

2020

平機會期刊 EOC Journal

平等

點線面

EQUALITY PERSPECTIVES



City under threat:

Inequalities unmasked by COVID-19

新冠病毒：疫情下的不平等



平等機會委員會
EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES COMMISSION

目錄 Contents

2 Chairperson's Message
主席的話3 Crash Course
知識補給站香港反歧視條例：
六個基本概念Six things you should know about Hong Kong's
anti-discrimination ordinances7 Deep Dive
深度分析我生意，
我話事？
My business, my rules?12 Further Reading
延伸閱讀為何他們的抗疫日子更艱辛？
Doubly disadvantaged:
who are having harder times amid COVID-19?香港黃竹坑香葉道41號16樓
16/F, 41 Heung Yip Road, Wong Chuk Hang, Hong Kong電話 Tel: 2511 8211 傳真 Fax: 2877 7600
網頁 Website: www.eoc.org.hk 電郵 E-mail: eoc@eoc.org.hk短訊查詢服務 SMS Enquiry Service: 6972566616538
(供聽障 / 有語言障礙人士使用 For people with hearing impairment/speech difficulties)平機會在
EOC onYouTube 頻道 YouTube channel:
www.youtube.com/user/hkeocFacebook 專頁 Facebook pages:
共融世代 Generation i
Uniquelyme HK
Embrace Campaign平機會流動應用程式
EOC Mobile App

新型冠狀病毒肆虐全球，引起民眾恐慌和不安。在不少地方，民情還夾雜了對政府防疫措施的不滿，部分人更表示要「抗疫自救」，繼而採取一些具有歧視性的措施，引起劇烈爭議。

在香港，有餐廳和商戶就以特區政府沒有應其要求「全面封關」為由，自行宣布拒絕服務說普通話的客人及／或內地人士。

很多人認為，這種差別待遇旨在預防傳染病、保障公眾健康，合乎公眾利益，因此不應被禁止。但我們必須考慮的是：這種一刀切的做法是否有其合理需要？這些措施又是否真的有助抗疫呢？

這些問題或許既沉悶又複雜，但以衡量某些行為是否違反香港現行的反歧視條例來說，卻非常重要。作為負責執行這些條例的法定機構，平機會有責任向公眾解釋法例，即使相關解說或許不能迎合部分人的既定想法。说到底，平機會在體察民情的同時，也不能為了贏得掌聲而刻意曲解法例。

今期《平等點·線·面》繼續貫徹平機會公眾教育的使命，首先解釋反歧視條例中的一些基本概念，進而就疫情引起的各種現象展開深入分析。最後，我們聚焦在不同弱勢社群因疫情而面對的困境，並介紹非政府組織所提供的支援服務。

誠盼各位讀者閱畢期刊後有所裨益，在此抗疫的艱難時期，與我們一起努力，消除歧視和偏見。

平等機會委員會主席

朱敏健, IDS

2020年5月

As COVID-19 stampedes across the planet, the fear and anxiety it sows tend to combine with discontent with government responses, giving rise to “DIY” precautionary measures among the public. Some of these practices, nonetheless, have courted controversy because of their discriminatory nature.

In Hong Kong, this is manifested in restaurants and shops who refused to serve Putonghua speakers and/or mainlanders, after demands for a complete border shutdown were not met by the SAR Government.

Many seem to believe that as long as differential treatment is aimed to contain an infectious disease and protect public health, then they are consistent with public interest and should not be prohibited. However, are such blanket measures reasonably necessary? Do they bear a rational connection to the stated objective of disease control?

Questions like these, as boring or pedantic as they may sound, are important because they may determine whether an act is lawful or not under Hong Kong's anti-discrimination ordinances. As the sole statutory body tasked with enforcing these ordinances, the EOC has an obligation to explain them to the public, even when that explanation may be unpalatable to some. After all, as much as the Commission strives to stay in touch with public sentiment, it cannot do so at the expense of distorting the law.

