HONG KONG

SUBMISSION TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S PANEL ON MANPOWER – 'POLICIES RELATING TO FOREIGN DOMESTIC HELPERS AND REGULATION OF EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES'

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Amnesty International Publications

First published in 2014 by
Amnesty International Ltd.
East Asia Regional Office
16/F, Siu On Building
188 Lockhart Road
Wan Chai
Hong Kong SAR
www.amnesty.org

Index: ASA 17/005/2014
Original Language: English
Printed by Amnesty International, East Asia Regional Office, Hong Kong SAR, CHINA

Amnesty International is a global movement of 2.2 million people in more than 150 countries and territories, who campaign on human rights. Our vision is for every person to enjoy all the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments. We research, campaign, advocate and mobilize to end abuses of human rights. Amnesty International is independent of any government, political ideology, economic interest or religion. Our work is largely financed by contributions from our membership and donations

AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL

SUBMISSION TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S PANEL ON MANPOWER – 'POLICIES RELATING TO FOREIGN DOMESTIC HELPERS AND REGULATION OF EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES.

Between May and October 2012, Amnesty International interviewed 50 Indonesian migrant domestic workers in Hong Kong. In March 2013, further interviews were conducted with 47 returnees in Indonesia who had worked in Hong Kong as domestic workers.[1] All of the interviewees were women. The issues raised are not limited to Indonesians, but reflect the problems faced by the wider community of migrant domestic workers irrespective of nationality.

Amnesty International's research demonstrates that placement agencies in Hong Kong employ coercive practices to maintain control over migrant domestic workers (e.g. the confiscation of identity documents, manipulation of debt and restrictions on freedom of movement). In this way, they compel migrant domestic workers to work in conditions where they are exposed to exploitation, forced labour, threats and physical/psychological violence.

Hong Kong placement agencies work in close partnership with Indonesian recruitment agencies, but they are separate organizations and come under the jurisdiction of the HKSAR authorities which have a responsibility to monitor and regulate them, and ensure that they are operating in full compliance with the laws in the Hong Kong SAR. The following outlines specific abusive practices, which in combination amount to trafficking and forced labour.

Contractual deception

Amnesty International's research demonstrate that many Indonesian migrant domestic workers discovered after arriving in Hong Kong that their wages or working conditions were different to what they had been promised by their broker and/or recruitment agency in Indonesia.[2] In the IMWU survey,[3] 60 per cent of the respondents said that their actual work was different from the terms and conditions stated in their contract.[4]

Typically, migrant domestic workers who were deceived regarding their terms and conditions of work were given false or misleading information relating to their wages, work hours, holidays and workload. Their actual working conditions in Hong Kong are reviewed in detail below.

Underpayment

Migrant domestic workers are excluded from the scope of Hong Kong's Minimum Wage Ordinance. Instead, they fall under a separate and less favourable Minimum Allowable Wage (MAW), which is currently set at HK$4,010 (US$517) per month.[5]

More than a third of the women interviewed by Amnesty International received a salary that was below the statutory Minimum Allowable Wage.[6] The testimonies given to Amnesty International are corroborated by the results of the survey conducted by IMWU in which 28 per cent of Indonesian migrant domestic workers experienced payment below the Minimum Allowable Wage, with a higher prevalence among respondents who were on their first contract.[7]

Despite the high number of employers paying below the Minimum Allowable Wage, between 2008 and 2012, the HKSAR Labour Department investigated only 143 cases of wage offences. Following the investigation, the Department prosecuted 49 employers, which

resulted in the conviction of 34 employers. Twelve of the convicted employers were sentenced to community service orders and three were sentenced to three months' imprisonment. The other convicted employers were given fines, of which the highest was HK$105,000 (US$13,500).[8]

Excessive and exploitative work hours

Many Indonesian migrant domestic workers in Hong Kong endure excessive working hours. Interviews conducted by Amnesty International indicate that on average they worked 17 hours per day[9] with respondents frequently noting that they were "on call 24 hours".

