

立法會 *Legislative Council*

立法會CB(3)700/08-09號文件

2009年6月19日內務委員會會議文件

定於2009年6月24日立法會會議上提出的質詢

提問者：

- | | | | |
|------|---------------------|--------|--------|
| (1) | 譚偉豪議員 | (口頭答覆) | |
| (2) | 葉國謙議員 | (口頭答覆) | (新的質詢) |
| | <i>(取代其原先提出的質詢)</i> | | |
| (3) | 何秀蘭議員 | (口頭答覆) | |
| (4) | 譚耀宗議員 | (口頭答覆) | |
| (5) | 甘乃威議員 | (口頭答覆) | (新的質詢) |
| | <i>(取代其原先提出的質詢)</i> | | |
| (6) | 李慧琼議員 | (口頭答覆) | (新的質詢) |
| | <i>(取代其原先提出的質詢)</i> | | |
| (7) | 陳健波議員 | (書面答覆) | (新的質詢) |
| | <i>(取代其原先提出的質詢)</i> | | |
| (8) | 何鍾泰議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (9) | 鄭家富議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (10) | 李華明議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (11) | 梁國雄議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (12) | 李國寶議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (13) | 黃成智議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (14) | 劉健儀議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (15) | 余若薇議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (16) | 石禮謙議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (17) | 張學明議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (18) | 陳偉業議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (19) | 李國麟議員 | (書面答覆) | |
| (20) | 林大輝議員 | (書面答覆) | (新的質詢) |
| | <i>(取代其原先提出的質詢)</i> | | |

註 :

NOTE :

議員將採用這種語言提出質詢

Member will ask the question in this language

推動街頭表演

(2) 葉國謙議員 (口頭答覆)

根據《簡易程序治罪條例》，任何人在公眾地方進行任何遊戲，以致在該處造成阻礙或形成喧鬧的集會，即屬違法。有不少市民向本人反映，該條例窒礙了不少有特色的街頭表演。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去3年，當局曾根據甚麼具體原因阻止街頭表演；及
- (二) 會否重新考慮與各區議會合作，由區議會負責統籌推行街頭表演專區試驗計劃，在全港合適的地區劃出地點供街頭表演之用；若會，詳情如何？

Promotion of street performances

(2) Hon IP Kwok-him (Oral Reply)

Under the Summary Offences Ordinance, it is an offence for any person who plays at any game in any public place, so as to obstruct the same or create a noisy assembly therein. Quite a number of members of the public have relayed to me that the Ordinance has hampered the staging of many distinctive street performances. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the specific reasons for which the authorities had disallowed the staging of street performances in the past three years; and
- (b) whether it will reconsider cooperating with the District Councils and entrusting the latter the responsibility to coordinate the implementation of a pilot scheme on designated zones for street performances, whereby locations in suitable areas across the territory are assigned for staging street performances; if it will, of the details?

七一遊行

(5) 甘乃威議員 (口頭答覆)

過去數年，每年七月一日都有數以萬計的市民參加遊行。下星期三的七月一日，本人預計將會有更多市民參加遊行，宣洩對政府缺乏誠意推行普選和多項施政失誤的不滿。另外，有政黨向有關的政府部門申請在銅鑼灣百德新街及旺角行人專用區設置攤位對是次遊行進行宣傳活動，卻遭拒絕。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 有否就不會推行2012年雙普選和過去多項施政失誤進行反省，尋找導致每年這麼多市民上街遊行的原因；若有反省，結果為何；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 今年要有多少市民上街遊行，政府才不會拒絕市民盡快落實2012年雙普選的要求，以及才會處理上街市民對政府施政的不滿；及
- (三) 當局最近拒絕政黨在行人專用區舉辦七一遊行的宣傳活動的申請，是否為了減少七一遊行的人數？

Marches on 1 July

(5) Hon KAM Nai-wai (Oral Reply)

Tens of thousands of people took part in the march on 1 July in each of the past several years. I expect that more people will participate in the march on the coming 1 July, i.e. next Wednesday, to express their dissatisfaction with the Government's lack of sincerity to implement universal suffrage and its various blunders in implementing policies. On the other hand, the applications by some political parties to the relevant government departments to set up pitches at the pedestrian precincts on Paterson Street in Causeway Bay and Mong Kok to promote the march have been rejected. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it has reflected on its refusal to implement dual universal suffrage in 2012 and its various blunders in implementing policies to find out the causes for so many people taking to the street to participate in the march each year; if it has, of the outcome; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) how many participants in this year's march are required to make the Government not to refuse the public's demand for expeditiously implementing dual universal suffrage in 2012 and to address their dissatisfaction with its blunders in implementing policies; and
- (c) whether the authorities' recent rejection of the applications by political parties for organizing promotional activities at pedestrian precincts for the 1 July march is an attempt to reduce the number of participants in the march?

重置油麻地果欄

(6) 李慧琼議員 (口頭答覆)

2007年4月審計署署長第四十八號報告書批評政府當局的重置油麻地果欄計劃由1969年決定至今仍未落實。多年來油麻地果欄每日通宵運作，對鄰近居民及駕車人士造成嚴重的交通和環境滋擾(尤其是噪音)。通過本屆油尖旺區議會轄下關注油麻地果欄工作小組的努力，區議會與鮮果欄商的分歧基本上已消除，業界代表亦於一年前明確表示願意有條件搬遷。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 展開談判及協商；若有，談判何時進行，現時進展如何；若沒有，原因為何；食物及衛生局是否已按在2008年1月向本會政府帳目委員會提交的“遷置油麻地果欄的暫定時間表”展開有關工作；若已展開工作，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 對於水果批發業界近年多次提出在新建之水果批發中心內，打造全球鮮果貿易中心的建議，發展局和商務及經濟發展局是否已展開研究；會否於重置油麻地果欄時一併協商、配套及發展；若會，詳情為何；若不會，原因為何；及
- (三) 對於現時油麻地區由晚上9時至早上8時，因果欄運作引致的噪音滋擾以及路面被佔用情況嚴重，有關的政府部門有何對策及其詳情，以及該等部門如何遏止這些違法行為擴散到其他地段？

Relocation of Yau Ma Tei Fruit Market

(6) Hon Starry LEE Wai-king (Oral Reply)

Report No. 48 of the Director of Audit published in April 2007 criticized the authorities that so far they had not implemented the plan to relocate the Yau Ma Tei (“YMT”) Fruit Market which was decided in 1969. For many years, the YMT Fruit Market is operating all night every day, causing serious traffic and environmental nuisances (especially that of noise) to the residents and drivers in the vicinity. Through the efforts of the Working Group on Concern for the Yau Ma Tei Fruit Market under the current Yau Tsim Mong District Council, the differences between the District Council and fruit traders has basically been resolved. The trade representatives also indicated clearly a year ago that they agreed to move out conditionally. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the Government has commenced negotiation and discussion with Kowloon Fruit and Vegetable Merchants Association Limited since the latter indicated its willingness to move out; if it has, when such negotiation was conducted and the present progress; if not, the reasons for that; whether the Food and Health Bureau has commenced the relevant work in accordance with the “Indicative Timetable for Relocating the YMT Fruit Market” submitted to the Public Accounts Committee of this Council in January 2008; if it has commenced work, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) whether the Development Bureau and the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau have commenced a study on the proposal to create a global fresh fruit trading centre in the new fruit wholesale centre, which has been put forward several times in recent years by the fruit wholesale

trade; whether this will be discussed, facilitated and developed in the context of the relocation of the YMT Fruit Market; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

- (c) regarding the present grave situation of noise nuisance and obstruction of roads due to the operation of the fruit market between 9:00 pm and 8:00 am in Yau Ma Tei District, what solutions the government departments concerned have and their details, and how the departments curb the spread of such illegal acts to other lots?