In the spirit of education, this issue of *Equality Perspectives* offers a crash course on key concepts found in the anti-discrimination ordinances, before delving into an in-depth analysis of various phenomena that have arisen from the ongoing contagion. We end with a look at some of the marginalised communities in the city that are taking a bigger hit from COVID-19, and the NGOs that have come to help.

I do hope that you will join us in fighting not only the virus itself, but also the discrimination and prejudice it feeds.

Ricky CHU Man-kin, IDS

Chairperson, Equal Opportunities Commission

May 2020

區議員不派口罩給藍絲，
肯定是歧視！
District Councillors refusing
to hand out masks to "blue
ribbons"? That's blatant
discrimination!

餐廳為求減低病毒傳播風險，拒絕招待說普通話的客人，有何不妥？
What's wrong about eateries refusing to
serve Putonghua-speaking customers if
they're doing it to contain the
spread of the virus?

港府
選擇性地對某些地區
封關，難道又不是歧視？
The Government is banning
arrivals from certain regions
but not others. Isn't that
discrimination?

香港反歧視條例：六個基本概念

Six things you should know about Hong Kong's anti-discrimination ordinances

新冠病毒疫情席捲全球，海外華人以至亞洲人成為被嘲諷、羞辱甚至襲擊的對象，各地的種族主義和排外情緒高漲。香港的社會、文化和政治環境雖與海外不同，亦未曾發生「掙雞蛋」、群毆等事件，但至4月底，平機會已收到約1,500宗與疫情相關的查詢和投訴。

Amid COVID-19 fears, Chinese and Asian diasporas have recently become targets of mockery, humiliation and, in some cases, outright violence, igniting concerns over racism and xenophobia.

While eggings, beatings and the like have not happened in Hong Kong, where social, cultural and political conditions differ from those overseas, the EOC has received about 1,500 enquiries and complaints related to the pandemic as of end of April.

歷史彷彿在重演：早於2003年沙士爆發期間，同樣有不同人士就各種現象向平機會表達關注。時至今日，市民仍未充分掌握歧視的法律定義；不論是從政者、議員、時事評論員抑或網民，眾人對於何謂「歧視」各有一套說法，當中更不時出現嚴重的誤解。

要開展有意義的討論，社會必須先就客觀事實達成共識。因此，我們是時候回歸基本步，重新認識反歧視條例下的一些重要概念。

History seems to be repeating itself – the 2003 SARS outbreak also saw people voicing various concerns to the EOC. Fast forward to 2020, it appears that many still do not have a grasp of what discrimination means under the law. Indeed, the word “discrimination” has been tossed around so often lately – by politicians, lawmakers, commentators and netizens alike – that confusion and misinformation reign supreme.

No constructive dialogue can take place if fundamental facts are not even agreed upon. It is, therefore, high time for a legal brush-up. Here you will learn about some of the key concepts underlying the anti-discrimination ordinances.

受保障特徵 Protected characteristic

一般而言，歧視性行為是針對一個人的某種身份或特徵而作出的。當判斷某行為是否構成違法的歧視行為時，考慮因素之一，乃此行為是基於甚麼特徵而作出的，以及該特徵是否受到香港的反歧視條例保障，亦即「受保障特徵」。

香港現時有四條反歧視條例，分別為《性別歧視條例》、《殘疾歧視條例》、《家庭崗位歧視條例》及《種族歧視條例》：

Generally, a discriminatory act is targeted at a person of a certain identity or with a certain characteristic. Whether an act amounts to unlawful discrimination depends, partly, on the ground it is based on, and whether that ground is a “protected characteristic” (aka. “prohibited ground”) under Hong Kong's anti-discrimination ordinances.

Currently, there are four anti-discrimination ordinances in Hong Kong, namely the Sex Discrimination Ordinance (SDO), the Disability Discrimination Ordinance (DDO), the Family Status Discrimination Ordinance (FSDO) and the Race Discrimination Ordinance (RDO):

受保障特徵 Protected characteristics



不受保障的特徵 NOT protected



知多一點 Learn more

值得注意的是，《香港人權法案條例》禁止基於政見和性傾向等其他身份的歧視，但條例只對政府和公共機構具約束力，而平機會亦無法定權力執行該條例。

While the Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance prohibits discrimination based on political opinion, sexual orientation and other status, it is binding on the Government and public authorities only. Enforcing the ordinance is also beyond the EOC's jurisdiction.

