the progress on the recommendation to remove mandatory death sentencing¹² had been limited.¹³

9. AI expressed concern that while the courts now allow judges to exercise some discretion in deciding whether or not to impose the death penalty in particular circumstances, the amended legislation still does not conform with international human rights law and standards.¹⁴ It further underscored that Singapore’s decision to resume executions in July 2014 after the two-year moratorium on executions and to uphold the mandatory death penalty for certain types of offences or if circumstances of the case do not meet certain criteria, was contrary to global trends towards abolition and prior UPR recommendations to abolish the death penalty.¹⁵ AI also noted that since the last UPR, Singapore had carried out seven executions. Four people were executed in 2011. Following the temporary suspension in the application of the death penalty in 2012 and 2013, Singapore resumed executions on 18 July 2014.¹⁶

10. Second Chances expressed concerns that: there was no express legal prohibition against execution of accused persons who are mentally ill at the time of execution; that the Cabinet was not legally obliged to consider the accused’s representation in considering whether a clemency should be granted; that there was a persistent lack of important factual information on the death penalty; and that there was a lack of sufficient notice of execution given to inmates or their families.¹⁷ JS3 expressed concern that important information such as the backgrounds of current death row inmates and those that have been executed or whether botched executions had taken place before were not available.¹⁸

11. According to AI, dates of scheduled executions are not notified to the public in advance. The prisoners, their family and lawyers are usually notified of the scheduled execution four days before it is carried out.¹⁹

12. AI recommended that Singapore: immediately re-establish a moratorium on executions, with a view to complete abolition of the death penalty; and prohibiting the imposition of the death penalty against persons with mental and intellectual disabilities.²⁰ MARUAH also recommended that the Government review the scope of capital offences to ensure that the death penalty is imposed only for intentional crimes with lethal consequences; and that all instances of mandatory death penalty be immediately repealed and replaced with a discretion given to the court to impose an appropriate sentence up to death.²¹

13. Child Rights International Network (CRIN) noted that any person who was under the age of 18 at the time of committing an offence punishable with death must be sentenced to life imprisonment in lieu of the death penalty.²²

14. Joint Submission 8 (JS8) noted that persons may embark upon their obligatory military service from the age of sixteen and a half contrary to article 2 of the OP-CRC-AC ratified by Singapore.²³

15. ICJ noted that Singapore laws provided corporal punishment, in the form of caning, as penalty for various crimes such as robbery; drug-related crimes, including “drug abuse”; vandalism; and even immigration-related offences (e.g. overstaying one’s visa).²⁴ ICJ also

noted that on 4 March 2015, the Singapore Court of Appeal, the country's highest court, issued a judgment declining to declare judicial caning unlawful.²⁵

16. CRIN noted that corporal punishment was a lawful sentence for male children over the age of seven.²⁶ CRIN specified that female offenders were exempt from sentences of caning. Sentences of corporal punishment may be handed to children aged seven to 15 only by the High Court, which tries children accused of certain offences, such as murder, rape, drug trafficking or armed robbery. Children aged 16 and 17 were tried as adults and liable to be sentenced to caning.²⁷

17. According to JS3, in 2012, 2,500 offenders were sentenced to judicial caning. Out of the 2,203 sentences carried out, 1,070 involved foreigners who were caned for committing immigration offences such as overstaying.²⁸

18. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children noted that in Singapore, corporal punishment of children was unlawful in child care centres but it was lawful in all other settings, including the home, alternative care settings, day care, schools, penal institutions, as a sentence for crime and in military service.²⁹

19. Franciscans International (FI) noted that Singapore adopted the National Plan of Action against Trafficking in Persons 2012 – 2015 and the Prevention of Human Trafficking Act 2014.³⁰ FI expressed concern that the Prevention of Human Trafficking Act 2014 focuses an inordinate amount of its text to the role of enforcement and the powers granted to police or enforcement officers.³¹ FI also expressed concern that the principles outlined under the law may be misused or manipulated and that it may result in the further traumatization of victims.³² Joint Submission 4 (JS4) expressed concern that the Government fails to recognize elements of trafficking in cases without physical confinement or abuse; and that there are limited efforts to prosecute and convict traffickers and there is lack of transparency regarding ongoing cases, which interferes with service providers' ability to assist victims.³³ FI recommended that Singapore ensure the prosecution and punishment of individuals involved in trafficking and provide further protection and rehabilitation mechanisms for victims.³⁴