Under Hong Kong law, there is no general statutory provision limiting maximum daily working hours, limiting overtime hours or stipulating overtime pay, including for migrant domestic workers.[10] This is not consistent with the Hong Kong government's obligations under international law. As a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR),[11] Hong Kong has a duty to "recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of just and favourable conditions of work which ensure", among others, "rest, leisure and reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay, as well as remuneration for public holidays".[12]

Denial of weekly rest day and holidays

Hong Kong's Employment Ordinance stipulates that "every employee who has been employed by the same employer under a continuous contract[13] shall be granted not less than one rest day in every period of seven days".[14] However, the denial of a rest day is a common problem among Indonesian migrant domestic workers in Hong Kong. More than half of the migrants interviewed by Amnesty International did not receive a weekly rest day.[15]

By denying migrant domestic workers their statutory rest day, the employer not only forces them to work more, but also prevents them from having contact with other migrants and accessing information about their rights and entitlements in Hong Kong.

Hong Kong law defines a rest day as "a continuous period of not less than 24 hours during which an employee is entitled [...] to abstain from working for his employer".[16] Interviews indicate that even when migrant domestic workers are given a rest day by their employer, it is often not a full 24 hours. This was the case for the majority of the interviewees.

Excessive agency fees

Under the HKSAR Employment Agency Regulation of the Employment Ordinance, placement agencies can charge migrant domestic workers for their services a maximum of ten per cent of the first month's wages.[17] This means that, at the current Minimum Allowable Wage of HK$4,010 (US$517), the maximum fee placement agencies in Hong Kong can charge is HK$401 (US$52).

However, Amnesty International's research demonstrates that most Indonesian interviewees had to hand over the vast majority of their salary to their placement agency, normally a monthly repayment of HK$3,000 (US$387) for the initial seven months of their contract. This corresponds to a total of HK$21,000 (US$2,709), which exceeds the statutory limits established by legislation in Hong Kong (as well as in Indonesia).

Consequently, serious indebtedness due to excessive recruitment fees is common among Indonesian migrant domestic workers. Many interviewees expressed how heavily they were burdened by their debt and their fear of acquiring more debt through new employment due to the common practice by placement of charging new fees. These debts often force workers to accept exploitation and abuse in the workplace. Several migrant domestic workers also told Amnesty International that they were reluctant to change employers because doing so would

incur further fees to their agencies.

Circumventing the law on recruitment fees

Recruitment agencies in Indonesia work closely with placement agencies in Hong Kong to ensure that their fees are fully repaid. As these fees routinely exceed the legal maximum that agencies are allowed to charge in both countries[18] the agencies circumvent the law by collecting payment through a variety of third party schemes.

One is for placement agencies to collect the fees through finance companies.[19] They compel migrant domestic workers to sign a document acknowledging receipt for a "loan" and instruct their employer to transfer most of the monthly salary to the finance company that issued the "loan". The IMWU survey found that 34 per cent of Indonesian migrant domestic workers were asked to sign a loan agreement.[20]

Alternatively, the agency instructs some migrant domestic workers to make cash payments to the loan company via 7-Eleven stores after they receive their salary from their employers. The 7-Eleven's receipt only includes an account number[21] and it is not made clear to the migrants who the recipient is.

Another illegal mechanism which the placement agencies use is to make an agreement with the employer to deduct a portion of the migrant domestic worker's salary and then to force the worker to sign a piece of paper stating that they had received their full salary (i.e. in line with the Minimum Allowable Wage). Some interviewees who were paid below the Minimum Allowable Wage specifically told Amnesty International that their employer made them sign a document falsely acknowledging receipt of their full wages.

Most of the migrant domestic workers interviewed by Amnesty International who looked for a new job in Hong Kong after the completion or termination of their first contract had to pay a new fee to the placement agency, which exceeds the legal maximum charge of 10 per cent of the worker's first month's salary.[22]

Physical/Psychological abuse and threats

Due in part to the isolated nature of their work, domestic workers are at greater risk of abuse, harassment and violence than other workers. This was acknowledged by the UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women in its General Recommendation 26:

"Women migrant workers are more vulnerable to sexual abuse, sexual harassment and physical violence, especially in sectors where women predominate. Domestic workers are particularly vulnerable to physical and sexual assault, food and sleep deprivation and cruelty by their employers."[23]

Two thirds of migrant domestic workers interviewed by Amnesty International had been subject to physical or psychological (verbal) abuse, and/or threats.[24] Employers threatened to terminate their contract or "send them back to Indonesia" if they didn't "work harder". Common psychological abuse included calling the migrant domestic worker "stupid", "deaf", "lazy", "crazy", "useless", "rubbish", "pig" and "dog".

