

# 立法會 *Legislative Council*

立法會CB(3) 339/09-10號文件

## 2010年1月15日內務委員會會議文件

### 定於2010年1月20日立法會會議上提出的質詢

提問者：

- |      |                       |        |        |
|------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
| (1)  | 葉國謙議員<br>(取代其原先提出的質詢) | (口頭答覆) | (新的質詢) |
| (2)  | 鄭家富議員                 | (口頭答覆) |        |
| (3)  | 黃定光議員                 | (口頭答覆) |        |
| (4)  | 梁家傑議員                 | (口頭答覆) |        |
| (5)  | 李永達議員                 | (口頭答覆) |        |
| (6)  | 林大輝議員                 | (口頭答覆) |        |
| (7)  | 劉皇發議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (8)  | 黃成智議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (9)  | 潘佩璆議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (10) | 張學明議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (11) | 劉健儀議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (12) | 李慧琼議員<br>(取代其原先提出的質詢) | (書面答覆) | (新的質詢) |
| (13) | 梁國雄議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (14) | 謝偉俊議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (15) | 余若薇議員<br>(取代其原先提出的質詢) | (書面答覆) | (新的質詢) |
| (16) | 甘乃威議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (17) | 陳淑莊議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (18) | 葉劉淑儀議員                | (書面答覆) |        |
| (19) | 陳偉業議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |
| (20) | 劉慧卿議員                 | (書面答覆) |        |

註 :

NOTE :

# 議員將採用這種語言提出質詢

# Member will ask the question in this language

## 公務員的中文水平入職要求

### # (1) 葉國謙議員 (口頭答覆)

現時，大部分公務員職位的入職要求規定申請人必須達到中文及英文水平的要求。有不少南亞裔的本港永久性居民向本人反映，他們因未能符合中文水平的要求而不獲聘任為公務員。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 最近3年，投考初級、中級及高級公務員職位空缺的人士當中，分別獲得聘任及不獲聘任的南亞裔本港永久性居民的分項人數；
- (二) 第(一)項的南亞裔永久性居民有否純粹因其中文水平未達入職要求而不獲聘任；若否，他們不獲聘任的原因為何；及
- (三) 自回歸以後，政府就各級公務員(包括外籍公務員)的中文水平入職要求作出的修訂詳情為何？

Chinese language proficiency requirements  
for entry to the civil service

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

At present, the appointment requirements for most civil service posts stipulate that the applicants must meet the Chinese and English language proficiency requirements. Quite a number of Hong Kong permanent residents who are South Asians have relayed to me that they were not offered appointment to the civil service because they failed to meet the Chinese language proficiency requirements. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) among those persons applying for civil service vacancies at junior, middle and senior ranks in the recent three years, of the respective numbers of Hong Kong permanent residents of South Asian descent who had been appointed and rejected;
- (b) whether any of the permanent residents of South Asian descent in (a) were not appointed solely because their Chinese language proficiency did not meet the appointment requirements; if not, of the reasons why they were not appointed; and
- (c) of the details of the amendments made by the Government since the reunification in respect of the Chinese language proficiency requirements for appointment as civil servants (including expatriate civil servants) at different levels?

## 沙田至中環線

### # (12) 李慧琼議員 (書面答覆)

香港鐵路有限公司(“港鐵公司”)於去年5月21日向九龍城區議會發出沙田至中環線(“沙中線”)工程有關九龍城段的諮詢文件，建議在啟德發展區內設置臨時支援工地(“支援工地”)。支援工地的面積預計約20公頃，將用作儲存物料及設置混凝土配料、攪拌設備和碎石機。有不少在該擬議支援工地附近(翔龍灣、傲雲峰及偉恒昌新村等)的居民向本人反映，他們擔心支援工地的面積過大及設施貼近民居，將引起嚴重的噪音、空氣及交通滋擾，影響他們的生活。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 上述支援工地內各項設施的安排詳情為何；
- (二) 鑒於政府及港鐵公司已委托環境顧問就上述沙中線工程及其相關臨時設施的設置及運作進行詳細的環境影響評估，何時完成評估報告，以及公開報告內容，以便市民就其內容發表意見；
- (三) 當局會否承諾將可能產生上述滋擾的支援工地內的設施盡量安排遠離民居；若會，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；有何新的具體措施減低沙中線工程進行期間對區內居民的滋擾；及
- (四) 會否因應區內居民的要求，重新檢討支援工地的面積；若會，詳情如何；若否，原因為何？

## Shatin to Central Link

(12) Hon Starry LEE Wai-king (Written Reply)