20. Joint Submission 7 (JS7) also recommended that Singapore ensure that victims have the right to accommodation, food, counselling services, legal aid, medical treatment and social support while their case is ongoing; victims should not be prosecuted for being undocumented immigrants or for working 'illegally' or for any illegal immigration infractions inadvertently committed while being trafficked; and victims have the right to work and a decent income while their case is ongoing.³⁵

21. FI expressed particular concern about sex trafficking into Singapore.³⁶ FI also noted that labour trafficking had proven more difficult to track and prevent as the greatest volume of cases involve the fishing industry. In many cases, workers who are trafficked through Singapore infrequently return to the country remaining offshore for extended periods of time or docking in ports in neighbouring countries.³⁷

22. JS3 stated that arrest and imprisonment without trial was allowed under the Internal Security Act (ISA), Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act and the Misuse of Drugs Act. JS3 also noted that the executive alone decided on arrest, imprisonment and the renewal of detention orders under the ISA. An advisory board appointed by the executive may review a detention order but this is conducted behind closed doors with no independent body overseeing the proceedings or checking the basis for its recommendation.³⁸

23. Function8 also noted that "preventive detention" or "indefinite imprisonment without trial" was permitted by the Internal Security Act, the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act and the Misuse of Drugs Act.³⁹ JS6 stated that the authorities continued to

invoke vague and ill-defined legislation to arbitrarily detain and imprison civil society activists and human rights defenders for undertaking their legitimate and peaceful activities.⁴⁰

24. Function8 further noted that presently, there were 11 people, all Muslims, being imprisoned under the Internal Security Act.⁴¹ Function8 also highlighted that the length of imprisonment under the Internal Security Act was indefinite.⁴² MARUAH also stated that there had been a consistent stream of past and present detainees alleging psychological mistreatment and even physical violence whilst in detention.⁴³ MARUAH recommended that detention cases be reviewed in court and that all detainees have a fair trial in court.⁴⁴

25. The Indiana University Fairbanks School of Public Health (IUFSPH) stated that all imprisoned women regardless of their crime were subjected to high-security measures, which may impact the women's emotional and mental health. IUFSPH also noted that there was no special assessment tool to determine whether a female prisoner was in need of mental health services.⁴⁵

3. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law

26. AI expressed concern that provisions in national legislation that undermine the presumption of innocence and place the burden of proof on the defendant, including under the Misuse of Drugs Act and the Arms Offences Act. Under sections 17-22 of the Misuse of Drugs Act, a defendant found in possession of a certain amount of controlled drugs, or holding keys or documents relating to the same controlled drugs, are automatically presumed guilty of possession for the purpose of trafficking unless it is proved that his possession of that drug was not for that purpose.⁴⁶ AI recommended that Singapore ensure rigorous compliance in all death penalty cases with international standards for fair trial, including the right to be presumed innocent until guilt has been proven beyond reasonable doubt.⁴⁷

27. MARUAH expressed concern that accused persons, particularly in capital cases, could be denied access to counsel for a period of time after arrest purportedly to enable the police to conduct investigations without undue interference. MARUAH also expressed concern that Singapore law allowed an accused person to be convicted based entirely on his confession recorded in the course of police investigation.⁴⁸

28. JS8 stated that conscientious objectors who refuse to perform military service had been treated as though they had been enlisted in the armed forces and were put on military courts under military law. They were routinely sentenced to detention in military penal facilities and this detention was arbitrary.⁴⁹

29. JS4 stated that when migrant workers are arrested, they may be uninformed of their right to make a phone call or gain access to the services of a language translator whereby they may be disadvantaged in communication and may not get help from a lawyer, an NGO or an embassy representative.⁵⁰

30. CRIN noted that the minimum age of criminal responsibility in Singapore was seven years old. Children aged seven to 15 were considered juveniles, while children over the age of 15 were tried as adults. Children over that age were liable to be sentenced to life imprisonment for a number of offences.⁵¹