In August 2013, the Mission for Migrant Workers, an NGO based in Hong Kong, published its findings from a survey of more than 3,000 migrant domestic workers. In the survey, it found that 58 per cent of the women faced verbal abuse, 18 per cent physical abuse and 6 per cent sexual abuse. The Mission believes that there are many more cases that go unreported due to fear or lack of information on how to file a complaint.[25]

It is not surprising then that only a few of the migrant interviewees who had suffered abuse

filed a police complaint. This was not only due to the aforementioned factors, but also other practical, financial and legal obstacles, primarily linked to their immigration status, which makes reporting difficult.

More than a third of the migrant domestic workers interviewed by Amnesty International stated that they had not been free to leave their employer's home.[26] According to several migrant interviewees and NGOs working with Indonesian domestic workers, placement agencies in Hong Kong specifically advise employers to prevent the workers from leaving the house, particularly during the initial months.

Amnesty International's research indicates that the reason for this is to ensure that the domestic workers do not have access to information or assistance which might lead to them challenging their terms and conditions of work, seeking alternative employment or not paying back the fees "owed" to the recruitment agency.

Several interviewees told Amnesty International that their employer and/or placement agency stopped them from calling home or speaking to other people, including other migrant domestic workers. These restrictions on the domestic workers' freedom of movement are further exacerbated by the removal of their personal identity documents.

Removal and retention of documents

In the interviews conducted by Amnesty International with Indonesian migrant domestic workers, the great majority revealed that their employer or placement agency in Hong Kong kept their identity documents (86 out of 93 who were asked and responded to the question), such as their passport, KTKLN and Hong Kong ID card,[27] and/or their employment contract. These documents were usually taken shortly after their arrival in Hong Kong. This is consistent with the IMWU survey where 74 per cent of the respondents said their documents were taken by their employer or placement agency.[28]

A further twenty-eight interviewees specifically stated that they had asked for their personal documents to be returned, but their employer or placement agency had refused to return them. Several interviewees stated that they were "too afraid" to ask for their documents because it could anger their employer or agency, and lead to some penalty, such as the premature termination of their contract.

The confiscation of passports, identity papers and contracts by employers or placement agencies is an effective way of maintaining control over migrant domestic workers, as without these documents, they cannot work legally in another job or even prove they have a right to be in Hong Kong if they leave the employer's house. This in turn makes it extremely difficult for them to leave jobs where they are subject to abuse.

Amnesty International also found that some migrant interviewees had difficulty getting their documents back after their contract was terminated or finished. Where their personal documents were retained by their employer or placement agency, Indonesian migrant domestic workers had little ability to negotiate the terms of their new job or the level of the repayment fee.

In IMWU's survey, 48 per cent responded that their personal documents were not returned to them after the completion or premature termination of their contract.[29]

Manipulated contract termination

Amnesty International's research found that more than a quarter of Indonesian migrant domestic workers had their contract terminated by their employer before or just after their salary deduction period ended.[30] In the survey conducted by IMWU, 40 per cent of the

respondents stated that their contract was terminated before the completion of their contract,[31] while 17 per cent faced termination just before their seventh-month repayment period.[32]

This is a common practice, which is manipulated by the placement agency in order to maximise profits, as the early termination of their contract forces the migrant domestic worker to look for another job, sign a new contract and pay the agency fee all over again. The new fee can be up to another seven months, depending for example on whether there is any remaining debt from her previous employment. During this time, the domestic worker will receive little, if any, of her wages.

It is important to note that nineteen of the migrants interviewed by Amnesty International, who did not have their contract terminated before or just after their salary deduction period, still had their contract terminated before the two-year completion date.

Under Hong Kong law, "either party may terminate the contract by giving not less than one month's notice in writing or by paying one month's wages to the other party".[33] Despite this, more than a quarter of the migrant domestic workers interviewed by Amnesty International had their contract terminated without notice and without receiving the due compensation.[34]

Outstanding payment of wages after premature termination of a worker's contract is also a common problem among Indonesian migrant domestic workers. Amnesty International has documented cases where workers sought remedy by filing a complaint against their employer with the Labour Department.