適用範疇 Applicable field

要判斷某歧視性行為是否違反四條反歧視條例，我們還需進一步了解該行為發生在甚麼範疇。四條條例分別列明了各自適用的範疇，一些共通的範疇包括：



直接歧視 Direct discrimination

在反歧視條例下，歧視主要分為「直接歧視」和「間接歧視」兩種，各有清晰和具體的定義。「直接歧視」是相對簡單的概念，指基於一個人的某種特徵（假設是「受保障特徵」），對其作出較差的待遇。

例如你是未婚的懷孕女性，若僱主表示分娩福利只會給予已婚的懷孕僱員，便構成基於婚姻狀況的直接歧視。

間接歧視 Indirect discrimination

「間接歧視」是指向所有人施以同一條件或要求，表面上一視同仁，但實際上該條件或要求並無充分理據，而且持有某種特徵（假設是「受保障特徵」）的人會因為較難符合該條件或要求，而蒙受不利。

例如某食物包裝工廠以衛生和安全為由，一律不准僱員留鬍子；若有資料顯示戴面罩便可符合衛生與安全標準，此要求便缺乏充分理據，且對依循留鬍子習俗的少數族裔（如錫克教徒）構成間接的種族歧視。

Another factor in determining whether a discriminatory act violates the four anti-discrimination ordinances is the field of activity where it took place. Each of these ordinances specifies their applicable fields. Some common fields include:

Under the anti-discrimination ordinances, there are mainly two kinds of discrimination: direct and indirect. Direct discrimination is a simpler notion. It refers to when a person is given less favourable treatment based on a protected characteristic.

If you are single and pregnant, for example, and your employer says maternity benefits are extended to married employees only, then it is a case of direct discrimination based on marital status.

Indirect discrimination occurs when a condition or requirement is applied to everyone, but it is unjustifiable and, in practice, adversely affects people with a protected characteristic who are less likely to comply with that condition or requirement.

Consider, for instance, a blanket ban on beards for health and safety reasons in a food packaging factory. If there is information that shows face masks could have been used satisfactorily to meet health and safety standards, then such a requirement would be unjustifiable, and it would amount to indirect discrimination against ethnic groups who have to keep a beard as a custom, such as Sikhs.

騷擾 Harassment

除了歧視，《殘疾歧視條例》和《種族歧視條例》亦分別禁止了針對殘疾和種族的「騷擾」行為。任何人如基於某人的殘疾／種族作出不受對方歡迎的行為，而一名合理的第三者在顧及所有情況後，亦預期該人會感到被冒犯、侮辱或威嚇，相關行為即構成殘疾／種族騷擾。

條例亦列明「適用範疇」，包括僱傭、教育、貨品、服務及設施的提供，以及處所的處置和管理等。教師把患有唐氏綜合症的學生喚作「白痴」、上司取笑某種族的下屬的口音等，均可能被視作「騷擾」行為。

Besides discrimination, the DDO and RDO outlaw harassment based on disability and race respectively. When a person engages in an unwelcome act on the ground of another person's disability or race, and a reasonable third person, having considered all relevant circumstances, would have anticipated that the person at whom the act is directed would be offended, humiliated or intimidated, then that act would, respectively, amount to disability or racial harassment.

The ordinances also specify the applicable fields, such as employment, education, provision of goods, services and facilities, and disposal and management of premises. Examples of possible harassment include a teacher calling a student with Down syndrome an idiot, and a supervisor making fun of the accent spoken by a subordinate of a certain race.



欲了解《性別歧視條例》下性騷擾的定義和相關的適用範疇，請參考平機會的「預防性騷擾資源庫」

Find out the definition of sexual harassment and the applicable fields under the SDO by accessing EOC's Anti-Sexual Harassment Resources



中傷 Vilification

此外，《殘疾歧視條例》和《種族歧視條例》進一步將「中傷」定為違法行為。如某人透過公開活動，針對某位（或某類）殘疾人士或基於某人的種族而煽動仇恨、嚴重的鄙視或強烈的嘲諷，即構成「中傷」。公開張貼嘲弄精神病患者的海報、在網上用粗言穢語指某種族的人士是社會負累，應被逐出香港等，均可構成「中傷」行為。

有別於歧視和騷擾，有關「中傷」的條文並沒有限定適用範疇。條例更指出，是否有人確實被煽動，並非衡量相關行為是否構成「中傷」的關鍵。

The DDO and RDO further prohibit vilification. A person commits vilification when s/he engages in a public activity and incites hatred, serious contempt or severe ridicule against a person with disability (or people with a certain type of disability), or a person on the ground of race. Examples of possible vilification include putting up a poster in public that ridicules people with mental illness, and using foul language on the Internet and saying that people of a certain race is a burden to society and should be banished from Hong Kong.

Unlike discrimination and harassment, the provisions outlawing vilification are not limited to a number of "applicable fields". The ordinances also state that in deciding whether an act constitutes vilification, it is immaterial whether a person is actually incited or not.

要準確評估某些言行是否構成歧視或其他違法行為，必先對法例有基本的了解。接下來的文章，將引用上述概念，深入分析新冠肺炎疫情引起的各種現象。

A fundamental grasp of the law is key to helping us assess whether certain remarks or behaviour amounts to discrimination or other kinds of unlawful acts. In the following article, you will be taken on an in-depth examination of the various phenomena arising from the COVID-19 pandemic, with the help of these important concepts.



我生意，我話事？ My business, my rules?

一間冰室、一張寫上不招待普通話客人的告示，觸發了一場有關「歧視」的爭議。

Debates about discrimination recently erupted over a local eatery, after it announced that it would stop serving Putonghua-speaking customers.

有人認定政府不全面封關造成防疫「漏洞」，民間出招「自救」乃無可厚非。另一邊廂，有港漂學者渴望化解對立、尋求對話，特意走進冰室用普通話點餐，又與店員分享投身本土社運的經歷，其後在網上發文細說事件經過，卻惹來「放蛇」、「離地」、「道德勒索」等批評。

有網民直言：「一個自由的地方，本來就有權選擇自己服務的受眾。」這無疑是對自由的徹底誤解。如一個地方容許巴士司機拒載與導盲犬同行的失明人士，或是餐廳拒絕招待少數族裔客人，這又是否一個「自由」和尊重平等的社會？人們免於歧視的自由，又有誰去捍衛？

事實上，香港現行的反歧視條例與不少普通法地區一樣，適用於「貨品、服務和設施提供」此範疇。即使在防疫的大前提下，服務提供者作出的措施也有恰當與不恰當之分。這篇文章旨在拆解各種迷思，從而讓讀者作出理性分析，建議讀者可先閱讀上文《香港反歧視條例：六個基本概念》，以建立對法例的基本認識。

同是華人，何來種族歧視？

Can racial discrimination occur between people of the same race, e.g. Chinese?

《種族歧視條例》從沒指出，作出歧視行為的人與被歧視的人必須是不同種族，才構成種族歧視。例如一位白人營運一間餐廳，拒絕接待白人顧客，卻歡迎非裔、亞裔等客人光顧；顯然，白人顧客相比其他種族的客人得到較差的待遇，餐廳營運者的行為因此構成直接的種族歧視。至於其種族是否與客人不同，完全不在考慮之列。

Those defending the move argue that since the Government did not shut down the city's borders completely, Hongkongers have been left to their own devices to contain the spread of the coronavirus. Meanwhile, in a bid to address the antagonism and seek genuine dialogue, a mainland-born scholar made the bold step of visiting the restaurant, ordering in Putonghua, and talking to the servers there about her participation in Hong Kong's social movements. When she blogged about the episode, however, she immediately drew flak, with some saying she had conducted what was essentially a "sting operation" while "sitting on a moral high horse".