4. Right to privacy, marriage and family life

31. Privacy International (PI) noted that the law through various pieces of legislation, including the Criminal Procedure Code and the Computer Misuse and Cyber-security Act did not impose a need for prior judicial authorization to conduct surveillance and interception.⁵² PI also noted that the surveillance structure spread wide from CCTV, drones,

internet monitoring, access to communications data, mandatory SIM card registration, identification required for registration to certain website, to use of big data analytics for governance initiatives, including traffic monitoring.⁵³

32. According to JS4, to obtain and keep work permits, migrant workers and migrant domestic workers are required to pass a medical examination for pregnancy and infectious diseases by a registered doctor within 14 days of arrival and periodically during employment. Employers can obtain a copy of the report directly from the doctor without a worker's consent.⁵⁴ JS4 also noted that work permit holders were not allowed to marry Singaporean citizens or permanent residents without permission from the Ministry of Manpower.⁵⁵

33. ICJ noted that the Singapore's Penal Code criminalized consensual sexual relations between men and provided a jail term of up to two years for any person convicted under this provision.⁵⁶ Joint Submission 1 (JS1) noted that the Penal Code had been used by a range of government agencies to deny or uphold a wider range of discriminatory policies that effectively strip LGBT Singaporeans of the prerogatives and protections of citizenship.⁵⁷ JS5 recommended that Singapore repeal section 377A of the Penal Code and decriminalize sexual relations between men. JS5 also recommended that Singapore take the necessary measures to eliminate legislation and policies that criminalize in a direct or an indirect way same sex relations and discriminate against LGBTI people.⁵⁸

34. JS3 noted that neither the law nor the state recognized same-sex relationships. Consequently, many benefits and rights enjoyed by married opposite-sex couples were denied to same-sex couples, including employee benefits extended to spouses, medical visitation and next-of-kin rights, rights to purchase subsidized public housing from the state and tax allowances for married couples.⁵⁹

35. JS3 noted that the Penal Code offered immunity to rapists if they are married to their victims making them liable only to the less charge of "voluntarily causing hurt."⁶⁰

36. JS3 noted that the Administration of Muslim Law Act (AMLA) permitted a Muslim man to enter into polygamous marriages of up to 4 living wives at any point in time without any legal requirement to obtain consent from the first wife. Unless specifically provided for in the initial marriage contract, a husband's polygamy is not recognized as a valid ground of divorce available to the wife.⁶¹

37. JS3 also noted that under AMLA, male heirs were given two shares of inheritance to every share given to a female heir in the same degree of relationship to the deceased. For matters of marriage, divorce and inheritance, Muslims were subject to the adjudication of the Singapore Sharia court, which administers AMLA.⁶²

5. Freedom of movement

38. JS8 noted that all male citizens and permanent residents aged between 13 years and 40 years required an exit permit issued by the Armed Forces Council to leave or remain outside Singapore.⁶³

39. JS3 noted that Singapore continues to deport and ban people living with HIV/AIDS.⁶⁴

40. JS3 noted that while the Employment of Foreign Manpower Act and Passports Act forbade employment agencies and employers from holding onto a worker's identity documents, they continued to confiscate and retain migrant domestic workers' travel and identity documents in a manner that infringes on their freedom of movement.⁶⁵ JS4 also noted that migrant domestic workers were required to live with their employers, which makes them especially prone to confinement, isolation and physical and sexual abuse with no opportunities to exercise freedom of movement.⁶⁶

6. Freedom of religion or belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life

41. JS4 noted that migrant domestic workers without a mandatory day off were unable to attend religious worship. JS4 also noted reports that they had been forbidden by their employers from praying and fasting.⁶⁷

42. JS8 noted that conscientious objection to military service was not recognized in law or in practice.

43. Human Rights Watch (HRW) stated that the authorities used two laws, the 2009 Public Order Act and the Public Entertainment and Meeting Act, to control and shut down any public rallies or demonstrations, public discussions and unauthorized political meetings.⁶⁸

