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ABSTRACT

Although Hong Kong is a party to the Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and has enacted legislation to safeguard women’s rights, the existing framework of protection is inadequate in critical respects and fails to achieve substantive equal protection for women. This paper examines existing law and policy governing women’s rights and identifies the underlying causes for its continued failings. It identifies some of the key gaps that render women continually vulnerable to discriminatory treatment. This paper concludes by outlining recommendations for achieving the goals of substantive and transformative equality for women.
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INTRODUCTION

Hong Kong represents a unique society in that it is full of contradictions. It characterizes both modernity and the conservatism of a bygone era. Whilst the former colony has put into place constitutional protections and legislative provisions to guarantee the equal protection of women’s rights, the current state of the law and jurisprudence has left the situation of women precarious and wanting.

Part I provides a very brief historical overview of Hong Kong’s transition from a colony to a Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China. Part II outlines relevant legislative provisions that protect the human rights of women in Hong Kong, underscoring Hong Kong’s international obligations to enact such laws and their constitutional entrenchment under the Hong Kong Basic Law. Part III charts the enactment of relevant anti-discrimination statutes in Hong Kong. It sets out the institutional framework put into place to protect against violations of women’s rights to equality and non-discrimination. In the process, it discusses related jurisprudence emanating from the Hong Kong courts. Part IV discusses other legislation that impacts the rights of women.

In evaluating the effectiveness of this framework, this paper argues that it falls short of international standards in numerous respects and undermines the rights of women. Evidentiary burdens, coupled with impediments in access to justice, renders the institutional protections available less than satisfactory. This results in the withdrawal or non-pursuit of claims by women. As the examples discussed will show, apart from the procedural obstacles to achieving effective enforcement, the courts, whilst progressive in terms of ascertaining the perpetration of discrimination from a substantive understanding of equality, are unduly deferential to the executive and legislative branches, in particular when claims have implications on economic or social rights and policies. The courts’ reluctance to exercise their powers of strict scrutiny where the fundamental right to equality is concerned exacerbates the plight of women and particularly hurts segments of the female population who already suffer from discrimination on multiple grounds. These examples

1. See discussion infra Parts I–II.
2. See discussion infra Part II.
3. See discussion infra Part III.
4. See discussion infra Part IV.
5. See discussion infra Part III.
6. See discussion infra Part III.
7. See discussion infra Part III.D.2.
8. See discussion infra Part III.D.2.
also reveal the underdeveloped nature of arguments relating to equality and intersectional discrimination which are rarely put before the courts. Hence, the jurisprudence on these concepts which are key to addressing invidious and deep-rooted discrimination, trails behind international jurisprudence. These examples include: access to the right abode for Filipina domestic helpers in Hong Kong; the right to health and obstetric services at equal costs for mainland mothers delivering babies in Hong Kong hospitals; and the rights of transgender women to marry a partner of their choosing. The paper concludes with recommendations on how the protection of women’s rights can be enhanced.9 It is imperative for the government to institutionalize gender mainstreaming with a view to enabling effective planning in policy and legal developments to advance the interests of women and protect them against direct and indirect forms of discrimination and other violations of their fundamental human rights. Such reform should be urgently prioritized in light of the actual and hidden costs of inadequate protection of the rights of more than half the population of Hong Kong.10

I. FROM COLONY TO SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGION:
A BRIEF HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Hong Kong’s status as a British colony since the mid-1800s resulted in the application of English common law in Hong Kong, subject to the need for modifications in light of local circumstances, until June 30, 1997.11 Hong Kong also had its own legislature within the first few years of British rule.12 Together, through the application of local legislation, the principles of common law as developed in England (subject to the modification for local circumstances test), and any English statutes that were applicable by the Queen’s Order in Council, this body of rules constituted the laws that would govern Hong Kong in its ninety-nine years as a British colony.13

---

9. See discussion infra Part V.
10. According to the latest available statistics on the population of Hong Kong, as of the middle of 2012, 3,818,100 out of a total population of 7,136,300 people were female. This amounts to 53.5 %. Population—Overview, CENSUS & STATISTICS DEPT: HKSAR, http://www.censtatd.gov.hk/hkstat/sub/so20.jsp (last visited Jan. 18, 2013).
The Sino-British Joint Declaration (the Joint Declaration)\textsuperscript{14} set the terms for the resumption of Chinese sovereignty over Hong Kong.\textsuperscript{15} The treaty provided that Hong Kong was to be constituted a Special Administrative Region (SAR) of the People's Republic of China (China).\textsuperscript{16} Under this arrangement, although under Chinese sovereignty, the Hong Kong SAR was to be granted a high degree of autonomy, and, more importantly, the laws and economic systems previously in force were to be retained, save where their continuation would be inconsistent with Chinese sovereignty, in which case, they were to be adapted where possible or otherwise repealed.\textsuperscript{17} Furthermore, Hong Kong would be governed in accordance with its mini-constitution, the Basic Law of Hong Kong (HKBL), which was promulgated in 1990 and came into effect on July 1, 1997, upon the establishment of the Hong Kong SAR.\textsuperscript{18} In furtherance of the objectives underlined in the Joint Declaration, the HKBL facilitates the continued application of “laws previously in force,”\textsuperscript{19} guarantees judicial independence,\textsuperscript{20} and enables the SAR to enact its own laws, policies, and to develop related jurisprudence in most areas of governance.\textsuperscript{21}

The significance of this arrangement was that it facilitated the smooth transfer of sovereignty to China whilst preserving the social, political, legal, and economic order that had prevailed in the colony for over one hundred years.\textsuperscript{22} This provided much needed confidence in the future of Hong Kong's continued stability as a region under the sovereignty of China.\textsuperscript{23} In the lead-up to the transfer of sovereignty, Hong Kong experienced a growth in its constitutional consciousness. This growth corresponded with the establishment of the city’s first Ombudsman’s office in the late 1980s,\textsuperscript{24} the enactment of the Hong
Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance\textsuperscript{25} (HKBORO) in 1991, and the promulgation of the HKBL, which enshrined Hong Kong’s core international human rights commitments,\textsuperscript{26} followed by the introduction of Hong Kong’s anti-discrimination laws, and the establishment of the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) in 1996,\textsuperscript{27} Hong Kong was well positioned to ensure a smooth transition into the unique constitutional experiment that characterized the one country, two systems arrangement.\textsuperscript{28}

In many respects, Hong Kong’s status as an international financial center and the modernization of the China’s economic system and legal framework, it was hoped, would help guarantee the continuation of the constitutional guarantees and human rights protections put into place in the run-up to the transfer of sovereignty.\textsuperscript{29} Although these provisions have, with some exceptions, survived the change of sovereignty,\textsuperscript{30} an analysis of the legal framework and jurisprudence suggests that these guarantees are very much in their infancy and need to be complemented by a more robust monitoring structure to achieve substantive equality for women.

II. \textbf{INTERNATIONAL LEGAL OBLIGATIONS: HUMAN RIGHTS PROTECTIONS AND THE GUARANTEES OF EQUALITY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION}

Hong Kong is bound by various international treaties, formerly through the obligations of the United Kingdom, as a signatory to the treaties concerned (which were specifically extended to apply to the British Empire’s colonial territories), and presently as a result of the provisions for the continuity of these obligations after the transfer of sovereignty as provided for under the Joint Declaration.\textsuperscript{31} These commitments have resulted in the enactment of various laws in Hong Kong with a view towards fulfilling these international obligations.\textsuperscript{32} Apart from the obligation to enact relevant legislation and develop supportive policy directives, state parties are required to report to the relevant treaty bodies periodically.\textsuperscript{33} As part of the report, countries

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance, (1997) Cap. 383.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Xianggang Jiben FA arts. 25–42 (H.K.).
\item \textsuperscript{27} Race Discrimination Ordinance, (2008) Cap. 602 (H.K.).
\item \textsuperscript{28} Xianggang Jiben FA arts. 1–2, 5 (H.K.).
\item \textsuperscript{29} See Joint Declaration, supra note 11, paras. 1, 3(1)–(2).
\item \textsuperscript{30} See discussion infra Parts IV–V.
\item \textsuperscript{31} See Joint Declaration, supra note 11, paras. 1, 3(1)–(2).
\item \textsuperscript{32} See discussion infra Part III.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Human Rights Treaty Bodies: Monitoring the Core International Human Rights Treaties, OFFICE OF THE U.N. HIGH COMM’R FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, http://www2.ohchr.org
\end{itemize}
are expected to provide an overview of treaty-related developments in their country, highlight problem areas, and identify steps that have been taken to address these gaps. Accordingly, Hong Kong files its reports with the relevant treaty bodies periodically, synchronizing its reports with the China’s reporting cycle since 1997. The treaty bodies’ committees review country reports submitted by the government, but also rely extensively on alternative and shadow reports submitted by non-governmental organizations. These alternative and shadow reports serve as a check against the country report. Upon reviewing all the submissions, the treaty bodies render “Concluding Observations” on the country’s fulfillment of the obligations under that treaty, commending good practices and highlighting areas of concern. The reporting country is expected to report on measures taken in response to the Concluding Observations in the subsequent reporting cycle.

Among the treaties that Hong Kong is bound by, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICERD) are key.

---

37. Shadow reports are those that follow after the non-governmental organization has reviewed the government’s report to the treaty body. Shadow and Alternative Reports, Women’s Resource Centre, 3 (2008) http://www.wrc.org.uk/includes/documents/cm_docs/2011/s/shadow_report_overview_feb_2010.pdf. Alternative reports, on the other hand, are reports that are submitted when governments have not made their reports to the treaty bodies publicly available. Id.
38. High Comm’r for Human Rights, supra note 33.
39. The periodic reports to the treaty body serve an important function to ensure that the government remains committed to the implementation and enforcement of international human rights standards. Id. The increasing trend of submitting alternative and shadow reports by non-governmental and other civil society organizations serves to bolster the independence, transparency, and objectivity of the process. Carole J. Petersen & Harriet Samuels, The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women: A Comparison of its Implementation and the Role of Non-Governmental Organisations in the United Kingdom and Hong Kong, 26 Hastings Int’l & Comp. L. Rev. 1, 24 (2002). Concluding Observations are taken seriously given their status as an international-level report card on the state’s performance. High Comm’r for Human Rights, supra note 33.
(ICESCR) safeguard a range of civil and political rights including the right to life, freedom of religion, speech and assembly, electoral rights, the right to due process of law, economic, social and cultural rights, including labor rights and rights to health, education, and an adequate standard of living. These protections are available to all individuals.41

