

立法會  
*Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(3)632/05-06

**Paper for the House Committee meeting  
on 16 June 2006**

**Questions scheduled for the  
Legislative Council meeting on 21 June 2006**

Questions by:

- |      |   |                 |                                   |
|------|---|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| (1)  | Hon Martin LEE  | (Oral reply)    |                                   |
| (2)  | Hon LEE Wing-tat<br><i>(Replacing his previous question)</i>    | (Oral reply)    | (New question)                    |
| (3)  | Hon SIN Chung-kai   | (Oral reply)    | (Original No: 4)                  |
| (4)  | Hon WONG Kwok-hing<br><i>(Replacing his previous question)</i>  | (Oral reply)    | (New question;<br>Original No: 5) |
| (5)  | Hon Frederick FUNG  | (Oral reply)    | (Original No: 6)                  |
| (6)  | Hon Ronny TONG  | (Oral reply)    | (Original No: 3)                  |
| (7)  | Hon LEE Cheuk-yan   | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (8)  | Hon CHAN Yuen-han   | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (9)  | Hon Andrew CHENG  | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (10) | Hon Howard YOUNG  | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (11) | Hon LI Kwok-ying  | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (12) | Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO  | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (13) | Hon Emily LAU   | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (14) | Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung<br><i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | (Written reply) | (New question)                    |
| (15) | Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki<br><i>(Replacing his previous question)</i>   | (Written reply) | (New question)                    |
| (16) | Hon CHOY So-yuk   | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (17) | Hon LAU Kong-wah  | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (18) | Hon Albert CHAN   | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (19) | Dr Hon Joseph LEE   | (Written reply) |                                   |
| (20) | Hon Martin LEE  | (Written reply) |                                   |

註 :

NOTE :

# 議員將採用這種語言提出質詢

# Member will ask the question in this language

#(2) 李永達議員 (口頭答覆)

本人收到市民多次投訴，指葵芳圍的食肆擴展營業範圍造成環境衛生和噪音問題。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 當局有沒有准許葵芳圍任何食肆的持牌人在其持牌食肆處所範圍以外的地方營業；
- (二) 食物環境衛生署去年對全港未經准許而擴展營業範圍的食肆持牌人提出的檢控數目，當中分別有多少個食肆牌照因而被暫時或永久吊銷；及
- (三) 鑒於現行法例規定，對未經准許而擴展營業範圍的食肆持牌人可施加的最高懲處為罰款 1 萬元及監禁 3 個月，政府有沒有考慮修訂法例，提高罰則以加強其阻嚇性；若有，考慮的詳情是甚麼；若沒有，原因是甚麼？

(2) Hon LEE Wing-tat (Oral Reply)

I have received repeated complaints from members of the public that the extension of food business by some food premises in Kwai Fong Circuit has led to environmental hygiene and noise nuisance problems. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the authorities have permitted any licensees of the food premises in Kwai Fong Circuit to conduct business at places beyond the confines of the licensed food premises;
- (b) of the number of prosecutions instituted by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department last year against licensees of food premises in Hong Kong for unauthorized extension of food business, and the respective numbers of food business licences suspended and revoked as a result of such prosecutions; and
- (c) as under the existing legislation, licensees of food premises convicted of unauthorized extension of food business are subject to a maximum fine of \$10,000 and imprisonment for three months, whether it will consider amending the relevant legislation to enhance its deterrent effect by imposing a heavier penalty; if so, of the details of its consideration; if not, the reasons for that?

#(4) 王國興議員 (口頭答覆)

現時女性僱員享有法定產假，但男性僱員卻沒有法定侍產假。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 會不會研究不立法設立有薪侍產假，是否構成家庭崗位歧視；若會，將於何時進行研究；若不會，原因是甚麼；
- (二) 會不會研究立法設立有薪侍產假對社會、經濟、鼓勵生育及私人機構等方面的效益和影響；若會，將於何時進行研究；若不會，原因是甚麼；及
- (三) 已立法設立有薪侍產假的國家的名單、向僱員提供有薪侍產假的本地私人機構數目，以及會不會考慮為公務員提供有薪侍產假？

(4) Hon WONG Kwok-hing (Oral Reply)

At present, female employees are entitled to statutory maternity leave while male employees are not entitled to statutory paternity leave. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it will study if the failure to legislate for paid paternity leave constitutes family status discrimination; if so, when such a study will be conducted; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) whether it will study the implications and benefits of legislating for paid paternity leave on society, economy, promotion of childbirth, and private organizations, etc; if so, when the study will be conducted; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) of the list of countries which have legislated for paid paternity leave, the number of local organizations in the private sector which grant paid paternity leave to their employees, and whether it will consider offering paid paternity leave to civil servants?

#(14) 梁耀忠議員 (書面答覆)

近年有多間小學因就讀學生人數不足而停辦，但當局仍計劃興建多所新校舍。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 按學校分區劃分，在過去 5 年及未來 5 年，每年適齡入讀小一及中一的兒童人數、已經或將會停辦的學校數目，以及已經或將會興建的校舍數目；
- (二) 有否評估在過去 3 年，每年因停辦學校的校舍空置和教學器材閒置浪費了多少資源；
- (三) 為減少浪費資源，會否重新考慮首先在適齡入學兒童人數持續下降的地區推行小班教學；若否，原因為何；及
- (四) 會否考慮暫停興建新校舍；若否，原因為何？

(14) Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung (Written Reply)

In recent years, quite a number of primary schools have ceased operation due to insufficient intakes, but there are still plans to build a number of new school premises. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the respective numbers of school-aged children for primary one and secondary one, the number of schools which ceased or will cease operation, and the number of school premises which were or will be built, in each of the past and next five years, broken down by school zones;
- (b) whether it has assessed the amount of resources that were wasted in each of the past three years as a result of school premises being left vacant and teaching equipment laying idle following the cessation of operation of schools;
- (c) whether, in order to reduce wastage, it will reconsider introducing small class teaching first in the districts with an decreasing number of school-aged children; if not, of the reasons for that; and
- (d) whether it will consider suspending the construction of new school premises; if not, of the reasons for that?

#(15) 郭家麒議員 (書面答覆)

據報，消費者委員會接獲有關水療服務的投訴近年有所增加，亦有英國機構發表報告，警告浸浴水療可能會嚴重損害身體健康，最大的危險是可能患上退伍軍人症。然而，大量水療及按摩服務的廣告仍在報章雜誌刊登。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去 3 年內，在本港提供水療及按摩服務的美容中心或其他機構的數目；
- (二) 當局現時如何規管該等服務，以及有關規管與對桑拿浴室及按摩院的規管有何分別；及
- (三) 會否考慮立法監管水療及按摩服務，包括監測水質及通風系統等環境衛生情況，以保障消費者及員工健康？

(15) Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki (Written Reply)

It is reported that the number of complaints received by the Consumer Council about spa treatments has been on the rise in recent years, and a British organization has released a report warning that spa may cause serious harm to health, with the greatest hazard of possible contraction of Legionnaire's disease. However, numerous advertisements on the spa treatment and massage services are still found in newspapers and magazines. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of beauty centres or other organizations which provide spa treatment and massage services in Hong Kong in the past three years;
- (b) of how such services are regulated and the differences between such regulation and those on sauna rooms and massage establishments; and
- (c) whether it will consider enacting legislation to regulate spa treatment and massage services, including monitoring the environmental hygiene conditions, such as water quality and ventilation, in order to protect the health of consumers and employees?