44. JS7 noted that the Speakers' Corner, located in Hong Lim Park, was designated in 2000 as the only public area in Singapore where citizens and permanent residents can give public speeches without a public entertainment licence, provided that these speeches do not touch on matters of race and religion. The use of the space is approved by the national parks Board which also governs the terms of conditions. The Commissioner of Parks and Recreation has the power to revoke approval of an event if, in his/her opinion, the event may "endanger or cause discomfort or inconvenience to other users of the national park, nature reserve or public park".⁶⁹ Joint submission 2 (JS2) noted that licences related to speech and expression were virtually impossible to obtain or come with onerous conditions that either modify the speech or restrict its distribution or access by members of the public.⁷⁰

45. International Service for Human Rights (ISHR) noted that human rights defenders asserting their right to freedom of speech and expression are particularly at risk in Singapore. Defamation lawsuits were routinely filed against bloggers and cartoonists for public comments that would be ordinary in rights respecting democracies. They were at risk of losing their jobs as the Government continues its unwillingness to let citizens have their say.⁷¹ JS2 also expressed concern about the use or threatened use of defamation suits by political office-holders, including the Prime Minister and government agencies against critics and contempt of court action against bloggers and cartoonists.⁷² JS2 further highlighted that Singapore regularly used the offence of contempt of court against persons criticizing the judiciary. The offence can lead to fines, imprisonment and the Prosecution may recover hefty costs from those it charges.⁷³

46. JS6 expressed concern that the Government had continued to regularly invoke vague legislation to censor and persecute independent media. The Media Development Authority was endowed with excessive discretion to suppress independent reporting and broadly control all forms of media and journalism. Provisions of the Newspaper and Printing Presses Act, Broadcasting Act, Undesirable Publications Act provided the Media Development Authority with side powers to impose sanctions on broadcasters of content deemed critical of the Government, offensive of public interest or order, national harmony or good taste and decency.⁷⁴ In this connection, HRW recommended that Singapore repeal the Newspaper and Printing Presses Act in its entirety and amend the Broadcasting Act, the Films Act, and the Undesirable Publications Act to eliminate censorship and lift onerous and overbroad requirements on online news portals and internet Service Providers that police content and block restricted materials.⁷⁵

47. JS2 also expressed concern that the Government regularly constrains speech through licencing while noting that the Media Development Authority imposed a new licensing regime that requires all online news sites to secure a license, should they reach 50,000 unique views per month over a two-month period. JS2 stated that the vague and arbitrary license conditions created a culture of self-censorship.⁷⁶ JS7 also stated that artistic

expression continued to be restricted when the subject matter touches on politically-sensitive topics. The theatre scene was tightly regulated as the scripts of all plays must be vetted in advance by the Media Development Authority.⁷⁷

48. ISHR also noted that media censorship laws in Singapore created a skewed portrayal of LGBTI individuals in local and mainstream media. Male same-sex relations were still criminalized and a 24-hour takedown requirement for ‘material that advocates homosexuality or lesbianism’ on popular websites was being introduced, placing LGBTI human rights defenders and human rights defenders advocating for LGBTI rights at risk.⁷⁸ JS5 recommended that Singapore take all necessary measures to allow broadcasting of LGBTI content without any kind of restrictions in all media, including print media, television, film and web broadcasting.⁷⁹

49. HRW noted that the Societies Act required that organizations with at least 10 members register, but permits the Government to deny applications on ground that its purposes are prejudicial to public peace, welfare or good order or that registration would be contrary to the national interest.⁸⁰

50. JS1 stated that no LGBTI organization had been able to register as a legal society. The Singapore Societies Act gives the registrar of Societies absolute discretion to refuse the registration of a society if the Registrar is merely satisfied that it would be contrary to the national interest for the society to be registered.⁸¹ JS5 stated that the Registrar of Societies had used the broad scope to deny registration of associations as a basis for rejecting applications by LGBTI associations.⁸²

51. JS6 stated that the Government had erected a highly restrictive regulatory regime which imposes debilitating limitations on the free exercise of the right to freedom of assembly. JS6 expressed particular concern about blanket restrictions on a variety of outdoor gatherings without a permit and sanctions for persons who violate these laws.⁸³