Pursuant to the ICCPR, all persons are entitled to equal protection under the law without discrimination.43 Articles 2 and 3 guarantee the rights protected under the treaty to all persons without distinction on any basis,44 and Article 3 specifically prohibits gender-based discrimination.45 Article 26 further provides that discrimination on any of the prohibited grounds: race, color, sex, language, religion, political opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status is impermissible and requires legal prohibition of, and equal and effective protection against, such discrimination.46 The ICESCR similarly protects individuals against such discrimination under Articles 2(2) and 3,47 the latter specifically calling for equality between men and women in the protection of economic, social, and cultural rights set out in the ICESCR.48 Between them, these clauses in both treaties serve to emphasize the importance of safeguarding, not only the guarantee of equal protection, but also equal treatment by prohibiting unlawful discrimination and recognizing the invidious impact of discrimination and its primary role in contributing to unequal treatment.49

Hong Kong is also a party to numerous other international treaties that have been adopted with a view to protecting specific groups of people and the rights and interests of people in particular circumstances. For example, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination50 (ICERD), CEDAW,51 the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading

42. ICCPR, supra note 40, arts. 1, 5–11, 13, and 15; ICESCR, supra note 41, arts. 1–3, 6, 9, 12, 14, 16–19, 21–22, and 25.
43. ICCPR, supra note 40, art. 26.
44. Id. arts. 2–3.
45. Id. art. 3.
46. Id. art. 26.
47. ICESCR, supra note 41, arts. 2(2), 3.
48. Id. art. 3.
51. CEDAW, supra note 34.
Treatment or Punishment\textsuperscript{52} (CAT), the Convention on the Rights of the Child\textsuperscript{53} (CRC), the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families\textsuperscript{54} (ICRMW), and more recently, the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance\textsuperscript{55} (CPED) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities\textsuperscript{56} (CRPD). Pursuant to its obligations under these treaties, the Hong Kong government is required to protect individuals and groups at risk through appropriate policies and legislation.\textsuperscript{57}

Despite the existence of these international human rights treaties and parallel national legislation which provides for the equal protection of the human rights of all individuals irrespective of sex,\textsuperscript{58} in practice, women face numerous barriers to the realization of their human rights as a result of discrimination and unequal treatment.\textsuperscript{59} For example, some countries exclude women from participating in the political system (the right to vote or run for public office), access to education, justice, employment, and even prohibit their inheritance of family wealth and assets.\textsuperscript{60} Women may also face circumstantial barriers to full and equal participation in society. For example, violence against women, the lack of adequate access to healthcare or child support, and barriers to certain types of employment or unequal pay for equal work are all factors that negatively impact women’s prospects for their equal enjoyment of rights.\textsuperscript{61} In these circumstances, countries around the world have recognized the need for specific protections that focus on the needs of women as a group and

\textsuperscript{52.} Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, \textit{opened for signature} Dec. 10, 1984, 1465 U.N.T.S. 85.
\textsuperscript{57.} See supra text accompanying notes 50–54.
\textsuperscript{58.} Women’s right to equality is guaranteed under the ICCPR and ICESCR under Article 2 of both treaties, committing states to ensuring the equal right to the enjoyment of all civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, and non-discrimination on grounds of sex, among other things. ICCPR, supra note 40, art. 2. Article 7 of the ICESCR specifically recognizes the right of women workers to be guaranteed conditions of work not inferior to those enjoyed by men, with equal pay for equal work. ICESCR, supra note 41, art. 7.
\textsuperscript{59.} See, e.g., CEDAW, supra note 34, art. 15.
\textsuperscript{61.} James Crabtree, \textit{UN: Barriers to Gender Equality Remain}, Fin. Times (July 6, 2011, 6:52 AM), http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/649bd546-a6f1-11e0-a808-00144feabda0.html #uxzn27y2zhVS1J.
how their rights to non-discrimination and equal protection can be effectively realized.  

Of the various international treaties listed above, most relevant to the protection of the rights of women is the CEDAW, which is one of the most widely ratified international conventions. As the preamble to the CEDAW notes, despite the equal protection rights guaranteed under the ICCPR, the ICESCR, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, “extensive discrimination against women continues to exist” and “violates the principles of equality of rights and respect for human dignity.” The preamble recognizes that discrimination against women impedes the ability of women to participate fully and on equal terms with men in political, social, economic, and cultural life, hampering prosperity of the family and the society as a whole. Furthermore, it emphasizes the need to develop women’s capacities and potential for equal and maximum participation in the service of humanity in order to secure development, welfare, and peace for countries. Finally, it singles out the historical lack of recognition of women’s contribution to the welfare of families and societies and the need for a change in the traditional role of women and men in the family and society in order to facilitate full equality between men and women. The central objective of the CEDAW is: 

the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women on the basis of sex. It guarantees women the equal recognition, enjoyment and exercise of all human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil, domestic or any other field, irrespective of their marital status, and on a basis of equality with men. 

63. As of September 2012, the CEDAW has been ratified by 187 states. See id. Although the CEDAW was ratified by the United Kingdom in 1985, its application was not extended to Hong Kong until 1996. Id. In 1997, upon the transfer of sovereignty, the Chinese government took over the reporting and implementations of CEDAW-related obligations for Hong Kong. LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL SECRETARIAT, supra note 35, para. 3. It also notified the Secretary General of the extension of reservations made by the China to its own obligations under the said treaty, to Hong Kong. U.N. TREATY DATABASE, supra note 62.  
64. CEDAW, supra note 34, pmbl.  
65. Id.  
66. Id.  
67. Id.  
The implementation of the CEDAW by state parties is overseen by the CEDAW Committee, which is established pursuant to Article 17 of the CEDAW Convention.\textsuperscript{70}

However, given that specific individuals and groups have been internationally recognized as being particularly vulnerable and at risk, leading to a proliferation of treaties to protect them, these other treaties are equally significant to address the impact of the circumstances they find themselves in which tend to have a compounded effect on women.\textsuperscript{71} Their situation is exacerbated by the multiple layers of discrimination they experience when inequalities in a range of spheres intersect.\textsuperscript{72} For present purposes however, it is sufficient to note the array of international obligations that are binding on Hong Kong, which make it incumbent on personnel involved in the development of law, policy, and jurisprudence to incorporate international standards into these processes to enhance the quality of protection for women, particularly given the multiple inequalities women experience as a group because women as a gendered group are often implicated in numerous other marginalized “groupings.” The lack of an intersectional approach to tackle multiple fronts of discrimination and inequality severely undercuts the effectiveness of human rights protections for women.

III. THE DOMESTIC IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAWS ON THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN AND THE GUARANTEES OF EQUALITY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

International obligations require the implementation of treaty provisions, usually through the enactment of local legislation. Hong Kong protects a range of human rights through provisions in the HKBL,\textsuperscript{73} the HKBORO,\textsuperscript{74} and various anti-discrimination laws.\textsuperscript{75} Pursuant to these laws, it has become possible to hold government, and in some instances private actors, accountable for a violation of these rights.\textsuperscript{76} However, apart from the inadequacies inherent in some of the implementing legislation, the supporting machinery

\begin{footnotes}
\renewcommand{\thefootnote}{\arabic{footnote}}
\footnote{70. The CEDAW Committee comprises twenty-three experts from a range of countries, the representatives serve the Committee on a rotational basis, serving two-year terms. CEDAW, supra note 34, art. 17(1)–(5).}
\footnote{71. See supra text accompanying notes 50–54.}
\footnote{72. At the Crossroads of Gender and Racial Discrimination, WORLD CONFERENCE AGAINST RACISM, http://www.un.org/WCAR/e-kit/gender.htm (last visited Jan. 18, 2013).}
\footnote{73. Xianggang Jiban Fa arts. 24–42 (H.K.).}
\footnote{74. Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance, (1997) Cap. 383.}
\footnote{76. See, e.g., id. §§ 17–18.}
\end{footnotes}
that enables the legal enforcement of these rights leaves much to be desired. To this end, the reporting obligations force a degree of self-scrutiny and reflection and are most useful in prompting change (given the international nature of any commendation or censure) before the next reporting cycle.\footnote{77. See supra text accompanying notes 35–39.}

\footnote{78. See discussion infra Part III.}

\footnote{79. For a comprehensive overview of the constitutional right to equality, its conceptualization and development through the courts’ jurisprudence, see Kelley Loper, The Right to Equality and Non-Discrimination, in The Law of the Hong Kong Constitution (2011).}

\footnote{80. Xianggang Jiben Fa art. 25 (H.K.).}

\footnote{81. Article 11 of the HKBL prohibits the enactment of any legislation that contravenes the HKBL. Id. art. 11.}

\footnote{82. For an overview of the various labor conventions that are applicable to Hong Kong and their implications on the rights of women in the labor market, see Rick Glofcheski & Ho Yan Leung, Job Security and Entitlements within Hong Kong’s Maternity Protection Legislation, 25 Int’l J. Comp. Lab. L. & Indus. Rel. 327, 329 (2009).}


\footnote{84. Xianggang Jiben Fa art. 39 (H.K.).}

\footnote{85. Id. arts. 25–41.}

The legal framework for the protection of the fundamental rights of equality and non-discrimination in Hong Kong is modeled after international human rights treaties.\footnote{80. Xianggang Jiben Fa art. 25 (H.K.).} Article 25 of the HKBL provides that “[a]ll Hong Kong residents shall be equal before the law,”\footnote{81. Article 11 of the HKBL prohibits the enactment of any legislation that contravenes the HKBL. Id. art. 11.} and any legislation contravening this provision is unlawful.\footnote{81. Article 11 of the HKBL prohibits the enactment of any legislation that contravenes the HKBL. Id. art. 11.} These rights have been further entrenched through Article 39 of the HKBL, which incorporates the provisions of the ICCPR, the ICESCR, as well as international labor conventions\footnote{82. For an overview of the various labor conventions that are applicable to Hong Kong and their implications on the rights of women in the labor market, see Rick Glofcheski & Ho Yan Leung, Job Security and Entitlements within Hong Kong’s Maternity Protection Legislation, 25 Int’l J. Comp. Lab. L. & Indus. Rel. 327, 329 (2009).} that were applicable to Hong Kong prior to 1997, into Hong Kong’s constitutional framework.\footnote{83. HKSAR v. Ng Kung Siu, [1999] 2 H.K.C.F.A.R. 442, 455B (C.F.A.).} Article 39, paragraph 2 provides that these freedoms shall not be restricted unless prescribed by law and that such restrictions are themselves to be in accordance with said international treaties.\footnote{84. Xianggang Jiben Fa art. 39 (H.K.).} The equality and non-discrimination guarantees in these instruments are, therefore, directly co-opted into the constitution to supplement the right to equality under Article 25 of the HKBL, which itself is notably brief, and the numerous human rights protections that are enshrined in the HKBL and other local legislation.\footnote{85. Id. arts. 25–41.} Moreover, any laws that contravene either Article 25 or Article 39 of the HKBL would be deemed unconstitutional and, as a result of the powers of
judicial review and the doctrine of separation of powers, may be struck
down as such by the Hong Kong courts in appropriate circumstances.86