At a meeting with the HKSAR Labour Department, the officials informed Amnesty International that if a migrant domestic worker wanted to contest her employer's pre-mature termination of the contract, she would need to "provide substantial evidence to support the claim". The Immigration Department will only approve the application if it falls "within the scope of exceptional circumstances" – "transfer, migration, death or financial reasons of the ex-employer, or if there is evidence substantiating that the FDH has been abused or exploited". The Department further stated that it would be "her word against the employer" and when asked if employers had to prove their reason for terminating the contract, the Department answered "no".[35]

Finding new employment: The Two-Week Rule

Under the New Condition of Stay, 1987, or the Two-Week Rule, migrant domestic workers in Hong Kong must find new employment and obtain an approved work visa within two weeks of the expiration or premature termination of their employment contract. Failing that, they must leave Hong Kong.

Even after completing their two-year contract, migrant domestic workers face difficulty in finding new employment due to the Two-Week Rule, which further exacerbates their vulnerability to exploitation by both their employer and placement agency. The time frame is clearly not sufficient as even the Immigration Department accepts that it normally takes "about 4-6 weeks" to process an application for change of employer by a migrant domestic worker once "all necessary documents" are received.[36]

The inability to find new employment in the two-week time limit leaves migrant domestic workers with little choice but to remain in abusive and/or exploitative conditions or accept jobs with unfavourable work conditions in order to maintain their immigration status.

The Two-Week Rule also significantly impedes their ability to access redress mechanisms in Hong Kong. A key obstacle is the fact that migrant domestic workers who lodge a complaint

against their employer or placement agency are likely to have their contract terminated. Under the current immigration policy, migrant domestic workers cannot normally change employers within their two-year contract except under "exceptional circumstances", including the transfer, migration, death or financial reasons of the former employer, or if the worker was abused or exploited.[37] This prevents many from raising issues of abuse, as doing so, would most likely result in loss of employment and income, and leave them with just two weeks to find new employment.

So unless the migrant can find another job in two weeks, which would be difficult given the average 4-6 week processing time by the Immigration authorities, they will have to apply for a visa extension at a cost of HK$160 (US$20), which does not allow them to work and is typically valid for one month or less. To take a case to the Labour Tribunal, it takes on average approximately two months. During this time, they will have to renew their visa and pay for their own accommodation, food and other expenses without any income. Most migrant domestic workers are unable to afford these costs.

In this respect, the Two-Week Rule provides a disincentive for migrant domestic workers to denounce exploitative or abusive practices and pursue criminal charges and/or compensation though the appropriate channels. This in turn makes the effective investigation and prosecution of those responsible for human and labour rights violations extremely difficult.

Amnesty International calls on the HKSAR government to:

- Thoroughly regulate and monitor placement agencies in its territory and sanction placement agencies which are operating in violation of Hong Kong's laws in respect to illegal excessive fees, including the application of criminal sanctions when appropriate.
- Take action to prevent and address human rights abuses and violations of Hong Kong's domestic legislation by employers (e.g. weekly rest days), including through the application of criminal sanctions when appropriate.
- Repeal or amend the Two-Week Rule to allow migrant domestic workers a reasonable period to find new employment, including incorporating the average time of 4-6 weeks it takes to issue a new visa.
- Amend current legislation which forces migrant domestic workers to live with their employers and excludes them from the Minimum Wage Ordinance.
- Waive the costs of visa extensions for migrant domestic workers who are seeking compensation for human and labour rights abuses, and ensure that they have effective access to appropriate support measures, such as shelters and interpretation, at all stages of redress, including the conciliation process at the Labour Department.
- As a matter of priority, extend the UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children (2000) to Hong Kong SAR (ratified by the People's Republic of China in 2010), incorporate its provisions into Hong Kong law and implement them in policy and practice, including the definition of trafficking to include trafficking for labour exploitation.
- Pursue with the Central Government in Beijing the ratification of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, and ILO Convention No.189 concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers (2011), incorporate their provisions into Hong Kong law and implement them in policy and practice.

---

[1] Amnesty International, *Exploited for Profit, Failed by Governments: Indonesian migrant domestic*

workers trafficked to Hong Kong, November 2013 (AI Index: ASA 17/029/2013), available at: http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/ASA17/029/2013/en.

[2] Of those interviewed who responded to this question, 45 out of 69 stated that their wages or work conditions in Hong Kong were different to what they have been promised in Indonesia.

[3] Data collected from questionnaires by the Indonesian Migrant Workers Union (IMWU), in conjunction with the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) and Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions (HKCTU), between July and September 2011 (hereafter referred to as the IMWU survey). The questionnaire was completed by 930 Indonesian migrant domestic workers in public venues (e.g. parks and other places where domestic workers meet) throughout Hong Kong.