52. MARUAH noted that elections were administered by the Elections Department under the Prime Minister’s Office and elections officials were appointed from the civil service.⁸⁴ MARUAH recommended that Singapore create an independent elections commission and that member of the public be appointed to serve as election officials.⁸⁵

7. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

53. JS6 expressed concern about requirements under the Trade Union Act obliging all unions to officially register with the Registrar of Trade Unions which can deny or withdraw a union’s registration on various arbitrary grounds, including that a union of similar purpose already exists.⁸⁶ JS3 noted that the Trade Unions Act forbade migrant workers from forming their own trade unions.⁸⁷ TWC2 underscored that the prohibition, coupled with the Public Order Act which criminalizes the conduct of non-approved cause-related gatherings such as industrial strikes, effectively disabled migrant workers from engaging in collective bargaining or other collective action on issues particular to migrant workers.⁸⁸ JS4 expressed similar concerns recommending that Singapore ensure that a migrant worker’s freedom of expression and association, and the right to participate in all aspects of civic and political life are respected.⁸⁹

54. JS3 stated that all low wage migrant workers were paid less than local workers. Low wage South Asian workers in all sectors of the economy were paid less than workers of all other nationalities. JS3 also noted that as an unequal wage structure was not a statutory offence, there was no legal recourse for the discriminated worker. Wage discrimination and low wages led to a strike by over 200 bus drivers from China in 2012. The State sentenced them to jail for instigating and participating in the strike.⁹⁰ In this regard, JS4 recommended that Singapore review the practice of wage discrimination by nationality and take steps to address the issue.⁹¹

55. JS4 noted that on average migrant domestic workers worked more than 13 hours a day and many workers were expected to work between 16 and 18 hours. Low skilled migrant workers who are covered by the Employment Act were pressured to work 12 – 16 hours a day, 7 days a week as a result of poor enforcement of legislation that stipulated that workers should not have to work more than 72 hours of overtime per month.⁹²

56. JS3 also noted that foreign domestic workers were excluded from the Employment Act preventing them from enjoying basic rights such as public holidays, sick leave, maternity leave and limits to working hours as other workers.⁹³

57. JS3 further noted that regulations stipulating accommodation standards for live-in domestic workers were vague resulting in many of them sleeping in places such as kitchens, living rooms and storerooms with no privacy. Other migrant workers such as construction and shipyard workers continued to live in crowded, cramped and unhygienic conditions due to weak enforcement.⁹⁴

58. JS1 noted that benefits and workplace policies aimed at levelling access for LGBTI employees were nearly non-existent except for a small handful of multinational organizations. JS1 also noted reports of workplace bullying, prejudice, harassment, blackmail and intimidation, which are often discussed only privately within the LGBTI community.⁹⁵

8. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

59. According to JS3, Singapore is reluctant to intervene to provide social protection/security to support basic needs such as sustenance and housing, due to its attachment to the state ideology of “meritocracy”, whereby “merit” is rewarded rather than human rights protected. This affects every aspect of Singapore’s welfare system where access to social assistance is decided by extremely stringent standards of means-testing or premised on employment.⁹⁶

60. JS7 stated that despite high social security contributions rates, more than 30 per cent of monthly salaries, employees did not receive comparable benefits.⁹⁷

61. JS3 noted that more than 80 per cent of the population lived in public housing and people excluded from public housing could find housing only in the vastly more expensive private property market, which results in discrimination on the basis of marital status, gender identity and sexual orientation as it excludes unwed mothers, same-sex couples and transgender people who have not undergone sex reassignment surgery from public housing.⁹⁸ JS1 recommended that Singapore allocate resources and implement comprehensive LGBTI-specific services in social service, mental health and healthcare sectors.⁹⁹

9. Right to health

62. JS7 noted that the majority of healthcare in Singapore was paid for by out of pocket expenditure and employer funded health insurance. Government subsidies accounted for about a third of overall health expenditure.¹⁰⁰