These constitutional and international guarantees are imple-
mented through a range of enactments. The HKBORO, for example,
provides that men and women shall have equal enjoyment of all civil
and political rights set forth in the HKBORO87 and shall enjoy equal
protection before the law.88 It also specifically protects the right to
equality and non-discrimination and replicates the list of prohibited
grounds of discrimination in the ICCPR. The HKBORO binds the
government, all public authorities, and any person acting on behalf
of the government or a public authority.89 Protection against dis-
crimination on grounds of sex is further elaborated in two anti-
discrimination statutes. The Sex Discrimination Ordinance90 (SDO)
enforces that women are not prejudiced against because of their gen-
der in a range of contexts including: employment, the provision of
goods and services, housing, voting, standing for elections, and the
development and implementation of government policy.91 The Family
Status Discrimination Ordinance92 (FSDO) prohibits discrimination
against a person on the grounds that they have responsibilities in-
volving the care of a family member.93 These two statutes apply to
the government and the private sector.94

Given the overlapping but differentiated applicability of this
scheme of provisions that seek to protect women against inequality
and discrimination, the importance of court-related jurispru-
dence in the elaboration of the nature and extent of the right to equality
and its relationship with the principle of non-discrimination cannot
be overstated. Protection against discrimination has been recognized
as an essential counterpart to securing the right to equality.95 The

86. For a detailed overview of the circumstances in which Hong Kong courts may legi-
timately exercise such powers of judicial review, see Puja Kapai, A Principled Approach To-
87. Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance, (1997) Cap. 383, § 3, art. 1 (replicating ICCPR,
supra note 40, art. 2(1), 3).
88. Id. at 8, § 8, art. 22 (replicating ICCPR, supra note 40, art. 26).
89. Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance at 2, § 7.
91. Id.
93. Id. at 1, pmbl.
94. See Sex Discrimination Ordinance at 4, §§ 3, 5; Family Status Discrimination
Ordinance at 3, § 3, 5.
95. For a detailed discussion of the development of equality law and related jurispru-
dence in Hong Kong in the early years of Hong Kong’s anti-discrimination laws, see
Carole J. Petersen, Equality as a Human Right: The Development of Anti-Discrimination
Law in Hong Kong, 34 COLUM. J. TRANSNAT’L L. 335, 334 (1996). See also Discrimination
Law, in EMPLOYMENT LAW AND PRACTICE IN HONG KONG (Rick Glofcheski et al. eds., 2010)
[hereinafter EMPLOYMENT LAW]; Carole J. Petersen, Implementing Equality: An Analysis
next section details some of the salient provisions of the SDO, the FSDO, and discusses the mechanisms that the anti-discrimination laws put into place to deal with violations of these rights.

A. Sex Discrimination Ordinance

The SDO was enacted in 1995 and came into force in 1996. It aims to protect people in Hong Kong against discrimination on the basis of sex, marital status, pregnancy, and against sexual harassment. Sections 4, 7, and 8 of the SDO prohibit both direct and indirect forms of discrimination. Where the cause for the treatment can be attributed directly to one of the prohibited grounds of sex, marital status, or pregnancy, this constitutes direct discrimination. Thus, where a person is treated less favorably than a person of the opposite sex, a different marital status, or a person who is not pregnant, this constitutes direct discrimination. Where a neutral requirement or condition is imposed which has the effect that a person falling within a prohibited category of discrimination would be less likely to be able to meet that condition, that condition cannot be justified regardless of the sex of the party concerned, and its application would have a detrimental impact on a person in the position of the party concerned, it would constitute indirect discrimination.

Moreover, the SDO protects women against sexual harassment in the workplace. “Sexual harassment” covers a range of behaviors including: unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or unwelcome conduct that is sexual in nature and would be perceived


96. EMPLOYMENT LAW, supra note 95, at 305.
97. Id. at 4, §§ 4–5, §§ 7–8.
98. Sex Discrimination Ordinance at 1, pmbl.
99. Petersen, Hong Kong’s First Anti-Discrimination Laws, supra note 95, at 335–36.
100. Id.
101. See id. at 337; see also EMPLOYMENT LAW, supra note 95, at 325.
102. See Petersen, Hong Kong’s First Anti-Discrimination Laws, supra note 95, at 337; see also EMPLOYMENT LAW, supra note 95, at 325.
103. Sex Discrimination Ordinance at 2, § 2. This section is to be read expansively so as to include hostility created in learning environments. See Yuen Sha Sha v. Tse Chi Pan, [1999] 2 H.K.L.R.D. 28, 28P–29A (D.C.). This is one of the first sexual harassment cases brought under the SDO by a female student at the Chinese University of Hong Kong whose roommate’s boyfriend had installed a hidden camcorder in her bedroom aimed to capture images near her dressing area. The liability for sexual harassment was constituted on the basis of invasion of the privacy of the student. As various commentators have noted, however, the decision also represents the difficulties victims of harassment, unequal treatment, and discrimination face in seeking to implement their rights through litigation, which can be a stressful, lengthy, and expensive process. See Petersen, Implementing Equality, supra note 95, at 188.
as such by a reasonable bystander, with regard to all the circumstances, leading her likely to conclude that the person at the receiving end of the behavior would be offended, humiliated, or intimidated.\textsuperscript{104}

The section also provides that a person, either acting alone or together with others, may create a hostile or intimidating working environment for another by engaging in conduct that is sexual in nature.\textsuperscript{105}

Section 9 of the SDO foresees the possibility that victims of sexual harassment or discrimination may face retaliation for lodging a complaint and therefore provides that where a person is victimized as a result of filing a claim under the SDO against a party, that would also constitute discrimination.\textsuperscript{106}

Whilst the SDO sets out the “actionable grounds” with respect to various activities and organizations, some sections specifically exempt certain entities from the application of provisions. For example, sections 21 and 38 exempt the government from actionable unlawful discrimination where the acts done are pursuant to immigration legislation pertaining to entry into, stay in, or departure from Hong Kong.\textsuperscript{107} These exemptions have been the subject of extensive criticism both locally, by non-governmental organizations, and also at the CEDAW Committee level.\textsuperscript{108} This is particularly so given the government’s reliance on the provisions and the relevant CEDAW reservation in defense of the two week rule that is imposed on foreign domestic helpers who are required to leave the territory within two weeks of the termination of their contract.\textsuperscript{109} In these circumstances, many helpers are left vulnerable in the event that they have claims to pursue against employers for outstanding debts, sexual or physical abuse, or if they wish to find another employer to continue working in Hong Kong.\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{104} Sex Discrimination Ordinance at 2, § 2(5)(a).
\textsuperscript{105} Id. at 2, § 2(5)(b).
\textsuperscript{106} Id. at 5–6, § 9.
\textsuperscript{107} Id. at 12, §§ 21(2), and 38(2). This is consistent with a reservation entered by the Chinese Government in a communication on the question of Hong Kong deposited with the Secretary-General, dated June 20, 1997. See Historical Information on CEDAW, U.N. TREATY DATABASE, China note 2, http://treaties.un.org/pages/HistoricalInfo.aspx?#“China” (last visited Jan. 18, 2013).
\textsuperscript{109} Id.
\textsuperscript{110} This is seen as gender-based discrimination due to the invidious impact of this rule on foreign domestic helpers as a group who are predominantly, if not exclusively, women. See Petersen, Equality as a Human Right, supra note 95, at 348. The rule has also been criticized for its role in creating an impediment to due process rights and access to justice given that many women have been forced to abandon their claims as a result of not being allowed to continue working in Hong Kong pending the outcome of these claims as the
More recently, this reservation came into play in the government’s defense of an immigration exception that specifically singles out foreign domestic helpers as being unentitled to counting their period of stay in Hong Kong towards the seven years of continuous residence requirement that is one of the conditions precedent to acquiring permanent resident status and the right of abode in Hong Kong.\textsuperscript{111} The exclusion of their time spent in Hong Kong as domestic helpers towards the calculation of the seven year period singles out this group of women compared to others who have similarly entered Hong Kong on employment but are entitled to count their stay in Hong Kong during this time towards the calculation of their period of continuous residence in Hong Kong.\textsuperscript{112}

Among other exceptions in the SDO, § 22 notably confers an exception to religious bodies where the preference for a person of a particular sex for certain duties is based in religious doctrine.\textsuperscript{113} This comports with the list of reservations made by the PRC Government at the time it lodged its acceptance of CEDAW-related obligations with respect to Hong Kong.\textsuperscript{114}

Also of particular interest is § 35, which secures the equal right of women to be eligible to stand for and vote in elections in any advisory body, defined to include a public body, public authority, a statutory advisory body, a prescribed body,\textsuperscript{115} and for relevant positions, including that of village representative or office-holder of a Rural Committee, as defined in the Heung Yee Kuk Ordinance.\textsuperscript{116} Despite this seemingly progressive stance against the entrenchment of cultural and indigenous practices pertaining to the rights of women, in practice, women do not have equal standing in such elections given the importance of the selection of heads of household, a process which invariably tends to be male-dominated in determining the pool of candidates for selection as village representatives, which, in turn, affects their eligibility to serve as Rural Committee members

\textsuperscript{111} See Submission to the Committee for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), ASIAN MIGRANTS COORDINATING BODY—HONG KONG & MISSION FOR MIGRANT WORKERS, § 1(a) (2009), available at http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/ngos/MFMW_China_75.doc [hereinafter Submission to the CERD].

\textsuperscript{112} See id. § 1(b).

\textsuperscript{113} See Submission to the CERD, supra note 110, at § 1(c).


\textsuperscript{116} U.N. TREATY DATABASE, supra note 62, n.14.

\textsuperscript{117} Sex Discrimination Ordinance at 17, § 35(1).

\textsuperscript{118} Id.
(who are selected from village representatives). Thus, the process of determining heads of households is one which ought to be checked for discrimination, as opposed to the broader level elections. This is particularly important where the designation as head of household carries with it significant legal and political powers. Alternatively, instead of a system in which households elect village representatives (through their head), individuals should be given the right to vote for village representatives.

However, despite the availability of legal protection against sex-based discrimination, women continue to face opposition and intimidation in the exercise of their rights to fully participate in public life in the New Territories. This is despite related exemptions in the SDO, for example, § 61, which provides that nothing in the SDO affects the terms of the New Territories Ordinance (NTO), the New Territories Leases (Extension) Ordinance (NTLEO), or renders unlawful any act done pursuant to those ordinances. Although it used to be the case that women were prohibited from inheriting land...

117. See Petersen, Equality as a Human Right, supra note 95, at 344. Although the case of Sec’y for Justice v. Chan Wah, [2000] 3 H.K.C.F.A.R. 459 (C.F.A.) (H.K.), applied this provision, the factual matrix concerned discrimination against non-indigenous residents in the village as opposed to a gender-based preference that emanated from religious doctrine as the reservation requires. See id. at 459G–61C. Indeed, it can be argued that this is precisely the kind of gender-based discrimination rooted in cultural practices that CEDAW was designed to help get state parties past.