[4] ITUC, IMWU and HKCTU, *Final Report on Malpractices of Recruitment Agencies toward Indonesian Domestic Workers in Hong Kong* (unpublished), in collaboration with the Institute for National and Democratic Studies (INDIES), June 2012, p46.

[5] This is for Standard Employment Contracts made on or after 1 October 2013. As all the migrant domestic workers interviewed for this report had employment contracts before this date, their salary entitlement is less than HK$4,010 (US$517). Previous MAW include HK$3,920 (US$505, since 20 September 2012), HK$3,740 (US$480, since 2 June 2011), HK$3,580 (US$460, since 10 July 2008), HK$3,480 (US$450, since 6 June 2007), HK$3,400 (US$440, since 31 May 2006), HK$3,320 (US$430, since 19 May 2005) and HK$3,270 (US$420, since April 2003). See also HKSAR Government, "Minimum Allowable Wage and food allowance for foreign domestic helpers to increase", 30 September 2013, available at: http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/201309/30/P201309300438.htm, accessed 6 October 2013.

[6] Of those interviewed who responded to this question, 33 out of 77 received a salary below the Minimum Allowable Wage.

[7] ITUC, IMWU and HKCTU, *Final Report on Malpractices of Recruitment Agencies toward Indonesian Domestic Workers in Hong Kong* (unpublished), in collaboration with the Institute for National and Democratic Studies (INDIES), June 2012, p40.

[8] Correspondence from the HKSAR Labour Department (Headquarters) on 15 August 2013.

[9] 94 interviewees provided information on their hours of work.

[10] HKSAR Labour Department, *Report of the Policy Study on Standard Working Hours*, June 2012, pp1-2, available at: http://www.labour.gov.hk/eng/plan/pdf/swh/swh_report.pdf, accessed 6 October 2013.

[11] Ratified in 1976 under the territorial application of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Upon resuming sovereignty over Hong Kong in 1997, the People's Republic of China notified the UN that the Covenant will also apply to the Hong Kong SAR, pursuant to the provisions of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong SAR.

[12] Article 7(d) of the ICESCR.

[13] An employee who has been employed continuously by the same employer for four weeks or more, with at least 18 hours worked in each week is regarded as being employed under a continuous contract. See HKSAR Labour Department, "Labour Legislation: Frequently Asked Questions about the Employment Ordinance, Cap. 57", available at: http://www.labour.gov.hk/eng/faq/cap57b_whole.htm, accessed 1 October 2013.

[14] Section 17 Grant of rest day, Cap 57A Employment Agency Regulation, Employment Ordinance of HKSAR, available at: http://www.legislation.gov.hk/blis_pdf.nsf/6799165D2FEE3FA94825755E0033E532/277C0DAA6FCB2973482575EE00348F4E/$FILE/CAP_57_e_b5.pdf, accessed 9 February 2013.

[15] Of those interviewed who responded to this question, 51 out of 93 did not receive a weekly rest day.

[16] Section 2 Interpretation, Cap 57A Employment Agency Regulation, Employment Ordinance of HKSAR, available at: http://www.legislation.gov.hk/blis_pdf.nsf/6799165D2FEE3FA94825755E0033E532/277C0DAA6FCB2973482575EE00348F4E/$FILE/CAP_57_e_b5.pdf, accessed 9 February 2013.

[17] Regulation 10(2) (Part II of Schedule 2), Cap 57A Employment Agency Regulation, HKSAR Employment Ordinance.

[18] Ministerial Decree No. 98/2012 sets the maximum total fee at IDR 14,780,400 or HK$13,436 (US$1,730). See Appendix 3.

[19] Peggy W.Y. Lee and Carole J. Petersen, *Forced Labour and Debt Bondage in Hong Kong: A Study of Indonesian and Filipina Migrant Domestic Workers*, Centre for Comparative and Public Law, Faculty of Law, University of Hong Kong, May 2006, pp26-27.

[20] ITUC, IMWU and HKCTU, *Final Report on Malpractices of Recruitment Agencies toward Indonesian Domestic Workers in Hong Kong* (unpublished, supplementary survey findings), in collaboration with the Institute for National and Democratic Studies (INDIES), 2013.

[21] Sheridan Prasso and Cathy Chan, "Indentured Servitude in Hong Kong Abetted by Loan Firms" *Bloomberg*, 13 November 2012, available at: http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-11-13/indentured-servitude-in-hong-kong-abetted-by-loan-firms.html, accessed13 February 2013.