63. JS1 recommended that Singapore implement anti-discriminatory guidelines in all healthcare and social service institutions; protect the rights of LGBTI service-users, as well as adopt international guidelines on providing sexual health information, prevention and treatment for LGBTI persons, especially LGBT youth. JS1 also recommended that Singapore outlaw all clinical practices that involve conversion therapy or practices that are discriminatory towards LGBTI-identified persons.¹⁰¹ JS1 further recommended that Singapore reinstate sex reassignment surgeries in public hospitals and allow *Medisave* and *Medishield Life* coverage for these procedures.¹⁰²

64. JS3 noted that migrant workers did not have universal access to health care. Employers often deported workers who are ill or in need of medical treatment.¹⁰³ JS4 recommended that Singapore strictly enforce employers' obligation to provide medical treatment to migrant workers and review laws and regulations that call for immediate and automatic deportation of a migrant worker on health grounds. JS4 also recommended that Singapore provide treatment on a right to health basis and ensure migrant workers have easy access to comprehensive and affordable health services.¹⁰⁴

65. IUFSPH noted that although the prison population suffered from HIV/AIDS at higher rates than the general population, Singapore did not appear to have any special programmes in place for women prisoners with HIV/AIDS.¹⁰⁵

10. Right to education

66. JS1 recommended that Singapore introduce comprehensive and evidence-based sexuality and sexual health programmes to all schools to include LGBTI-related issues.¹⁰⁶

11. Persons with disabilities

67. JS7 stated that the Compulsory Education Act did not include children with disabilities. The Government provided financial support up to 4 times that of a 'normal' child. But the affordability of special education and accommodation of the needs of persons with disabilities remained unclear, including how adequately parents are supported in this process. Where accessibility is concerned, only around 80 per cent of bus routes were wheel-chair accessible. JS7 also noted that there was no adequate holistic planning to remove barriers to accessibility, so that connections between individual components of the transport network or from transport nodes to nearby locations were disabled-accessible. JS7 further noted that not all government schools were fully wheelchair-accessible.¹⁰⁷

12. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

68. Transient Workers Count Too (TWC2) noted that the Singapore's legal regime for the employment of migrant workers was based on an employer-sponsor model: the employer has a great deal of power over many aspects of the worker's life, including, significantly, the absolute discretion to deny the worker the opportunity to change jobs by simply refusing to consent to a transfer. A worker's employment can be terminated by the employer for no just cause at any time.¹⁰⁸

69. JS3 noted that in 2013, 53 migrant workers were deported without due process, which was also evident in the State's treatment of local and undocumented migrant sex workers working without permits. They were deported without any due process and banned from re-entry for 3 years.¹⁰⁹ JS3 also noted that female work permit holders faced deportation for being pregnant.¹¹⁰ JS4 also noted that many migrant workers secretly terminate their pregnancies by dangerously self-administering abortion drugs in the result that these workers are denied their right to found a family.¹¹¹

70. JS3 noted that migrant workers covered by the Employment Act continued to be routinely denied overtime pay, annual leave, paid sick leave and protection from wrongful dismissals.¹¹²

71. TWC2 noted that the Employment of Foreign Manpower Act and related policies tied work permit holders to specific employers.¹¹³ JS4 also noted that migrant workers who wish to pursue claims against employers are often forcefully repatriated without access to justice. Aggrieved workers also do not have the right to switch employers freely.¹¹⁴ Migrant Workers' Centre also noted that the authorities in 2015 extended the statutory maximum period of employment for migrant workers on work permits from 18 years to 22 years in several key industry sectors and allowed experienced migrant workers with proven skills

records to continue to stay and work in Singapore with different employers even if their work tenures with the original work permit employer had ended.¹¹⁵ JS4 recommended that Singapore review the system whereby migrant workers are not allowed to switch employers freely with a view to liberalizing it further.¹¹⁶

72. JS3 stated that Singapore continued to deny asylum to thousands of Rohingya fleeing Myanmar resulting in them being stranded at sea.¹¹⁷

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:

AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
CRIN	Child Rights International Network, City (Country);
FI	Franciscans International, Geneva (Switzerland);
Function8	Function8, (Singapore);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, Geneva (Switzerland);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, New York (United States of America);
ICJ	International Commission of Jurists, Geneva (Switzerland);
ISHR	International Service for Human Rights, Geneva (Switzerland);
IUFSPH	The Indiana University Fairbanks School of Public Health, Indiana (United States of America);
MARUAH	MARUAH (Singapore);
MWC	Migrant Workers' Centre, (Singapore);
PI	Privacy International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
Second Chances	Second Chances, (Singapore);
TWC2	Transient Workers Count Too, (Singapore);

