

**Motion to be moved by Hon YUNG Hoi-yan
under Rule 49B(1A) of the Rules of Procedure
to censure Hon Claudia MO**

Wording of the Motion

That this Council, in accordance with Article 79(7) of the Basic Law, censures Hon Claudia MO for misbehaviour (details as particularized in the Schedule to this motion).

Schedule

Details of Hon Claudia MO's misbehaviour are particularized as follows:

1. At the meeting of the Panel on Security of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") on 3 December 2019, Hon Claudia MO said that Hon YUNG Hoi-yan should withdraw her candidacy for the post of Deputy Chairman of the Panel as she would soon take maternity leave. The pretext given by Ms MO was to allow Ms YUNG sufficient time to take rest after giving birth and she further insulted Ms YUNG by saying that her IQ was low.

2. According to section 5(1) of the Sex Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 480) on sex discrimination against women, "[a] person discriminates against a woman in any circumstances relevant for the purposes of any provision of this Ordinance if—
 - (a) on the ground of her sex he treats her less favourably than he treats or would treat a man; or
 - (b) he applies to her a requirement or condition which he applies or would apply equally to a man but—
 - ...
 - (iii) which is to her detriment because she cannot comply with it."

3. According to section 8 of the Sex Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 480) on discrimination against pregnant women, "[a] person discriminates against a woman in any circumstances relevant for the purposes of any provision of Part 3 or 4 if—
 - (a) on the ground of her pregnancy he treats her less favourably than he treats or would treat a person who is not pregnant; or
 - (b) he applies to her a requirement or condition which he applies or would apply to a person who is not pregnant but—
 - ...
 - (ii) which he cannot show to be justifiable irrespective of whether or not the person to whom it is applied is pregnant; and
 - (iii) which is to her detriment because she cannot comply with it."

4. According to Section 5 of the Family Status Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 527) on discrimination against a person who has family status, “[a] person discriminates against a person who has family status in any circumstances relevant for the purposes of any provision of this Ordinance if—
 - (a) on the ground of the second-mentioned person’s family status or that person’s particular family status (*the relevant family status*) he treats that person less favourably than he treats or would treat another person who does not have family status or the relevant family status, as the case may be;...
5. The Sex Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 480) seeks to prohibit discrimination on the ground of sex, marital status or pregnancy while the Family Status Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 527) prohibits discrimination on the ground of family status.
6. Hon Claudia MO’s remarks have misled other LegCo Members and the public to think that Hon YUNG Hoi-yan is incapable of performing her duties and/or her capability at work will be undermined by her pregnancy and childbirth. She even intended to deprive Ms YUNG of her equal opportunity to stand for election as the Deputy Chairman of the Panel and of her right to participate in politics and LegCo business. Ms MO’s remarks clearly reflect that working women are still subject to a certain degree of discrimination due to pregnancy or the likelihood of getting pregnant in future. Had she not been covered by immunity from legal proceedings under the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance (Cap. 382), she could have been prosecuted for making remarks violating the Sex Discrimination Ordinance and the Family Status Discrimination Ordinance.
7. Hon Claudia MO, being a LegCo Member and a mother, is not only biased against a pregnant LegCo Member, but has even made insulting remarks at her, expressing explicit discrimination against pregnant women and showing no basic respect for women. Moreover, Ms MO’s further personal attack and insulting remarks against Hon YUNG Hoi-yan have set a very bad example to the public, and are contrary to the assumed standard of conduct expected of a LegCo Member and constitute misbehaviour under Article 79(7) of the Basic Law.