118. Id. at 2.

119. Few Women Take Part in Elections, S. CHINA MORNING POST, Mar. 6, 2011, http://www.scmp.com/article/740029/few-women-take-part-elections (lamenting that only 2.23 percent of candidates in the 2011 village elections were women and a meager 0.79 percent of candidates were women in indigenous representative elections).


122. Sex Discrimination Ordinance, (1997) Cap. 480, § 61(b) (H.K.). A question that arises is whether Article 40 of the HKBL resurrects the exclusive male succession right which was challenged and resulted in the passage of the exemptions in the NTO and the NTLEO. Article 40 preserves the lawful and traditional rights of indigenous inhabitants of the New Territories. XIANGGANG JIBEN FA art. 40 (H.K.). Insofar as it protects the interests of male indigenous inhabitants as a matter of tradition, it is arguable that such rights have been inadvertently “restored” to the extent that these were diminished by the passage of any earlier ordinances. See LISA HOPKINSON & MANDY LAO MAN LEI, CIVIC EXCHANGE, RETHINKING THE SMALL HOUSE POLICY 31 (2003). However, the counter-argument to this position would be that Article 40 only protects the “lawful” rights and to the extent that the rights asserted by male indigenous inhabitants are discriminatory against female indigenous inhabitants, they cannot be lawful rights. See, e.g., CHRISTINE LOH, CIVIC EXCHANGE, INHERITANCE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS WOMEN OF THE NEW TERRITORIES 4–5, 8–9 (2004). However, see Johannes Chan, Rights of the Indigenous Inhabitants of the New Territories, in THE LAW OF THE HONG KONG CONSTITUTION (2011), where he argues that since the protection of such traditional rights entail their exclusivity to male indigenous inhabitants and as such, cannot be attacked on grounds of gender equality to diminish such rights whether by relying on the equality provision. See XIANGGANG JIBEN FA art. 25; Sex Discrimination Ordinance at 26, § 61.
Hong Kong, purportedly as a result of Chinese customary law, this prohibition was lifted in 1994.\textsuperscript{123} Despite this change, however, the Small House Policy extended by the government in 1972, under which it offered free building licenses or government land at a discounted premium to male indigenous inhabitants descended from indigenous male lineage of a recognized village in 1898,\textsuperscript{124} remains firmly intact today despite the discrimination inherent in such a policy insofar as it works to enrich indigenous men so defined as opposed to indigenous women in such clans, and to the extent that it discriminates against non-indigenous peoples.\textsuperscript{125}

Section 13 of the NTO empowers courts to recognize and enforce any Chinese custom or customary right affecting land in the New Territories.\textsuperscript{126} Moreover, the HKBL, through Article 40, has effectively entrenched the rights of male indigenous inhabitants.\textsuperscript{127} This represents a significant and missed opportunity to rectify outdated practices and strike an appropriate balance between the preservation of cultural practices and the need for their reconciliation with modern constitutional principles such as gender equality. The circumstances that might have justified some of these policies in 1898 (after the British invasion) certainly warrant review in an era when property is at a premium in Hong Kong,\textsuperscript{128} and any such discount offered to particular groups on the basis of their lineage and gender should certainly raise grave doubts about the government’s commitment to equality.

These circumstances are unfortunate and underscore the continued influence of the Heung Yee Kuk, originally recognized by the colonial government to represent the interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the New Territories.\textsuperscript{129} It is arguable, however, that their original function has largely been dispensed with and they now remain warlords of power in their individual fiefdoms, eager to hold


\textsuperscript{124.} Merry & Stern, \textit{supra} note 123, at 401.

\textsuperscript{125.} For an elaboration of this policy, see \textit{Director of Audit, Audit Comm’n: HKSAR, Report of Audit Comm’n No. 39 Ch. 8} (2002). It is also pertinent to note the CEDAW Committee’s call that the Hong Kong Government repeal discriminatory provisions of the Small House Policy and ensure that indigenous women have the same rights and access to property as indigenous men. See \textit{Concluding Comments, supra} note 108, para. 38.


\textsuperscript{127.} \textit{Xianggang Jiben Fa} art. 40 (H.K).

\textsuperscript{128.} See Merry & Stern, \textit{supra} note 123, at 401.

on to their privileges in times and circumstances that no longer jus-
tify their position. In fact, the Heung Yee Kuk remains a male-
dominated consultative body, which ought to be democratized in
view of the power the committee wields over the interests of women
and the special privileges they enjoy over those entitled to ordinary
non-indigenous residents. The shifting demographic and social cir-
cumstances in light of the urbanization of the New Territories have
narrowed the gap between those with indigenous lineage, and the
common Chinese population in Hong Kong. However, the contin-
ued protection of the rights of indigenous inhabitants under Article
40 of the HKBL represents an almost insurmountable challenge in
light of its entrenchment of “traditional rights and interests.”
Article 40 of the HKBL provides that “[t]he lawful traditional rights
and interests of the indigenous inhabitants of the ‘New Territories’
shall be protected by the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.”
Arguably, it could be said that the entrenchment of any policies, tra-
ditions, rights, or interests that contravene the equality guarantee is
itself unlawful and thereby not protected by this provision.
However, such a watered-down reading would be perceived as a threat
by the Heung Yee Kuk and would be strongly contested if the Small
House Policy or other discriminatory policies persisting in Hong Kong
were to be challenged in court for their constitutionality.

On the whole, the anti-discrimination legislation in Hong Kong
reflects a fairly formal approach to the concept of equality. A version
of equality that is substantive or transformative such that it would
serve to eliminate the impact of past discrimination and build ca-
pacities to empower prejudiced individuals to militate against past
setbacks remains a distant goal for local advocates of equality.
The SDO does, however, provide that voluntary temporary special

---

130. See Merry & Stern, supra note 123, at 394, 398, 401.
131. See id. at 396.
132. Xianggang Jiben Fa art. 40 (H.K.).
133. Id.
134. For a detailed exposition of this argument, see Chan, supra note 122.
135. For an overview of the rights of indigenous people in Hong Kong, see id.
136. Sandra Fredman has written extensively about the distinction between the for-
mal, substantive, and transformative approaches to equality and the significant and mean-
ingful changes that can be brought about through government commitment to visions of
transformative equality in its framework laws for equal protection and non-discrimination.
See Sandra Fredman, Beyond the Dichotomy of Formal and Substantive Equality: Towards
a New Definition of Equal Rights, in Temporary Special Measures: Accelerating De
137. See Sandile Ngcobo, The Meaning of Article 4(1) of the UN Convention on the
Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women: A South African Perspective,
in Temporary Special Measures: Accelerating De Facto Equality of Women Under
Article 4(1) 181, 202 (Ineke Boerefijn et al. eds., 2003).
measures such as affirmative action policies or other special measures “reasonably intended” to allow equal access to traditionally marginalized groups, are permissible as part of the aims of anti-discrimination law. Unfortunately, this is not a requirement and thus, does not impose any obligations on the government or other relevant institutions to adopt such measures necessary to achieve substantive equality in the representation of women in different spheres, whether in employment, government services, or traditionally male-dominated fields. The lack of “bite” or the negligible educational value of this section is notable in light of the fact that neither the government nor any other industry or institution in Hong Kong has thus far implemented any such measures. This reaffirms the view that the government is generally loathe to upset the business sector by introducing


140. Shockingly, the one instance in which the government has adopted a “special measure” is with respect to advancing the position of boys by computing their results in the Secondary School Placement Allocation system in Hong Kong in a manner that boosts the results of the top 30% of boys in order to equalize their numbers with girls, who were performing better than boys on average. See Equal Opportunity Comm’n v. Dir. of Educ., [2001] 2 H.K.L.R.D. 690, 738F (C.F.I.) (H.K.). Overall, the policy worked to the severe detriment of girls, who, although performing better than the boys, would not be placed in an elite school, the placement to which they would have been entitled, had it not been for the government’s application of this special measure which enabled boys with lower results to secure placement at elite secondary schools. See id. at 713H–14G. This system became the subject of a judicial review application, initiated by the EOC in the Hong Kong courts and eventually, led to the striking down of this practice in view of its discriminatory impact on girls. See id. at 692B, 742H. Surprisingly, despite the government’s general stance against affirmative action of any kind, the government defended the policy as a necessary, temporary measure in order to ensure that girls did not obtain a majority of the places in the highly coveted elite schools. Id. at 711F. The argument was that the measure was necessary to achieve equality between girls and boys and therefore, was permitted by § 48 of the SDO. Id. at 691E. However, this argument failed due to the fact that temporary measures are supposed to be temporary, and the policy had been (secretly) in place for almost twenty years. See id. at 732A. See also Andrew Byrnes, The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, in The UNITED NATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL (P. Alston ed., 2nd ed., 1999) (arguing that the court could have rejected the special measures defense on grounds that it was designed to advance the interests of women in order to address historical discriminatory practices against them as a group, and as such the provision could not be used to safeguard the interests of men).
law or policy that would interfere with the free market or laissez-faire approach.  

A further area of concern is the lack of appropriate recourse for sexual minorities such as members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community who often face discrimination on the grounds of their sexual orientation and gender identity. There have been some successful challenges brought before the courts drawing on equality and non-discrimination provisions in the HKBL and HKBORO on grounds of sexual orientation discrimination, however. These cases were successful and led to the repeal of legislation that was discriminatory given its detrimental impact against the group concerned. A successful claim against a private actor has yet to be made to determine whether discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation can be covered by the term “sex” in the SDO. However, 

141. See Petersen, supra note 139, at 418 (noting that the government’s resistance to quotas or affirmative action is premised on the conflict between such measures and the ideals of a free market economy and a meritocratic system).

142. Despite the lack of an explicit category prohibiting discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, the claimants were able to successfully argue that the phrase “sex” or “other status” reasonably covered discrimination against persons of different sexual orientation as a group. See Sec’y for Justice v. Yau Yuk Lung, [2007] 10 H.K.C.F.A.R. 335, 346 (C.F.A.) (H.K.). The argument has yet to be tested for its applicability to persons alleging discriminatory treatment on the basis of gender identity. See, e.g., Robyn Emerton, Time for Change: A Call for the Legal Recognition of Transsexual and Other Transgender Persons in Hong Kong, 34 H.K.L.J. 515, 519 (2004). At present, a transgender person would need to establish that they suffer from gender identity disorder, which would bring them within the prohibited ground of discrimination based on “mental disorder” and therefore, that they had been unlawfully discriminated against under the Disability Discrimination Ordinance. Id. at 542–43 (citing Disability Discrimination Ordinance, (1997) Cap. 487, § 2 (H.K.)). However, it should be noted that the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ECOSOC), has defined “sex” to include “physiological characteristics” and “the social construction of gender stereotypes, prejudices and expected roles.” See Comm. on Econ., Soc., and Cultural Rights, General Comment No. 20: Non-discrimination in Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, May 4–May 22, 2009, para. 20, ESCOR, U.N. Doc. E/C12/GV/20, 42nd Sess. (July 2, 2009) [hereinafter ECOSOC]. The category “other status” has likewise been recognized to include “sexual orientation” for the purposes of Article 22 of the HKBORO by the Court of Final Appeal in Sec’y for Justice v. Yau Yuk Lung, [2007] 10 H.K.C.F.A.R. 335, 346D (C.F.A.) (H.K.). This category has been broadly construed to include multiple discrimination, age, marital and family status and sexual orientation and gender identity, among other things. See ECOSOC, supra note 142, 174, para. 27. The Human Rights Committee (which oversees state implementation of the ICCPR) and ECOSOC have also repeated calls for Hong Kong to implement relevant anti-discrimination law to guard against sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination.

143. See Leung v. Sec’y for Justice, [2006] 4 H.K.L.R.D. 211, 239C–40H (C.A.) (H.K.) (setting the age of consent at 16 for both heterosexual and homosexual intercourse, deeming all government-sponsored discrimination based on sexual orientation to be unconstitutional, interpreting Articles 1 and 22 of the HKBORO to include sexual orientation).

144. On Hong Kong’s public movement towards the development of protections for the LGBT community and its brush with faces of extreme conservatism within the community in the context of domestic violence protection for lesbian and gay couples, see Puja Kapai, The Same Difference: Protecting Same-Sex Couples Under the Domestic Violence Act,
in light of the successes of the constitutional challenges raising similar arguments concerning the breadth of this category at appellate level courts, it is only a matter of time before the right case presents itself before the courts for an explicit determination of this issue.

B. Family Status Discrimination Ordinance

The Family Status Discrimination Ordinance145 (FSDO) is another important statute enacted in 1997 in recognition of the discrimination that people, predominantly women146 who are responsible for the care of immediate family members, routinely face, and to prohibit discrimination on the basis of “family status.”147 This prohibition covers direct and indirect forms of discrimination148 against persons with family status and recognizes a range of family relationships.149 Like the SDO, there is a provision to protect victims against retaliation for filing a complaint or taking legal action.150 However, the jurisprudence relating to the FSDO is underdeveloped insofar as the full ambit of the protections are concerned, particularly in instances where a suitable comparator is required, in order to arrive at a determination of the grounds for discrimination.151

C. Race Discrimination Ordinance

The Race Discrimination Ordinance152 (RDO) was enacted in July 2008 and came into force in July 2009.153 The RDO makes it


146. A recent survey on public attitudes towards gender issues revealed that almost 80% of the respondents cited gender-based prejudice regarding the roles and abilities of women, their responsibilities for taking care of children, and the prevalence of sex discrimination and gender inequality in society as the three primary reasons that women in Hong Kong fail to realize their full potential. See LABOUR AND WELFARE BUREAU: HKSAR, WOMEN’S COMMISSION: FINDINGS OF SURVEY ON COMMUNITY PERCEPTION ON GENDER ISSUES 5 (2009), available at http://www.lwb.gov.hk/eng/press/resulte.pdf.
148. Id. at 3, § 5.
149. Id.
150. Id. at 3–4, § 6.
151. See Johannes Chan, Comparators in Marital Status Discrimination: General or Specific, 40 H.K.L.J. 563, 563 (2010).
153. The circumstances surrounding the passage of the RDO are unprecedented considering the heavily politicized discourse surrounding the need for such legislation in Hong Kong, societal attitudes towards the problematization of racial discrimination, and the heavily contested nature of the scope and content of the law. Sunny Chiang, Will the Race Discrimination Ordinance Eliminate Race Discrimination in Hong Kong?, LEXISNEXIS,
unlawful to discriminate, harass, or vilify a person on the ground of race.\footnote{Race Discrimination Ordinance at 1, pmbl.} “Race” is defined as a person’s race, color, descent, or national or ethnic origin.\footnote{Id. at 4–5, § 8(1)(a).} The ordinance covers not only acts of discrimination that are motivated by the victim’s race, but also acts based on the race of a near relative of the victim.\footnote{Id. at 4, § 5.} As with the other anti-discrimination legislation in Hong Kong, direct and indirect discrimination are covered by the RDO.\footnote{Id. at 3–4, § 4.} Significantly, the RDO also renders unlawful conduct constituting victimization on the grounds of a complaint being lodged by the victim\footnote{Id. at 4, § 6.} or harassment based on the victim’s or a close relative’s race.\footnote{Id. at 4, § 7.} Harassment as defined includes unwelcome words or conduct which would cause a reasonable person in the circumstances to feel offense, humiliation, or intimidation.\footnote{See Race Discrimination Ordinance, (2008) Cap. 602, 4, § 7 (H.K.).} Likewise, conduct or words that create an intimidating or hostile work environment for the victim will constitute racial discrimination and even a single incident would suffice if the elements of the offence are met.\footnote{See Race Discrimination Ordinance and I, EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES COMM’N, http://www.loc.gov/lc/usgovinfo/census/2010census/index.html (last visited Jan. 18, 2013).}

Section 45 replicates a provision in the Disability Discrimination Ordinance,\footnote{Disability Discrimination Ordinance, (1997) Cap. 487 (H.K.).} prohibiting any act designed to incite hatred towards,
serious contempt for, or severe ridicule of, a person or group of persons in public based on race.\textsuperscript{163} Section 46 further provides that where the incitement is accompanied by threat of physical harm, it will constitute serious vilification and may attract a fine of up to HK$100,000 and imprisonment for up to two years.\textsuperscript{164} These provisions set out the legal framework and provisions that guarantee protection against a range of discriminatory acts.

D. Machinery for the Implementation of Anti-Discrimination Laws in Hong Kong

This section considers the effectiveness of the legal framework by evaluating the availability of channels for redress under the said anti-discrimination laws and constitutional provisions on equality and non-discrimination. In doing so, it reviews the work of the EOC and the impact of the local courts on the development and protection of the rights and interests of victims of discrimination.

1. The Equal Opportunities Commission

Section 66 of the SDO constituted the EOC, which has been tasked with the oversight and the enforcement of the anti-discrimination laws in Hong Kong.\textsuperscript{165} It has the power to investigate and conciliate discrimination claims brought under the four ordinances and indeed, has the statutory duty to attempt conciliation prior to exercising its power to provide legal assistance to a party to bring a claim in the courts when conciliation has failed.\textsuperscript{166} This raises...
concerns about whether this invariably places an obstacle to a woman’s right to bring a suit at law without such prior obligation to attempt conciliation.\textsuperscript{167}

Whilst the fact that there is a statutory body that is tasked with the investigation and regulation of such complaints pertaining to discrimination is significant, empirical research and scholarship on the work of the EOC since its inception has revealed various problems and limitations, many of which are inherent in the statutory set-up of the body, its restricted mandate, and most crucially, its lack of independence.\textsuperscript{168} Taking the latter issues first, the EOC has been criticized for its lack of institutional independence because the Chief Executive of the HKSAR (the highest ranking official in the administration, accountable only to the National People’s Congress of China) appoints all its members, including the chairperson.\textsuperscript{169} Apart from the first chairperson, Miss Anna Wu, who was instrumental in tabling Hong Kong’s first, expansive anti-discrimination bill in the Legislative Council in the early 1990s,\textsuperscript{170} the subsequent appointments have been fairly conservative and are usually drawn

or in-house counsel who can prove intimidating to the layperson in a process which was designed to preserve an equality of arms by keeping the complaint outside of the courtroom. See Petersen, supra note 139, at 401, 423. Similar issues have been encountered in other jurisdictions. See, e.g., Anna Chapman, Discrimination Complaint-Handling in New South Wales: The Paradox of Informal Dispute Resolution, 22 SYDNEY L. REV. 321, 347 (2000).

\textsuperscript{167.} See Petersen, supra note 139, at 401, 423. Although it is arguable that the requirement to conciliate prior to receiving the EOC’s assistance is a condition precedent only if a party relies on the EOC to bring a lawsuit, where a party does not have the means and the EOC or legal aid are the only avenues that make the prospect of bringing the perpetrator to account possible, such a requirement can be an obstacle to the substantive right to litigate. \textit{Id.} However, with recent civil justice reform trends, it is likewise arguable that such a course of action is an important means to streamline cases brought to court. The issue, however, is particularly sensitive in cases concerning discrimination and warrants further study given the impact of a failed (or successful) conciliation attempt on the victim and their resolve to pursue the claim through courts. \textit{Id.} at 428. The pressure of encountering the perpetrator during the conciliation process and the prospect of protracted litigation can cause many claimants to relive the trauma of humiliation. See, e.g., UN Women, supra note 60, at 96 (illustrating that appearing before truth seeking bodies has been shown to bring about such results among victims of sexual violence). In Hong Kong, the issue is further exacerbated by the victim’s lack of legal representation or support when compared to the likelihood that the respondent is likely to be well-armed with advisors and legal experts in tow. See David Luban, \textit{The Right to Legal Services, in A READER ON RESOURCING CIVIL JUSTICE} (Paterson & Goriely eds., 1996) (demonstrating the crucial link between the right to legal representation and the right of access to justice and equality before the law); \textit{see also} P.B. & Ors. v. Dir. of Immigration, [2009] 1 H.K.C. 133, 162 (C.F.I.) (H.K.) (affirming the fundamental link between the three rights).