[22] Of those interviewed who responded to this question, 34 out of 68 migrant domestic workers looked for a new job in Hong Kong after the completion or termination of their first contract. Of these 21 had to pay a new fee to their placement agency.

[23] Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, General Recommendation 26 on Women Migrant Workers, UN Doc. C/2009/WP.1/R, 5 December 2008, para20.

[24] Of those interviewed who responded to this question, 63 out of 94 had been subjected to physical or psychological (verbal) abuse, and/or threats.

[25] Jonathan Levine, "Survey reveals extent of abuse of foreign maids in Hong Kong", *South China Morning Post*, 4 August 2013, available at: http://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/article/1294210/survey-reveals-extent-abuse-foreign-maids-hong-kong?page, accessed 20 September 2013.

[26] Of those interviewed who responded to this question, 34 out of 91 stated that they were not free to leave their employer's home.

[27] Under the Registration of Persons Ordinance, all Hong Kong residents aged 11 or above must register for a Hong Kong ID card, except for genuine travellers in transit through Hong Kong or persons who have been permitted to stay for not more than 180 days; the aged, the blind and the infirm whose exemption has been approved by the Commissioner of Registration. For more information, see "General Information on Hong Kong Identity Cards", available at:

http://www.gov.hk/en/residents/immigration/idcard/hkic/geninfor.htm, accessed 6 March 2013.

[28] ITUC, IMWU and HKCTU, *Final Report on Malpractices of Recruitment Agencies toward Indonesian Domestic Workers in Hong Kong* (unpublished), in collaboration with the Institute for National and Democratic Studies (INDIES), June 2012, p34.

[29] ITUC, IMWU and HKCTU, *Final Report on Malpractices of Recruitment Agencies toward Indonesian Domestic Workers in Hong Kong* (unpublished), in collaboration with the Institute for National and Democratic Studies (INDIES), June 2012, p54.

[30] Of those interviewed who responded to this question, 28 out of 33 said that contract was terminated by their employer before or just after their salary deduction period ended.

[31] ITUC, IMWU and HKCTU, *Final Report on Malpractices of Recruitment Agencies toward Indonesian Domestic Workers in Hong Kong* (unpublished), in collaboration with the Institute for National and Democratic Studies (INDIES), June 2012, p47.

[32] ITUC, IMWU and HKCTU, *Final Report on Malpractices of Recruitment Agencies toward Indonesian Domestic Workers in Hong Kong* (unpublished, supplementary survey findings), in collaboration with the Institute for National and Democratic Studies (INDIES), 2013.

[33] This is also stated in para10 of the Standard Employment Contract (see Appendix 4). Moreover, employers "may summarily dismiss your helper without notice or payment in lieu of notice if your helper, in relation to the employment: wilfully disobeys a lawful and reasonable order; misconducts himself/herself; is guilty of fraud or dishonesty; or is habitually neglectful of his/her duties". Equally, migrant domestic workers "may terminate your employment contract without notice or payment in lieu of notice if: you reasonably fear physical danger by violence or disease; you are subjected to ill-treatment by your employer; or you have been employed for not less than five years and you are medically certified as being permanently unfit for the type of work you are engaged". See HKSAR Labour Department, *Practical Guide for Employment of Foreign Domestic Helpers: What foreign domestic helpers and their employers should know*, September 2012, pp18-19, available at: http://www.labour.gov.hk/eng/public/wcp/FDHguide.pdf, accessed 29 May 2013.

[34] Of those interviewed who responded to this question, 25 out of 27 said that their contract had been terminated without notice and without the due compensation.

[35] Amnesty International meeting with the HKSAR Labour and Immigration Departments in Hong Kong on 11 October 2013 and correspondence from the two Departments on 15 October 2013.

[36] Correspondence from the HKSAR Labour Department (incorporating information provided by the HKSAR Immigration Department) on 15 August 2013.

[37] HKSAR Immigration Department, "Immigration Department implements measure to deter abuse of arrangements for premature termination of contract by foreign domestic helpers", Press Release, 30 August 2013, available at: http://www.immd.gov.hk/en/press/press-releases/20130830.html.

Amnesty International
East Asia Regional Office
16/F, Siu On Building
188 Lockhart Road
Wan Chai
Hong Kong SAR
www.amnesty.org

AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL