

To : Equal Opportunities Commission
Mailing Address : 19/F., Cityplaza Three,
14 Taikoo Wan Road,
Taikoo Shing, Hong Kong
Tel : (852) 2511 8211
Fax : (852) 2511 8142
Email : eoc@eoc.org.hk
From : S. M. Wong,UM-Bloggers and all Undersigned Persons
Date : 31.10.2014
Subject : **Opinion on the Discrimination Law Review (DLR).**

Opinion on the Discrimination Law Review (DLR).

Submitted by:
S. M. Wong, UM-Bloggers and all Undersigned Persons
<<http://blog.um-gallery.net>>
31/10/2014

I strongly object the opinions revealed in the captioned review for the following reasons:

1. The principles as stated in the consultation paper is misleading as equality and anti-discrimination are apparently self-evident ethical principles which are hardly to be rebutted. but the very nature of the review is to provide an unjust and inequitable preferential benefits to the intended social groups which in the end cause reversal discrimination to all ordinary people. It should be noted that equality alone is not the same as equal opportunity as the mission assigned to your commission; the pursuit of equality without considering other factors may thus violate the principles of justice and equitability. However, in the consultation paper, equality and equitability are deliberately confused.
2. The consultation paper claims that the captioned review is intended to modernize the ordinance so as to cope with the social development. Again, the social development mentioned in the document probably referred to the law reform for the recognition of some extraordinary behavioral pattern of some people in the western societies, such as the special sex orientation and non-marital sexual relations among two or more persons. However, the proposition totally neglects the fact that the cited reform is even controversial in western world as its ethical implication violates the main stream religious thoughts prevailing in their societies. Back to our city, I definitely believe that the proposed reform will violate the traditional ethical value and all religious thought of Chinese society.
3. I accept that we should offer adequate protection to people who have a different living style or behavioral pattern for whatever reason supposing that their behavior causes no harm to other people. It is good enough to remove all criminal liabilities against their harmless behavior but I deem that the proposed law reform will in the contrary adversely harm and offend the majority in the society in the light that it offers over-protection to the intended social groups and seemingly promotes their living style and behavioral pattern.
4. The prevailing law has already provided legal convenient means for rectifying de facto marriage arising from justifiable reasons including losing documents or likewise. It is not necessary to formally rectify the sexual relationship in the legal framework in the current context. The existence of non-marital sexual relationship in some jurisdictions may be caused by a lot of reasons such as tax avoidance or inheritance of property.
5. The inclusion of sexual relationships other than the conventional definition of monogamy into marriage is a breach of the ethical value of the majority in our society. Such alteration also fundamentally change the micro-structure of our society which will in turn create a lot of nuisances to the social life of ordinary people and cause many loop holes in our legal framework regarding social welfare and housing policy. The proposed review confuses the concept of adequate protection for minority with preferential benefits for privileged groups at the sacrifice of the interest of majority and actually violate the principle of proportionality.

In the last two decades, too many changes of old laws and making of new laws have been initiated under the flag of modernization and universal value which only reflect the value of western culture without any concern about the local context. I appeal to your reputable commission to suspend the said review until all people have discussed the issue thoroughly and arrived at consensus or, at least, the consent of majority.

Undersigned