\textsuperscript{170.} This measure was tabled before the government decided to introduce its own anti-discrimination laws one by one.
from people formerly in the service of the government.\footnote{171} This has grossly undermined the public's confidence in the EOC's ability and willingness to take issue with equality claims involving the government.\footnote{172} From the lack of procedural transparency concerning the appointment of its members, to its funding being tied to the government's purse, the structural set-up bodes ill for anybody tasked with a mandate as important as this one.\footnote{173} Invariably, the EOC's accountability to the government rather than the public has also been extensively criticized as interfering with the EOC's institutional mandate: its capacity for handling discrimination-related complaints against the government. Most importantly, this framework violates the Paris Principles,\footnote{174} which require that such a body be plural and independent in its representation.\footnote{175} The Paris Principles call particularly for adequate funding and financial independence so that the control of the purse is not used as a means to influence the work of such an institution.\footnote{176} The lack of independence crucially impacts the ability of the institution to carry out its mandate effectively and in a manner that wins the public's confidence, particularly in terms of its willingness to pursue discrimination claims against the government and its policies.\footnote{177}

Separately, the effectiveness of the enforcement machinery has emerged as less than satisfactory from the claimants' perspective. In one of the most comprehensive studies of the operation of the EOC's legal enforcement framework for gender-related complaints to date, Petersen, Fong, and Rush found that the process entrenched a sense of powerlessness in the complainants given the lack of assistance provided to them as part of the EOC's policy to remain “neutral" in

\footnote{171. Kapai, supra note 168, at 355.}
\footnote{172. Id. at 338.}
\footnote{173. See, e.g., id. at 355.}
\footnote{175. Paris Principles, supra note 174, at 5, para. 2.}
\footnote{176. Id.}
\footnote{177. Although, the EOC has succeeded in securing some measure of public confidence given its openness and success in pursuing claims against the government in the field of sex and disability discrimination.}
the investigation process.\footnote{178} This was unsatisfactory for claimants who found the prospect that they had to face the perpetrator (especially in sexual harassment claims) particularly intimidating, daunting, and unhelpful insofar as the process itself failed to yield any conclusive “finding” or “judgment” pertaining to the respondent’s conduct after the investigation process is complete.\footnote{179} Petersen and her team conducted an in-depth study of 188 SDO and FSDO complaints filed with the EOC.\footnote{180} Of these, the majority pertained to pregnancy-related and sexual harassment claims in the employment context.\footnote{181} Of this sample, 45% of the claims were discontinued and only a small number (28 out of 188) were discontinued on the basis that they did not pertain to conduct rendered unlawful under the ordinance or were frivolous or lacking in substance.\footnote{182} Although there was no direct information available from the study as to the specific reasons for the withdrawal of the remainder of the complaints, interviews and focus groups revealed that fatigue and an imbalance between the time invested and the prospects for a worthy outcome are typical reasons.\footnote{183} The EOC instigated a trial program for “early conciliation” in which parties were invited to reconcile before the investigation process was completed by the EOC, and it found that in the majority of cases, parties were more likely to reach an early conciliation for similar reasons.\footnote{184} Claimants who were unsuccessful in conciliation would be invited to apply for legal assistance with the EOC or alternatively, litigate in courts if they could afford to do so without assistance.\footnote{185} Those who were unable to do either of these would abandon their complaint.\footnote{186} The EOC’s record of assistance, however, is shockingly low at less than 4% of the complaints received.\footnote{187}

The study’s findings reveal that 42% of this sample successfully attempted conciliation.\footnote{188} Whilst this appears to be a comparatively

\footnote{178. This view, taken by EOC officers, as reported in the study is disappointing and, as the authors suggest, reveals a limited and purely formal approach to equality. See Petersen, supra note 139, at 427–28.}
\footnote{179. Id. at 428.}
\footnote{180. Id. at 424.}
\footnote{181. CAROLE J. PETERSEN ET AL., ENFORCING EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES: INVESTIGATION AND CONCILIATION OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS IN HONG KONG (2003).}
\footnote{182. See Petersen, supra note 139, at 424.}
\footnote{183. Id. at 425.}
\footnote{184. Id.}
\footnote{185. Id.}
\footnote{186. PETERSEN ET AL., supra note 181.}
\footnote{187. See Petersen, supra note 153, at 474–75.}
\footnote{188. PETERSEN ET AL., supra note 181.}
favorable rate in terms of the reported rates for other countries, \(^{189}\) it is unsurprising given the obligatory requirement to attempt such conciliation under the SDO.\(^{190}\) Similarly, the 80% success rate of conciliation is likewise unsurprising given the rate of complaint withdrawal and the reported fatigue and desire to come to early conciliation where possible.\(^{191}\) Thus, these figures are not necessarily indicative of the “effectiveness” of the enforcement mechanism, but rather reveal the inherent burdens and limitations of this model for the enforcement of such claims, particularly considering the unequal bargaining positions of the likely victims and respondents in such cases.\(^{192}\) At best, the process yields an unworthy compromise for those willing to see their complaints through to the end, a result fueled by the respondent’s knowledge of the difficulties of the victim’s financial or other situation.\(^{185}\) Respondents, often well-armed and advised, tend to capitalize on the pressures of the process to get the best possible outcome from their point of view.\(^{194}\) There are various points during the process when the respondent wields full power to negotiate other terms and thus, there is nothing to lose by continuously proposing unreasonable offers for the victim to reject or accept. This is true even once litigation has commenced in court. As such, the respondent remains stronger in the current model.\(^{195}\)

Furthermore, as Petersen’s study reveals, victimization is rampant in its express and subtle forms.\(^{196}\) Although the statutes contain important provisions against victimization in order to ensure that victims are not precluded from pursuing their lawful rights and remedies by the discriminating party’s power, might or determination to coerce them through financial or other means to silence or persuade them to drop their claims, it is inevitable that in the face of the tactics used by and the relative power of the respondent, the victim will be driven towards withdrawal of the claim in many instances.\(^{197}\)

Finally, even where conciliation is successful, the “remedy” obtained is usually incommensurate to the energy, time, and personal struggle involved in pursuing the respondents. In many respects, it
could be argued that these failings send out an unfortunate message about the seriousness of the conduct involved, the impact of such conduct on victims, and the relative importance of pursuing such claims to achieve justice in our society. At the most basic level, it sends the signal that these types of incidents are not as serious as other violations of the law, or alternatively, that the treatment of particular groups of people in society on account of their differences, is somehow acceptable or not worth putting up as much of a fight for. That women fall into this category, along with other groups who are routinely marginalized in free-market societies, is a reflection of the attitude of the Hong Kong government and the level of its commitment toward eradicating serious harms to the integrity, dignity, and respect of marginalized groups. That women, as a group, comprising almost half the population of Hong Kong, can continue to be so marginalized speaks volumes about the extent of the government’s commitment to eradicate gender inequality and implement effective substantive equal protection for all.

In light of the current enforcement model, the Hong Kong Human Rights Monitor has proposed, together with the EOC, that an Equal Opportunities Tribunal be set up in order to facilitate a more effective enforcement mechanism for such claims.\textsuperscript{198} Despite this, however, the initial response in some quarters has simply been to offer to further streamline the litigation process when these claims get to the district courts.\textsuperscript{199} However, such a system would still be expensive and procedurally complex in terms of accessibility compared to an Equal Opportunities Tribunal.\textsuperscript{200} However, whether and the extent to which these suggestions result in reform of the process and avenues for pursuing discrimination-based claims remains to be seen.

2. The Courts of the HKSAR

As discussed earlier, the courts remain open to adjudicating claims filed by litigants with their own means or those who appear before them with the assistance of the EOC.\textsuperscript{201} However, due to the
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exorbitant costs of litigation and the statutorily mandated conciliation attempt which unduly lengthens the process, only a limited number of claims have made it to the courts. Hong Kong courts use international standards and jurisprudence and have generally been receptive to arguments pertaining to the application of substantive standards of equality in reviewing objectionable government policy where claims have been brought. The courts have also held that intent to discriminate is irrelevant to the finding of unlawful discrimination. As such, where direct or indirect discrimination is found as a matter of fact based on the circumstances, that would be sufficient. Indirect discrimination is defined as the imposition of a condition or requirement that, although equally applicable to all, results in a disproportionate and negative impact on a person falling within a particular class. Where the court finds differential treatment based on prohibited grounds, the burden shifts to the party accused of such conduct to show that the distinctive treatment was justified because it pursued a legitimate aim that was connected to a rational objective and that the means used were proportionate to the ends. Where this justification is demonstrated, there is no finding of discrimination. Indeed, this is how the “special measures” clause in the context of anti-discrimination legislation is seen as an imperative of the obligation to achieve equality, as opposed to an “exception” to the equality principle.

Inevitably, given the recent realization of the more comprehensive implications of the concept of equality and its implementation,
there is an internationally recognized sentiment that a more complex approach to equality is required. Although the tests of direct and indirect discrimination have worked relatively well in simpler instances of discrimination—where a substantial body of case law has been developed internationally and locally—arriving at a more just outcome has proven difficult in some instances. This difficulty has been most pronounced in the application of the “but for” test in determining the existence of direct discrimination. This test requires an assessment of whether another person similarly situated as the claimant would have been treated in the same manner but for the particular trait on which discriminatory treatment is alleged.

The difficulty of identifying a suitable hypothetical “comparator” against which to test the discriminatory nature of the policy complained of has been lamented, particularly where pregnancy-related claims are concerned. More recently, the problem was encountered in the context of marital status discrimination, where an employer dismissed a woman on the basis of her husband’s dismissal by the same employer. The claimant argued that this amounted to discrimination contrary to the FSDO. It proved difficult to establish whether there was discrimination on grounds of marital status since no comparator seemed suitable given that a single person would not have been so dismissed and neither would any other married person, except if they were married to this particular claimant’s husband. Thus, the differential treatment was based on her specific marital status with respect to a particular individual. It was not of a general nature wherein other similarly situated married persons could be compared. Unfortunately, in the case concerned, these aspects could not be sufficiently distinguished for the purposes of the application of the comparator test. Fortunately, the Hong Kong court
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applied a broad interpretation of the concept of “marital status” or “family status” and embarked on an inquiry of the circumstances surrounding the discriminatory act as opposed to limiting itself to the “mechanical” realm of the “but for” analysis. This broader inquiry in the attempt to elucidate whether there was differential treatment on the basis of a prohibited ground is to be much welcomed. It is hoped that the courts will continue to recognize the need for adopting broader investigative and interpretive approaches in tackling difficult questions of this nature as they arise in the context of anti-discrimination law. Achieving substantive equal protection is necessarily a complex exercise which requires different approaches for different people and groups for a number of reasons.

Because the Hong Kong government has not as yet implemented gender mainstreaming across the board in its development of law and policy, there has been no opportunity to see the special measures provision in action. There was, however, one opportunity in which Hong Kong courts considered its application in light of the government’s attempted use of the provision to justify a policy which involved scaling the results of boys seeking entry into secondary schools in order to place them in elite schools, to the detriment of girls who had performed better. Although the court arrived at the right decision, its approach in construing the relevant policy in terms of its nature has been described as somewhat formalistic. The court failed to comment on the broader, invidious implications of this policy in light of the relative position of girls and women in society when compared to boys and men and the original purpose of the special measures clause, which is underscored by the recognition that the group protected under the ordinance belongs to a class that has suffered discrimination as a matter of historic practice. As such, the use of the special measures provision to advance the interests of boys as a group was contrary to the purpose of the said provision.

Although the courts have been fairly open in recognizing different forms of discrimination and have not held back from holding parties accountable, including where the government is the respondent in the proceedings, there is some hesitation in extending the
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application of these principles to some areas of policy, for example, economic policies and social welfare rights. In the consideration of such cases, the Court of First Instance has, for example, categorized the prohibited grounds into two distinctive categories, one entailing traits such as race, caste, noble birth, membership in a political party, gender, and the other including grounds such as ability, education, wealth, and occupation. In applying this dictum, Cheung J in *Kong Yun Ming* relegated the second category of traits to one where differential treatment based on one of these grounds could be justified by a less onerous test of justification when compared to the more rigorous justification test that would apply if the discriminatory behavior was based on grounds falling within the first category. The grounds in the first category are traits that one might arguably construe as “innate” or “immutable,” and in the words of Cheung J:

> matters that go to the very make up or identity of the person in question as an individual; something that is basic, essential or
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This bifurcation of discrimination grounds and the differential levels of scrutiny they are subjected to based on an elusive concept such as the “centrality” of the trait to the person concerned is problematic. Discrimination on grounds falling in the second category may well affect a person’s ability and right to live a meaningful life of equal dignity. Furthermore, the varying level of scrutiny applied on these terms is likely to have a disproportionate and negative impact on women, which is not only unfortunate but critical to note in view of the tendency of economic and social policies to work against the interests of women as a group in many instances. Four recent cases that have come before the Hong Kong courts attest to the disproportionate impact of such policies on women.