One netizen, in particular, wrote, "In a land of freedom, people should be able to decide whom they serve." This, unfortunately, is a blatant misrepresentation of what freedom means. Think about a bus driver not letting a blind person with a guide dog get on the vehicle, or a restaurant turning away ethnic minority customers. A society that condones these acts is far from a land of freedom, because true freedom depends, amongst other things, on equality being upheld, on people being free from fear of discrimination.

As in many common law jurisdictions, the anti-discrimination ordinances in Hong Kong are applicable to the provision of goods, services and facilities. Even when aimed to keep the pandemic in check, measures taken by service providers may not be apt at times. This article seeks to dispel some of the most widespread myths around the matter and help readers approach the issue in a more informed manner. Those who wish to get a basic grasp of the law first are encouraged to read the preceding article, "Six things you should know about Hong Kong's anti-discrimination ordinances".

Nothing in the Race Discrimination Ordinance (RDO) suggests that for racial discrimination to occur, the perpetrator must be of a different race than the victim. An example: a shop owned by a Caucasian refuses to serve fellow Caucasians while opening its doors to Africans, Asians and people of other races. Obviously, Caucasians in this instance are being treated less favourably than customers of other races. The shop owner is committing an act of direct racial discrimination, regardless of whether he or she belongs to the same race as the customer being turned away.



不接待普通話客人，可構成種族歧視？

Why might banning Putonghua-speaking customers amount to racial discrimination?

在《種族歧視條例》下，「種族」是指某人的種族、膚色、世系、民族或人種，語言並不包括在內。然而，根據條例，當服務提供者向所有客人實施同一要求（例如客人一律不能說普通話），看似一視同仁，但實際上某種族的人（例如華人）相比其他種族，會因為較難符合該項要求而蒙受不利，相關做法仍可構成種族歧視。

這正正是「間接歧視」的概念（詳見本刊第一篇文章）。條例第4條第2款指出，間接歧視必須符合兩個條件，才會被視作「有理可據」而不違法：一、相關做法背後有著「合法的目的」；二、目的和做法之間，有著「合理和相稱的關連」。

簡而言之，不適當的手段，並不會因為背後有著正當的目的而忽然變得合理。服務提供者在推行防疫措施前，必須考慮兩個問題：這些措施是否真的與防疫有關係？店舖可否採取其他可行措施，避免一刀切地影響某些族群？

如服務提供者旨在避免接待來自內地的受感染人士，但卻一律拒絕招待所有說普通話的客人，在本港居民當中、以普通話作為第一語言的人士將同樣受到影響，因此該措施和其目的之間，難以稱得上有著「合理和相稱的關連」。再者，政府現已強制內地抵港人士接受14天檢疫，加上中國以外的地區均陸續出現確診個案，如服務提供者單單拒絕招待普通話客人，實在難以證明與防疫有著「合理和相稱的關連」，故有可能違反《種族歧視條例》。

Under the RDO, “race” may refer to the race, colour, descent, national or ethnic origin of a person. Although language is not included in the definition of race, racial discrimination may occur when a service provider imposes a requirement on customers (e.g. by not allowing customers to speak Putonghua) which, in practice, leads to the detriment of people of a certain race (e.g. ethnic Chinese) who are less likely to be able to meet that requirement than people of other races.

This is known as “indirect discrimination” (refer to the preceding article for details). According to Section 4(2) of the RDO, indirect discrimination is justifiable and lawful only when: (i) there is a legitimate objective; and (ii) the condition bears a rational and proportionate connection to the objective.

Put simply, the end does not always justify the means. When service providers take preventive measures against COVID-19, they must ask themselves two questions: Are the measures in fact relevant to the stated goal of blocking the spread of the virus? Are there any alternatives that wouldn’t affect a disproportionate number of people?

Even when a service provider aims to avoid serving infected persons visiting from mainland China and proceeds to ban all Putonghua-speaking customers, the fact remains that the ban would also affect those who are Hong Kong residents and speak Putonghua as their first language. Therefore, it would be extremely difficult to prove that there is a rational and proportionate connection between the measure and its stated objective. Moreover, considering the 14-day mandatory quarantine that now applies to arrivals from mainland China, and the COVID-19 cases that have sprung up in numerous countries and regions, it would again be far-fetched to say that a rational and proportionate connection exists between the objective of disease control and a ban targeted at Putonghua-speaking customers.

不接待新移民或內地人又是否違例？

How about banning customers who are new immigrants or mainland visitors?

拒絕招待新移民和來自內地的客人，又會否違反《種族歧視條例》？作判斷前，我們須明白，相關行為是分別針對客人的「居民身份」和「來源地」而作出的。現行的《種族歧視條例》所保障的特徵，並未包括「居民身份」和「來源地」（有關「受保障特徵」的概念，詳見本刊第一篇文章），因此相關行為目前不受條例規管。

必須留意的是，如服務提供者拒絕招待從內地來港的華人，但卻同時招待同樣從內地到港的其他族裔人士（如英裔、法裔等），相關行為就是基於種族、而非針對「來源地」所作出的差別性待遇，因此可構成違法的直接種族歧視。



Is it against the RDO to refuse to serve new immigrants and mainland visitors? To answer the question, one needs to be aware that such an act is targeted respectively at a person’s *residency status* and *place of origin*. Both are not among the protected characteristics under the RDO (refer to the preceding article for an introduction of the notion of “protected characteristic”). The act therefore does not fall under the RDO’s remit.

However, when a service provider turns away ethnic Chinese visitors from the mainland while serving visitors of other races (such as ethnic British and French) from the mainland, then it would be differential treatment based not on place of origin, but on race instead. It may amount to unlawful direct racial discrimination.

不接待內地人和醫護人員，竟可構成殘疾歧視？

Why might banning customers who are mainlanders and health care workers amount to disability discrimination?

根據《殘疾歧視條例》，「殘疾」定義甚廣，其中包括存於體內、可能引致疾病的有機體，例如病毒。條例更列明，「被認為存在」、「曾經存在」以至「未來可能存在」的殘疾均包括在內。換言之，如服務提供者猜測或認定某客人被病毒感染，進而基於此假設而作出歧視性行為，條例依然適用。

The Disability Discrimination Ordinance (DDO) defines disability broadly. It includes the presence of organisms in the body that can cause disease or illness, such as viruses. It also covers disability that “is imputed to a person”, “previously existed”, or “may exist in the future”. In other words, the DDO still applies when a service provider discriminates against a customer based on the speculation or perception that he or she has been infected with a virus.

的確，政府已根據《預防及控制疾病條例》（第599章）將「2019冠狀病毒病」納入「法定須呈報傳染病」，而《殘疾歧視條例》第61條亦豁免了針對傳染病而作出的行為，但該條文亦同時指出，有關行為必須以保障公眾健康為目的，更須屬於「合理地需要」的做法，才不會違法。

不論是商鋪、餐廳抑或酒店，如服務提供者假定所有內地人和醫護人員均被感染，並基於此假設，一律拒絕招待他們，即使做法以防疫為目的，亦可能不符合「合理地需要」的要求。鑑於政府已實施強制檢疫等防疫措施，若相關客人並非正在接受強制檢疫，拒絕服務他們未必是合理和必需的做法。

For sure, the Government has listed COVID-19 as a statutory notifiable infectious disease under the Prevention and Control of Disease Ordinance (Cap. 599). It is also true that Section 61 of the DDO states that the DDO does not apply to an act targeted at a person with an infectious disease. That section, however, also specifies that the act in question must be reasonably necessary for the purpose of protecting public health.

Whether it is a shop, a restaurant or a hotel, when a service provider assumes that all customers who are mainlanders or health care workers have been infected, and goes on to issue a blanket ban based on that assumption, it would be far-fetched to say that the measure is “reasonably necessary” despite its stated aim of containing the outbreak. Indeed, as the Government has implemented various containment measures, including issuing quarantine orders, it may not be reasonable and necessary to refuse service to a customer who is not under mandatory quarantine.

政府選擇性地對某些地區封關，難道不是種族歧視？

Is the Government committing racial discrimination when it bans arrivals from certain regions but not others?