為保險及金融業提供援助

(7) 陳健波議員 (書面答覆)

面對金融海嘯的影響，保險與金融業首當其衝受到嚴重打擊。保險業監理處公布的臨時統計數字顯示，2009年首季新造長期業務(不包括退休計劃業務)的保單保費與2008年同期比較顯著下降60.5%至85.44億元，主要原因是個人人壽及年金(非投資相連)業務的新造保單保費及個人人壽及年金(投資相連)業務的新造保單保費分別大跌24.2%及83.5%。事實上，保險與金融行業中不少中層管理和前線銷售人員的收入已經大不如前，甚至失業，加上雷曼兄弟事件加重市民對投資產品的戒心，不少從業員正面臨結構性失業的危機。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 會否採取措施提高市民對保險與金融業的信心，以鞏固香港作為亞洲金融中心的地位；若有，內容為何；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 會否向保險與金融業從業員提供具體的支援，從而協助他們走出經濟困局；及
- (三) 可否盡快成立“保單持有人保障基金”，以穩定市場和激發市民投保的意欲？

Assistance for insurance and finance sectors

(7) Hon CHAN Kin-por (Written Reply)

In the face of the impact of the financial tsunami, the insurance and finance sectors have been the first to be dealt a serious blow. According to the provisional statistics released by the Office of the Commissioner of Insurance, new office premiums (excluding Retirement Scheme business) of long-term business for the first quarter of 2009 receded significantly by 60.5% to \$8.544 billion when compared with the same period in 2008, which was attributable to 24.2% and 83.5% drop in Individual Life and Annuity (Non-Linked) business and Individual Life and Annuity (Linked) business respectively. In fact, many middle-level management and frontline sales staff of the insurance and finance sectors have suffered significant drop in income, or even lost their jobs. In addition, as the Lehman Brothers incident has raised people's skepticism over investment products, many employees in the sectors are facing the threat of structural unemployment. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council whether:

- (a) it will take measures to enhance the public's confidence in the insurance and finance sectors, in order to consolidate Hong Kong's status as an Asian financial centre; if it will, of the contents of such measures, if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) it will provide specific assistance for employees in the insurance and finance sectors to help them out of the economic mire; and
- (c) it is possible to establish "policyholders' protect funds" expeditiously in order to stabilize the market and stimulate the public's desire to take out insurance?

對本地參展商的經濟支援

(20) 林大輝議員 (書面答覆)

本人接獲珠寶業人士的投訴，指有展覽會舉辦商(“展辦商”)在香港會議展覽中心(“會展中心”)舉行的展覽會所收取的參展費，比香港貿易發展局(“貿發局”)主辦的同類型展覽會高出超過四成。在金融海嘯令本港出口貿易數字大減的嚴峻經濟形勢下，參展費不減反加，不但大大增加業界的營運成本，令中小型企業(“中小企”)經營困難和窒礙行業發展，亦削弱本港展覽業的競爭力。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 現時以各種形式向本地參展商就參展費用提供的資助的詳情為何；
- (二) 過去5年，有否進行研究或統計，比較貿發局與私營展辦商在會展中心舉行同類型的展覽會時收取的參展費相差多少，以及有關的差別的原因為何；
- (三) 鑒於會展中心一期及二期中庭通道的擴建工程已完成，是否知悉貿發局與香港會議展覽中心(管理)有限公司(“會展管理公司”)有否為該擴建工程而修訂於1997年簽訂的經營及管理合約；如果有，詳情為何；如果沒有，原因為何；
- (四) 鑒於根據上述合約的規定，會展管理公司每年須以會展中心整體運作的毛利收入，按照規定的百分率向貿發局支付費用，以及在2003年7月1日以後，會展管理公司每年須向貿發局繳付8.634%的毛利收入，是否知悉，這百分率現時有否改變；如果有，原因為何；如果沒有，原因為何；