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: Oogachaga (Singapore); and Pink Dot SG (Singapore).
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: Community Action Network (CAN) (Singapore) and Reporters Without Borders (RWB), City (Country);
JS3	Joint submission 3 submitted by: Association of Women for Action and Research (AWARE), (Singapore); Function 8 (Singapore); Humanitarian Organization for Migrant Economics (HOME), (Singapore); Project X, (Singapore); Sayoni, (Singapore); Singapore Anti-Death Penalty Campaign, (Singapore); Think Center, (Singapore); The Online Citizen, (Singapore); We Believe in Second Chances (Second Chances), (Singapore); WWF Singapore, (Singapore);
JS4	Joint submission 4 submitted by: Humanitarian Organization for Migration Economics (HOME), (Singapore) and Think Center (Singapore);
JS5	Joint submission 5 submitted by: Kaleidoscope Australia Human Rights Foundation (Australia); Sexual Rights Initiative; Safe Singapore (Singapore); Sayoni (Singapore); Bear Project and Young Out (Singapore);
JS6	Joint submission 6 submitted by: World Alliance for Citizen Participation (CIVICUS), (South Africa); MURUAH (Singapore);

- JS7 Joint submission 7 submitted by: MURUAH (Singapore); Humanitarian Organization for Migration Economics (HOME), (Singapore); The Online Citizen (Singapore); Transient Workers Count Too (Singapore);
- JS8 Joint submission 8 submitted by: International Fellowship of Reconciliation (ifor), Alkmaar (The Netherlands); Conscience and Peace Tax International (CPTI), Leuven (Belgium).

² The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

³ AI, p.1. See also A/HRC/18/11, recommendations 96.8 (Slovenia), 96.9 (Egypt), 96.10 (Czech Republic), 96.11 (Poland), 96.13 (United Kingdom), 96.14 (Japan), 96.15 (Ghana), 96.16 (France), 96.17 (Kazakhstan), and PI, para. 7.

⁴ ICJ, paras. 21 – 24.

⁵ ICJ, para. 28 (h).

⁶ JS6, para. 6.5.

⁷ JS5, para. 9.

⁸ JS5, paras. 15 – 17.

⁹ JS3, para. 6.

¹⁰ AI, pp. 1 – 2. See also ICJ, para. 14.

¹¹ Human Rights Council, *Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review – Singapore*, 11 July 2011, A/HRC/18/11, recommendations 97.1 (Finland, France), 97.3 (Czech Republic), 97.4 (Canada).

¹² A/HRC/18/11, recommendations 97.3 (Czech Republic), 97.4 (Canada), 97.5 (United Kingdom), 97.6 (France, Slovenia).

¹³ AI, p.1. See also ICJ, paras. 12 – 13.

¹⁴ AI, p. 1.

¹⁵ AI, p. 1. See also ICJ, paras. 8 – 10. See also A/HRC/18/11, recommendations 97.1 (Finland, France), 97.3 (Czech Republic), 97.4 (Canada), 97.5 (United Kingdom).

¹⁶ AI, p. 3.

¹⁷ Second Chances, para. 1., and paras. 28 – 34.

¹⁸ JS3, para. 38.