目前，《種族歧視條例》的適用範疇，並不包括政府所行使的職權和職能（有關「適用範疇」的概念，詳見本刊第一篇文章）。此外，根據條例第55條，政府在應用任何有關出入境的法例時，如受影響人士本身沒有進入香港及在港逗留的權利，相關做法則不受《種族歧視條例》規管。

Currently, the RDO does not apply to the exercise of Government powers and functions (refer to the preceding article for an introduction of the notion of “applicable field”). Furthermore, according to Section 55 of the RDO, the ordinance does not affect the Government's application of any immigration legislation concerning persons who do not have the right to enter and remain in Hong Kong.

香港近年興起一句說話：「魔鬼在細節。」其實，真相也往往埋藏在細節當中。要衡量某些行為是否構成歧視，就必須認識法例、掌握事實，才能作出準確判斷。如單憑直覺說了算，甚至以訛傳訛，只會加深誤解、讓矛盾繼續滋長。誠然，疫症當前，保持個人衛生、減少社交接觸固然重要，但拒絕流言蜚語、將客觀事實還原，也是抗疫不可或缺的一環。

People often say that the devil is in the details. So is the truth. A clear grasp of the law and the facts is essential to a sound assessment of whether certain behaviour amounts to discrimination. Relying on our gut instinct or worse – trusting and spreading hearsay – would only further misunderstanding and disharmony. Indeed, if social distancing and personal hygiene are half of the battle against COVID-19, then the other half comes down to saying no to misinformation and honouring truth.



本港學校為了防疫已停課數月，但所謂「停課不停學」，不少老師利用科技繼續授課，使用 Zoom、Google Meet、Microsoft Teams 等遙距會議程式進行網上學習彷彿成為常規。然而，並非所有家庭都能負擔購置電腦的費用，或是安裝高速網路設備。科技面前，並非人人平等。

事實上，新冠病毒「大流行」揭露了社會上種種不平等的現象，貧富懸殊造成的「數碼鴻溝」只是其中之一。在疫情下，不少弱勢社群的處境較其他人更為艱難，但與此同時，亦有機構伸出援手，盡展關愛精神。

Online learning has become a norm for Hong Kong students lately, as schools suspend classes on campus to block the spread of the novel coronavirus. But as much as words like Zoom, Google Meet and Microsoft Teams – all names of video conferencing tools – have entered our everyday language, not everyone is able to enjoy the benefits of technology. For impoverished households, access to computers and high-speed Internet remains a luxury.

The truth is, the digital divide is only one of the many inequalities exposed by the pandemic. Turn over the page and find out why COVID-19 is dealing a harder blow to minorities in the city, and how others are helping.



少數族裔往往未能及時掌握最新疫情和相關資訊，問題源自官方發布的消息和防疫指引的翻譯有時並不完整或出現延誤。有非政府組織反映，即使部分新聞稿備有烏爾都語、印度語、尼泊爾語、泰文、他加祿語和印尼語等翻譯版本，內容卻含有大量生硬和技術性的詞彙，令人難以明白。

Ethnic minorities (EMs) struggle with access to information as translation of official news updates and guidelines on prevention tends to be incomplete or delayed. Even when translated into languages spoken by ethnic minority communities, such as Urdu, Hindi, Nepali, Thai, Tagalog and Bahasa Indonesia, some statements by the authorities have been described by NGOs as filled with formal and technical language, making it difficult for most to understand.

外籍家庭傭工被規定要與僱主同住，一旦僱主須接受強制家居檢疫，外傭又不能外宿，自然面對更高感染風險。此外，部分外傭希望在休息日外出，以匯款回鄉或與三兩知己共聚，但卻被僱主要求留在家中。

Foreign domestic workers (FDWs) whose employers are under home quarantine face heightened risk because of the “live-in” rule, while some want to go out on their day off to transfer money back home or meet friends, but are asked to stay in.