- (五) 是否知悉在過去5年，會展管理公司向貿發局繳付第(四)項所述的年費的金額，以及該筆款項的用途；
- (六) 會否考慮要求貿發局將第(五)項所述的該筆款項用作資助本港中小企繳付參展費，以實質支援會展業務的發展；如果不會考慮，原因為何；
- (七) 是否知悉，貿發局有否定期就會展管理公司的服務表現作出評估；如果有，評估的結果、準則及機制為何；如果沒有，原因為何；評估是不是由一個有獨立人士或業界代表參與的評審委員會進行；如果是，委員會成員的名單；如果不是，原因為何；
- (八) 鑒於貿發局現時向本地及海外公司收取同等的參展費用，政府如何有效地協助本港中小企降低參展成本；會否進一步考慮給予本地中小企其他有關的優惠；如果會，詳情為何；如果不會，原因為何；
- (九) 是否知悉，貿發局有否要求會展管理公司與展辦商在簽訂租用場地合約時，須加入給予本港中小企任何形式的優惠的條款；會否設立展覽會收費及服務水平的投訴機制，並以此作為日後是否向展辦商租出場地的考慮因素；如果會，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；及
- (十) 是否知悉，會展管理公司在執行場地租用政策時的詳細考慮因素；優先預留場地給定期在同一時段申請舉辦展覽的展辦商的原因；會展管理公司有否評估該優先預留場地租用政策會否造成壟斷的情況；如果評估結果為有壟斷，會否引入公平競爭的場地租用政策；如果評估結果為沒有，原因為何？

Financial assistance for local exhibitors

(20) Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai (Written Reply)

I have received complaints from people of the jewelry industry that the exhibition fees charged by some exhibition organizers for exhibitions held at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (“HKCEC”) are more than 40% higher than those charged for exhibitions of the same type organized by the Hong Kong Trade Development Council (“HKTDC”). Under the critical economic situation caused by the plunge in local export trade as a result of the financial tsunami, the increase in exhibition fees, instead of decrease, not only substantially increases the operating costs of the industry, which leads to difficulties in the operations of small and medium enterprises (“SMEs”) and hinders the development of the industry, but also weakens the competitiveness of the exhibition industry in Hong Kong. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the details of the various forms of subsidies for exhibition fees currently provided to local exhibitors;
- (b) whether in the past five years, it had conducted studies or compiled statistics to compare the differences between the exhibition fees charged by HKTDC and those by private exhibition organizers for exhibitions of the same type held at HKCEC; and the reasons for the relevant differences;
- (c) given the completion of the extension project of the atrium link between Phases I and II of HKCEC, whether it knows if HKTDC and the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (Management) Limited (“HKCEC (Management) Limited”) has revised, in the light of the extension project, the

operation and management contract signed in 1997; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

- (d) given that according to the provisions of the aforesaid contract, the HKCEC (Management) Limited shall pay HKTDC a fee calculated at a prescribed percentage of the gross revenue from the overall operations of HKCEC each year, and the HKCEC (Management) Limited shall, with effect from 1 July 2003, pay HKTDC each year a fee calculated at 8.634% of the gross revenue, whether it knows if that percentage has now changed; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (e) whether it knows the amount of the annual fee, as mentioned in (d), paid by the HKCEC (Management) Limited to HKTDC in the past five years, and the use of such funds;
- (f) whether it will consider requesting HKTDC to use the funds in (e) to subsidize SMEs in Hong Kong to pay for exhibition fees, so as to give material support to the development of exhibition businesses; if it will not, of the reasons for that;
- (g) whether it knows if HKTDC has regularly assessed the performance of the HKCEC (Management) Limited; if it has, of the outcome, the criteria and mechanism of the assessments; if not, the reasons for that; whether the assessments are conducted by an assessment committee with the participation of independent members or trade representatives; if so, of the membership list of the committee; if not, the reasons for that;
- (h) given that HKTDC is currently charging local and overseas companies the same exhibition fees, how the Government effectively assists SMEs in Hong Kong in reducing exhibition costs; whether it will further consider giving other relevant concessions to

local SMEs; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

- (i) whether it knows if HKTDC has requested the HKCEC (Management) Limited to add clauses to the venue hiring contracts entered into with exhibition organizers provisions on any form of concessions to SMEs in Hong Kong; whether it will set up a complaint mechanism in respect of the fees and service levels of exhibitions, and take this into account in considering whether or not the exhibition organizers may hire the venues in the future; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (j) whether it knows the detailed considerations of the HKCEC (Management) Limited in implementing its venue hiring policies; of the reasons for giving priority in venue hiring to exhibition organizers which regularly apply for organizing exhibitions in the same time slots; whether the HKCEC (Management) Limited has assessed if the policy of giving priority in venue hiring will give rise to monopoly; if the assessment result is that monopoly exists, whether it will introduce a fair competition policy in venue hiring; if the assessment result is in the negative, of the reasons for that?