For example, relying on the right to social welfare and equality under the HKBL and HKBORO, a Mainland Chinese woman married to a Hong Kong resident whose husband died shortly after she came to Hong Kong sought to challenge the seven-year residency requirement before she could qualify as a recipient of Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA). The court accepted the government’s justification that there were economic reasons for this policy in light of the limited availability of resources and that, as matters of policy, issues concerning the allocation of such resources necessarily
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need to be treated with a view to their long-term sustainability. 236 The court held that “[c]onstitutionally and institutionally, the courts are not well-placed and equipped to deal with or adjudicate [such questions concerning the social welfare system].” 237 At the same time, however, the court acknowledged that the policy could be challenged for its “infring[ement of] other constitutionally-guaranteed rights under the Basic Law or the Hong Kong Bill of Rights” including any “unequal treatment amongst residents of the [SAR] that cannot be justified, in other words discrimination.” 238 This decision has critical implications for a number of women, particularly immigrant women, whose marital, economic, or other status might change for the worse if they are not able to find work or have children to fend for. The seven-year waiting period before women in such situations can obtain social security in light of the sudden change in circumstances is discriminatory, not only on grounds of sex, but also immigration status and potentially race or nationality. 239 Because immigrant women may experience exclusion from the employment market for a certain period of time (in the eventuality of divorce, separation, or death of a spouse or partner), their impoverishment as a result of this policy needs to be critically understood and specifically addressed.

Similarly, the court in *Yao Man Fai George v. Director of Social Welfare* 240 held that a similar requirement that the applicant of CSSA be a resident in Hong Kong for a continuous period of one year immediately preceding the date of her/his application for the allowance was valid on the basis that, in areas involving social or economic policy, the court would defer to the relevant arm of the government charged with governance in that field, except in cases in which there was an inherently suspect ground of discrimination involved. 241 It further affirmed the differential level of scrutiny that applied in examining justifications for such policies. 242 Although this case was brought by a man, it is important to recognize the reality that the provision has important implications for a number of women from Mainland China who may travel back and forth on two-way permits pending the determination of their permanent residence status or alternatively, 243 to spend extended periods of time across the border to look after children waiting to be reunited with their families in Hong Kong.
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Likewise, in *Raza v. Chief Executive-in-Council*, an applicant challenged the government’s imposition of a HK$400 levy on employers of foreign domestic helpers and its reduction of the stipulated minimum wage for foreign domestic helpers by the same amount. It was argued that the policy amounted to a form of “disguised taxation” levied on foreign domestic helpers and was discriminatory in that it did not apply similarly to other foreign workers. The court ruled in favor of the government on the grounds that the importation of foreign labor into Hong Kong was a policy area which the government was better placed to consider in light of social needs and thus, the government ought to be given a wide realm of discretion within which to formulate such policy. This ruling also overlooks the disproportionate and negative impact of the policy on women as a group because most foreign domestic helpers tend to be women and in the context of Hong Kong, they tend to be women belonging to particular ethnic or national identity groups. This places minority ethnic women at a protracted risk of multiple discriminatory treatment in a range of spheres.

Finally, in *Fok Chun Wa v. Hospital Authority*, a Chinese woman from the Mainland married to a Hong Kong permanent resident and awaiting her one-way permit to join him, delivered her baby in Hong Kong whilst on a two-way permit. The hospital categorized her as falling into the group of “Non-Eligible Persons” for the purposes of determining the obstetric costs associated with her delivery. This resulted in her having to pay significantly higher costs compared to other residents. She challenged the policy in court on the ground that her circumstances were different from Non-Eligible Persons because unlike them, she had a direct family connection in Hong Kong which should allow her to be classified as an Eligible Person. However, in line with the courts’ approach in earlier cases and the categorization of the discriminatory treatment as falling in the “second category” of the grounds enumerated in *R (Carson) v. Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*, the court held that this was a matter
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of “broad social policy” to be deferred to the government. It is interesting that the judgment of the Court of First Instance in the case notes that of all babies born to Non-Eligible Persons, 75% of them were born to Hong Kong permanent resident fathers. Thus, the question of whether the distinction between children born to a permanent resident woman and children born to a non-permanent resident whose partner is a Hong Kong permanent resident is justifiable on grounds of economic and social policy needs to be critically assessed. It is also important to closely review the situation with regards to married and unmarried women and their treatment. It would constitute unjustifiable marital status discrimination if women who were married were to be treated more favorably under a revised policy as opposed to unmarried mothers in using marriage to verify the degree of “permanence” of such family connection if this is seen as a ground based on which the differential treatment between the two groups of women can no longer be justified.

In light of recent jurisprudence that has highlighted the major policy gaps that detrimentally impact the fundamental rights of women, it is imperative that the courts apply greater scrutiny to policies, at least with a view toward signaling to the relevant government departments that there is a higher threshold they will be held to account for in light of the negative and disproportionate impact of many of these policies on women as a group. In this vein, it would also be desirable for the courts to evaluate the basis for the bifurcated grounds of discrimination and to reassess whether different levels of scrutiny applied to economic or social policies, as opposed to discrimination based on immutable traits, can be justified.

Indeed, the government’s failure to effectively implement gender mainstreaming at various levels renders it even more important for the courts to scrutinize law and policy in all areas closely with a view toward performing its primary function as a check on the exercise of power by the other government branches and to ensure that fundamental rights are fully protected. More importantly, the role of Hong Kong courts has become increasingly significant given its unique position as a guardian of minority interests in a political framework crippled by a lack of democratic progress and the consequent under-representation of such groups in law and policy-making processes. In these circumstances, if courts fail claimants in cases
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similar to those brought in recent years, these victims of systemic and structural discrimination will continue to be marginalized. The strained relationship between the people and the executive government has put Hong Kong courts at the forefront of rights-related developments. Without the courts stepping up to their role as the only guardian with the power to effectively protect against excesses of the majority and the government, there is little prospect that minorities will ever extricate themselves from the cycle of disadvantage.

Of further significance is the need to recognize that certain groups of women face intersectional discrimination. This means that they face discrimination on multiple fronts because they fall within two or more categories of persons who are routinely discriminated against. Women who are immigrants, racial or ethnic minorities, suffer from a disability, are unemployed or single parents, for example, are not only discriminated against on the basis of their sex, but the impact of discrimination on grounds of sex is often compounded by their membership in another marginalized community. The cases above aptly illustrate this concept of intersectional discrimination. Consider, for example, that the unequal treatment of the non-permanent resident mother in *Fok Chun Wa* was extended to her on the basis of her immigration status and (invariably) her sex because men do not need obstetric services. Likewise, the foreign domestic helpers in *Raza* and *Vallejos* faced unequal treatment on grounds of their immigration status, economic class, occupation, and indirectly, their sex, given that most domestic helpers tend to be women. Moreover, it is likely that the policy discriminates against individuals on grounds of race or nationality because domestic helpers in Hong Kong come from particular countries within the region.

However, the courts did not consider any of these cases as instances of multiple discrimination. Nor did the courts seek to deconstruct the impact of such complex and layered discrimination.
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on particular groups of women. Indeed, this would have been open to the courts, not only on the basis of the existing anti-discrimination statutes but also on the basis of provisions in the HKBL and HKBORO. Intersectional discrimination may be considered as falling within the meaning of the phrase “other status.” Indeed, ECOSOC notes that “[s]ome individuals or groups of individuals face discrimination on more than one of the prohibited grounds, for example women belonging to an ethnic or religious minority. Such cumulative discrimination has a unique and specific impact on individuals and merits particular consideration and remedying.” The lack of a substantive approach to applying anti-discrimination law and equality-related constitutional provisions grossly undermines the potential of women to extricate themselves from their disadvantaged position in society and to compete on equal terms with others.

IV. OTHER PROVISIONS PROTECTING THE INTERESTS OF WOMEN

There are numerous other laws in Hong Kong that protect the interests of women. For example, the Domestic Violence Ordinance (DVO) seeks to protect individuals against violence in intimate or family contexts; the Crimes Ordinance (CO) and the Offenses Against Persons Ordinance (OAPA) criminalize violent and harmful behavior such as rape, sexual assault, physical assault, grievous bodily harm, murder, and other behavior causing injury and death and are also used alongside DVO provisions where the acts concerned meet the standards required for criminal liability to attach; and the Matrimonial Causes Ordinance (MCO), to name but a few.

Although most of these are general in nature in that they apply regardless of the gender of the victim seeking relief under the said
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ordinances, it is recognized that some of the provisions are more likely to impact the rights and circumstances of women. However, these laws have had to be reconsidered in light of changing circumstances, culture, and calls for reforms that have recently been met in some respects.

For example, while the reported rate of violence against women in Hong Kong is lower than that in other countries, eleven out of every 100 women experience physical violence during their lifetime, with six out of every 100 women experiencing physical violence at the hands of their husband or partner during their lifetime. The number of reported instances of battering between spouses in Hong Kong showed an increase from 970 to 5,575 for women between 1998 and 2008. The number of women who reported rape and indecent assault during the same period increased from 1,263 to 1,406. In light of this dramatic increase of incidents and reporting, it was argued that the DVO, first enacted in 1986, was outdated and failed to adequately address the various forms of domestic violence that women were experiencing. Furthermore, it was argued that in light of the increased incidence of cohabiting as opposed to living together only in the context of marital relationships, which presents an equal risk of violence in intimate spheres, there was a need to update the DVO to extend protection across a range of relationships and that such protection should not be tied to the temporality of the relationship given that people now move in and out of relationships. The government’s long-held position was that many of the acts, if not covered by the DVO, were caught by the criminal law in any event and thus, there was no pressing need for reform. The lobbying efforts of numerous groups who pushed for civil remedies against domestic violence given the sensitivities involved in such a case, the need to broaden the scope of the DVO’s applicability to other filial and past intimate relationships and the need for a new working definition of domestic violence as well as the CEDAW Committee’s reiteration of the need to ensure adequate protection against domestic violence finally led to amendments to the ordinance.