- ¹⁹ AI, p.2.
²⁰ AI, p. 4.
²¹ MARUAH, para. 27.
²² CRIN, para. 2.
²³ JS8, para. 6.
²⁴ ICJ, para. 2.
²⁵ ICJ, para. 3.
²⁶ CRIN, para. 1.
²⁷ CRIN, para. 3.
²⁸ JS3, para. 39.
²⁹ GIEACPC, para. 2.1.
³⁰ FI, para. 6.
³¹ FI, para. 15.
³² FI, para. 15. See also JS3, para. 17.
³³ JS4, para. 14.
³⁴ FI, para. 16.
³⁵ JS7, para. 41.
³⁶ FI, para. 7.
³⁷ FI, para. 10.
³⁸ JS3, para. 13. See also HRW, p. 4.
³⁹ Function8, para. 1.
⁴⁰ JS6, para. 5.1.
⁴¹ Function8, para. 2.1.5.
⁴² Function8, para. 2.3.2.
⁴³ MARUAH, para. 35.
⁴⁴ MARUAH, para. 38.
⁴⁵ IUFSPH, paras. 4.2.2 and 4.2.4.
⁴⁶ AI, p. 2.
⁴⁷ AI, p. 4.
⁴⁸ MARUAH, para. 21.
⁴⁹ JS8, para. 4.
⁵⁰ JS4, para. 19.
⁵¹ CRIN, para. 1.
⁵² PI, para. 18.
⁵³ PI, para. 16.
⁵⁴ JS4, para. 21.
⁵⁵ JS4, para. 23.
⁵⁶ ICJ, paras. 15 – 20. See also JS1, para. 1. And JS3, para. 2.
⁵⁷ JS1, para. 2.
⁵⁸ JS5, paras. 7 – 8.
⁵⁹ JS3, para. 21.
⁶⁰ JS3, para. 3.
⁶¹ JS3, para. 4.
⁶² JS3, para. 4.
⁶³ JS8, para. 7.
⁶⁴ JS3, para. 12.
⁶⁵ JS3, para. 23.
⁶⁶ JS4, para. 25.
⁶⁷ JS4, para. 29.
⁶⁸ HRW, p. 3.
⁶⁹ JS7, paras. 6 – 8.
⁷⁰ JS2, para. 2.04.
⁷¹ ISHR, para. 3. See also JS7, paras. 13 - 14.
⁷² JS2, para. 2.03. See also JS7, para. 11., HRW, pp. 2 – 3.
⁷³ JS2, para. 5.02. See also JS7, para. 12.
⁷⁴ JS6, para. 2.2.

- ⁷⁵ HRW, p. 2.
⁷⁶ JS2, para. 6.02.
⁷⁷ JS7, para. 10.
⁷⁸ ISHR, para. 3.
⁷⁹ JS5, para. 26.
⁸⁰ HRW, p. 4.
⁸¹ JS1, paras. 10 – 12. See also JS3, para. 26.
⁸² JS5, para. 21.
⁸³ JS6, para. 3.2.
⁸⁴ MARUAH, para. 3.
⁸⁵ MARUAH, para. 8.
⁸⁶ JS6, para. 4.4.
⁸⁷ JS3, para. 27. See also TWC2, para. 3.4.
⁸⁸ TWC2, para. 3.4.
⁸⁹ JS4, paras. 30 - 31.
⁹⁰ JS3, para. 8. See also, JS4, para. 11.
⁹¹ JS4, para. 11.
⁹² JS4, paras. 34 – 35.
⁹³ JS3, para. 28. See also TWC2, paras. 3.2. and 3.2.1.
⁹⁴ JS3, para. 33.
⁹⁵ JS1, para. 39. See also JS3, para. 10.
⁹⁶ JS3, para. 7.
⁹⁷ JS7, para. 29.
⁹⁸ JS3, para. 5. See also JS7, para. 30.
⁹⁹ JS1, para. 38.b.
¹⁰⁰ JS7, para. 32.
¹⁰¹ JS1, paras. 38.c. – 38.d.
¹⁰² JS1, para. 38.g.
¹⁰³ JS3, para. 32. See also JS4, paras. 39 – 44.
¹⁰⁴ JS4, para. 45.
¹⁰⁵ IUFSPH, para. 4.2.1.
¹⁰⁶ JS1, para. 38.e.
¹⁰⁷ JS7, para. 40.
¹⁰⁸ TWC2, para. 5.1.
¹⁰⁹ JS3, para. 11.
¹¹⁰ JS3, para. 22.
¹¹¹ JS4, para. 22.
¹¹² JS3, para. 19.
¹¹³ TWC2, para. 3.1.
¹¹⁴ JS4, para. 16.
¹¹⁵ MWC, para. 5.2.
¹¹⁶ JS4, para. 38.
¹¹⁷ JS3, para. 18.
-