In its consultation paper on the Kowloon City section of the Shatin to Central Link (“SCL”) project issued to the Kowloon City District Council on 21 May last year, the MTR Corporation Limited (“MTRCL”) has proposed setting up a temporary works area (“works area”) in the Kai Tak Development Area. It is expected that the works area will cover about 20 hectares and will be used for material storage and installation of concrete batching, stirring and rock crushing facilities. Quite a number of residents in the vicinity of the proposed works area (such as Grand Waterfront, Sky Tower and Wyler Gardens, etc.) have relayed to me their worries that the excessive size of the works area and the close proximity of its facilities to the residential area would lead to serious noise, air and traffic nuisances, thus affecting their daily life. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the details of the arrangements for various facilities in the aforesaid works area;
- (b) given that the Government and MTRCL have engaged an environmental consultant to conduct a thorough environmental impact assessment on the installation and operation of the aforesaid SCL project and its related temporary facilities, when the assessment report will be completed and the contents of the report publicized to the public, so as to facilitate members of the public to express their views on the contents;
- (c) whether the authorities will undertake to arrange for the facilities, which may give rise to the aforesaid nuisances in the works area, to be located as far away from the residential area as practicable; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; what new specific measures they have in place to reduce the nuisances to residents in the district during the implementation of the SCL project; and

- (d) whether it will, in response to the request by the residents in the district, review afresh the size of the works area; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

## 被遺棄或流浪的動物

### # (15) 余若薇議員 (書面答覆)

據報，一名市民在獲悉生活於其居所附近的3頭流浪狗被漁農自然護理署(“漁護署”)的職員捕捉後，為免該等狗隻被人道毀滅，所以向漁護署聲稱她是狗隻的主人，但最後遭當局票控沒有根據規定為其畜養的狗隻領取牌照。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 去年由漁護署接收的流浪貓狗數目，以及在漁護署捕獲及接收的貓狗當中，分別獲動物主人領回及獲市民領養的貓狗數目為何；
- (二) 當局現時有否任何機制覆核流浪動物經漁護署獸醫師評估為應作人道毀滅的個案；若沒有，原因為何；
- (三) 當局會否考慮修訂相關法例及檢討現行措施，以鼓勵更多市民申領流浪動物，以及避免他們被檢控干犯類似上述的罪行；
- (四) 當局如何釐定流浪動物由被捕獲或接收後逗留在漁護署動物管理中心至最後被領養或被人道毀滅的時間；當局會否考慮延長申請領養該等動物的期限，以便相關動物福利機構有足夠時間作出領養申請，避免該等動物遭不必要的人道毀滅；
- (五) 當局現時只容許市民透過動物福利機構領養被其捕獲或接收的動物的原因為何；會否考慮容許市民直接向漁護署動物管理中心申領被捕獲的動物；若否，原因為何；
- (六) 當局現時對動物福利機構申請加入漁護署動物領養計劃的審批詳情為何；會否考慮修訂有關條件，以鼓勵更多機構參與此計劃；及

(七) 當局就動物領養計劃的最新宣傳詳情為何；會否加強宣傳，使更多市民參加此計劃？

## Abandoned or stray animals

(15) Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee (Written Reply)

It was reported that a member of the public, after learning that the three stray dogs staying in her neighbourhood had been caught by the staff of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (“AFCD”), claimed to be the dogs’ owner to prevent them from being euthanized, but she was eventually charged for failing to obtain the licences required for the dogs she kept. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the numbers of stray cats and dogs received by AFCD last year; and among the cats and dogs caught and received by AFCD, the respective numbers of those reclaimed by their owners and adopted by the public;
- (b) whether the authorities have any mechanism in place at present for reviewing the cases in which stray animals are assessed by the veterinary officers of AFCD that they should be euthanized; if not, of the reasons for that;
- (c) whether the authorities will consider amending the relevant legislation and reviewing the existing measures, so as to encourage more people to apply for the adoption of stray animals and prevent people from being prosecuted for offences similar to the aforesaid one;
- (d) how the authorities determine the time that a stray animal can stay in AFCD’s animal management centre after being caught or received and before they are finally adopted or euthanized; whether the authorities will consider extending the time limit for the application for adopting such animals, so that the animal welfare organizations concerned will have sufficient time to apply for adoption to prevent such animals from being euthanized unnecessarily;

- (e) of the reasons for the authorities allowing members of the public to adopt animals which have been caught or received by them only through animal welfare organizations at present; whether they will consider allowing members of the public to apply directly to AFCD's animal management centre for adoption of the animals caught; if not, of the reasons for that;
- (f) of the details of the authorities' existing vetting and approval for applications from animal welfare organizations for participating in the AFCD Re-home Scheme; whether they will consider amending the relevant conditions, so as to encourage more organizations to participate in this Scheme; and
- (g) of the details of the authorities' latest publicity work on the Re-home Scheme; whether they will step up publicity so that more members of the public will participate in this Scheme?