聽障人士利用手語溝通，而部分手語動作需接觸眼睛、鼻子或口部，如不保持手部衛生，或會引致病毒感染。此外，一些依靠讀唇來溝通的聽障人士，也因為口罩遮蓋了口鼻，令他們未能讀唇，在溝通上面對多一重障礙。

People with hearing difficulties, too, may be subject to a higher risk of infection as eye-, nose- and mouth-touching gestures are part of some sign languages. Communication gets even harder in an increasingly masked world where reading lips is impossible.

善用支援 共度時艱 Leverage these resources and stay strong together:

- 防疫短片和小貼士，備有少數族裔語言版本**
Videos and tips about precautionary measures in EM languages

香港融樂會
Hong Kong Unison
www.unison.org.hk

香港基督教服務處－融匯
Hong Kong Christian Service – CHEER
www.hkcscheer.net
- 就僱傭和出入境事宜為外傭提供協助的機構**
Assistance on employment and immigration issues facing FDWs:

家傭匡扶中心
HELP for Domestic Workers
www.helpfordomesticworkers.org

外勞事工中心
Mission for Migrant Workers
www.migrants.net

- 為聽障人士而設的疫情最新消息**
COVID-19 updates tailored for people with hearing difficulties

香港聾人福利促進會
Hong Kong Society for the Deaf
www.facebook.com/hksod
- 龍耳**
Silence
www.facebook.com/silence.deaf



視障人士依靠觸感如點字獲得資訊和確認位置，因此接觸到細菌和病毒的風險或較其他人高。部分人因擔心疫情不敢或不便外出，故未能搜羅和搶購口罩、搓手液等防疫物資；長者和行動不便人士亦面對同樣問題。

People with visual impairment rely on Braille and other tactile cues to obtain information and ascertain their location, which may make them more vulnerable to infection. Too worried to venture out of the apartment, they are often left behind in the city's rush on masks, hand sanitisers and other protective gear, a problem that also affects the elderly and people with mobility difficulty.

有特殊學習需要的兒童，例如有自閉症的小孩，或會因學校停課、需要適應網上學習而感到日常規律被打亂，變得焦躁和不安。隨著相關中心關閉或支援服務暫停，他們亦無法像平常一樣接受輔導和治療。

Children with special educational needs (SEN), such as those on the autism spectrum, may be upset or thrown off by disruptions to their routine as classes get suspended or go online. Also, they may not be able to see their counsellor or therapist as often as they need, once support centres shut down and services come to a halt.



照顧者需要照料因疫情而長期留在家中的小孩、長者或殘疾人士，承受著極大的壓力與疲勞。若僱主未有實施在家工作等彈性工作安排，對於有家庭責任的僱員而言，更是雪上加霜。

Carers are more stressed and tired than usual, as the family members they look after – whether they are children, elders or people with disabilities – spend more time at home amid Hong Kong's partial lockdown. Frustrations deepen when employers have not implemented homeworking or other flexible working arrangements.

- 視障人士支援熱線 — 瞳行抗疫一線通**
Hotline service for people with visual impairment

3723 8252 (星期一至六 Mon-Sat : 1100-2100 ; 星期日 Sun : 1000-1700)
5590 8863 (星期一至日 Mon-Sun : 1800-2100)
服務期至2020年5月31日 Available until 31 May 2020

由利希慎基金贊助、香港盲人輔導會、香港失明人協進會、路德會石硤尾失明者中心、香港視網膜病變協會及香港失明人互聯會輪流接聽

Funded by Lee Hysan Foundation and operated by Hong Kong Society for the Blind, Hong Kong Blind Union, Shek Kip Mei Lutheran Centre for the Blind, Retina Hong Kong and Hong Kong Federation of the Blind

- 與SEN兒童一起抗疫指南**
Guides to helping children with SEN get through life amid COVID-19:

協康會
Heep Hong Society
www.heephong.org/tools-and-resources/fight-virus-with-sen (Chinese only)
- 居家親子活動靈感**
Activity ideas for children staying at home

保良局學生輔導服務
Po Leung Kuk Student Guidance Services
www.facebook.com/plksgs (Chinese only)



簽署約章，與100+間機構攜手推動種族共融
Join these 100+ pioneering organisations by signing the Charter