The reform has been welcomed for its expansion of the scope of relationships which are now covered by the DVO, including same-sex cohabiters, its extension to past relationships and its improvements in terms of accessibility to a range of court remedies and the
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arrest powers of the police where court orders have been violated. There remain, however, deep-rooted problems in victims’ accessibility to timely police and social welfare assistance due to failings at the policy level, as well as the lack of sufficient resources to assist women in pursuing available remedies. For example, the costs of obtaining an injunction still remain prohibitively high for women, particularly where they are economically dependent on the perpetrator of the abuse or have left the family home with their children. Moreover, if women make the decision of seeking temporary shelter in government-run or other shelters, there must be provisions for their right to housing and social welfare in order to make their independence from their spouse sustainable. Moreover, single women’s need for government housing is relegated in priority to the pressing needs of married couples and families with children. Under the current system, women victims hardly have a real choice when it comes to leaving the abuser. In its most recent Concluding Observations on Hong Kong, the CEDAW Committee once again highlighted the need for the government to more effectively address domestic violence in society. It has called on the government to provide a budget overview to enable the CEDAW Committee to ensure that resources are fully applied to tackle this acute problem.

In other reform, the Crimes Ordinance was amended to remove the marital rape exemption that existed as a defense against a charge of rape of a woman by her lawful husband. The Evidence Ordinance has also been amended to remove the “rape shield,” the need for a special direction to the jury or corroboration of the victim’s testimony in sexual offense cases, and spouses are privileged against incrimination of their spouses in general and in criminal proceedings.

These changes have been long coming, and in light of the existing legal and policy framework, are hardly sufficient. There is a dire need to implement a policy of gender mainstreaming at all levels
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although the government has long promised to do so and has even set up a Women’s Commission with the mandate to oversee this task. Despite this, much remains to be done. Although the government prides itself on the development of a gender mainstreaming checklist, the application of this checklist to the initiatives of various departments, the training of staff in various departments in gender sensitivity, raising awareness and the empowerment of women through public education, and the benchmark it has set for women’s participation in advisory and statutory bodies, these initiatives are piecemeal and do not represent a genuine and focused effort at redressing the historic and persistent discrimination faced by women. To ensure effective measures for structural changes that apply substantive measures to unravel the impact of past discrimination, a systematic approach to a change in the policy development processes, including impact assessments of law and policy, and the implementation of laws that offer substantive protection to women in areas where they face particular risks of being marginalized by general norms is required. This can best be met by instituting a procedure similar to that required under the United Kingdom’s Human Rights Act of 1998 and the Equality Act 2010, both of which mandate that an Equality and Human Rights Impact Assessment be carried out with respect to proposed legislation and policy by relevant government bureaus before the measure can be enacted formally.

V. PUTTING THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK INTO CONTEXT

There are numerous areas in which the government has long been dragging its feet and a brief overview of some key areas that beckon urgent reform reveals that the lack of a systematic policy through which gender-based impact analyses of law and policy is mandated has allowed various groups of women to fall through the cracks. For example, the continuation of the functional constituencies in Hong Kong’s legislative body has gender equality implications given that men are more widely represented in the professional classes and therefore, as corporate and individual voters, functional constituency arrangements work to the advantage of men. Women
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who are not professionals or who are homemakers suffer as they have only one vote as opposed to two (or even three in the case of some corporate voter representatives). An even more telling indicator of the representativeness of women under this system is the fact that there have only ever been eight functional constituency legislators who were women, and there is an average rate of return of three female legislators from this voting component every election cycle, only recently improving to return five female legislators in 2000 and 2004, respectively.

In terms of political representation of women by women in other bodies, note that in the District, Executive, and Legislative Councils, women comprised less than 20% of the total number of elected candidates in each of the three bodies. It is only most recently that the Chief Executive Leung Chun Ying’s incoming government has, for the first time since the handover, a woman as its Chief Secretary as well as a female chair of its Executive Council.

Likewise, women are more likely to be single parents than men and also, more widely represented in those classified as “poor,” more likely to be unemployed, or receive unequal pay for work of equal value when compared to men, and they are less likely to sit on

288. For a general overview of the workings of the functional constituency system in Hong Kong, see Simon N.M. Young & Anthony Law, A Critical Introduction to Hong Kong’s Functional Constituencies, Functional Constituency Research Project 26–42 (2004), available at http://www.hku.hk/ccpl/Docs/FCsreport.pdf; Simon N.M. Young, Hong Kong’s Functional Constituencies: Legislators and Elections 24 (2004), available at http://www.civic-exchange.org/eng/upload/files/200503_FunctionalConstituencies.pdf. The September 2012 elections are the first in which each individual will now be entitled to two votes: one in the geographic constituency and the other in the functional constituency which compromises professional classes, but for the first time, for those who do not fall into a pre-existing functional constituency, they are entitled to vote for another list of candidates. See, e.g., Press Release, Legislative Council, Statement by the Chief Secretary for Administration, Mr. Henry Tang, on the Consultation Document on the Methods for Selecting the Chief Executive and for Forming the Legislative Council in 2012 (Nov. 18, 2009), available at http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/ca/papers/ca1126-pr0911118-e.pdf.
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boards of corporations or other influential bodies. Three segments of the Hong Kong population that have grown in recent years are older women, single mothers and female foreign domestic helpers.

Indeed, the Hong Kong government has itself acknowledged some of these issues in its report to the CEDAW Committee, recognizing that “obstacles still remain to the advancement of women in Hong Kong.” It acknowledged the difficulties that elder women experienced in rejoining the labor force, the fact that a larger proportion of women were engaged in low income jobs, casual labor, and that there were growing income disparities between men and women.

These figures speak to the dire need for more to be done in order to ensure that the human rights of women are adequately protected and enforced. The limited number of challenges brought to the courts is no indication of the lack of need for reform. If anything, they reveal a severe lack of accessibility to justice and reparations in light of the figures that are depictive of the inequalities experienced by women in multiple spheres. They merely put into context the limited impact of the current framework despite the existence of protections and frameworks that facilitate access to justice and law reform and their inadequacies by failing to achieve these crucial objectives and protecting women’s interests effectively.

CONCLUSION

Internationally, it appears that Hong Kong ranks relatively well on two of the United Nations’ measures relating to the assessment

296. See Shalini Mahtani et al., Women on Boards: Hang Seng Index 2009 (2009) available at http://www.communitybusiness.org/images/cb/publications/2009/WOB.pdf. The study found that with a rate of 8.9% representation of women on boards, whilst Hong Kong compares favorably to the likes of the Australia, it fell far behind in this regard compared to the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Canada, who had representations in the double digits up to 15%. Id. at 16. The women interviewed cited various reasons, including the “invisible filter” where they would themselves pull back from promotions or higher positions due to family obligations or the fact that they found they were not as well networked as the men, also there was a perception of the talent pool among women being limited. Id. at 5. Interestingly, of all the women surveyed, only one was supportive of the use of quotas as adopted in some European countries in order to address the situation. Id. The others shied away from preferential treatment and preferred other ways of improving female representation on corporate boards. Id.
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of gender disparities in a country.\textsuperscript{302} For example, in 2007, Hong Kong ranked 22nd out of 155 countries on the Gender-Related Development Index.\textsuperscript{303} However, the analysis in this paper points to the need for a critical review of our laws and institutional frameworks for protecting the human rights of women. In addition to having strong rule of law and constitutional and domestic protections enshrined in legislation to protect the rights of women, it is equally important that the framework itself be predicated on a system that enables reform in light of international developments and institutionalizes procedures and structures that achieve the goals of equal protection at a substantive level. The development of a substantive and transformative approach to equality has unfortunately, not been fully incorporated at relevant levels of governance in Hong Kong to facilitate the critical shift towards a more systemic and entrenched regime that would ensure that the rights of women are fully protected. Measures, such as the adoption of an equality and human rights impact assessment framework through which law and policy is vetted at all levels of government departments and ministries, would go a long way towards bridging the gap between the sexes. Moreover, the role of the EOC and the courts needs to be evaluated in light of the circumstances women, as victims of discrimination and unequal treatment, face in multiple spheres.\textsuperscript{304} It is unsatisfactory to leave decisions about the plight of the powerless in the hands of the powerful majority.\textsuperscript{305} Indeed, this is precisely where courts need to step in to apply substantive equality measures to adjudge the impact of government policies on marginalized communities whose particular vulnerabilities exacerbate their experience of inequality.\textsuperscript{306} The tools that enable the courts to do so already exist in the HKBL and the HKBORO. This mandate to apply equality provisions rigorously must extend to economic and social policy. Anything less than that violates the constitutional and human rights guarantee of equality and non-discrimination.

Furthermore, the government needs to seriously consider whether the adoption of special measures is necessary in key areas relating to political representation and professional and other opportunities to address the historical discrimination that women have suffered
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as a group and to promote fully their empowerment and inclusion in society as full and equal members.\footnote{307. See \textit{supra} Part III.D. for a discussion of special measures the government is empowered to enact.}

In terms of where to begin, the government could start by taking its cue from the Concluding Observations issued by the CEDAW Committee over the last two reporting cycles with a view toward addressing fully, and in good faith, the recommendations made by the Committee.\footnote{308. See Concluding Comments, \textit{supra} note 108.} Moreover, it should note the burgeoning civil society movement in Hong Kong and review the various reports submitted by the numerous NGOs who work on different aspects of women’s rights. Their insights are crucial to raise the government’s awareness to better inform their policy development and law-making initiatives. There should also be a greater culture of cooperation and openness between the government and such organizations so as to facilitate a good faith exchange of views on upcoming policy and legislative changes so that interested groups can speak on an informed basis to impact proposed changes.

Finally, the government would be well-served to begin charting figures that depict the plight of women who are members of other marginalized groups.\footnote{309. See \textit{supra} Part III.D.} For example, it should develop tools to obtain figures on migrant women, women belonging to ethnic, national or religious minority groups, disabled women, older women and sexual minorities. Women in these groups represent some of the most vulnerable sectors of the population in Hong Kong and remain severely under-protected and under-represented.\footnote{310. See \textit{supra} Part III.D.} Effective data collection tools will further the government’s ability to assess the impact of law and policy more comprehensively and enable it to devise specific policies that address the vulnerabilities of these groups. Intersectional analysis has proved to be an immensely useful tool to identify populations at risk on multiple grounds of discrimination and to assess the effectiveness of measures to enable substantive equal protection.\footnote{311. See \textit{supra} Part III.D.} This data would enable better benchmarking of standards and would facilitate better planning and budget allocation in times where resource allocation is the key to implementing effective and sustainable change.\footnote{312. See \textit{supra} Part III.D.}

The achievement of equality in the substantive and transformative sense is a journey that is long and calls for critical self-reflection.
We are committed to internationally recognized standards and have witnessed the impact of the empowerment of women on the well-being of society as a whole. The state of inequality that persists in Hong Kong implores us to charge fully forward to internalize these important principles and to heed the lessons of international successes reflecting the outcomes of the implementation of these standards so that the equal rights of women can be substantively recognized to deliver the promise of equal respect, worth, and dignity of all human beings.