

# 立法會

## Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 502/09-10

### Paper for the House Committee meeting on 5 March 2010

### Questions scheduled for the Legislative Council meeting on 10 March 2010

Questions by:

- |      |  |                 |                |
|------|--|-----------------|----------------|
| (1)  | Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan                  | (Oral reply)    |                |
| (2)  | Hon Starry LEE Wai-king                  | (Oral reply)    | (New question) |
|      | <i>(Replacing her previous question)</i> |                 |                |
| (3)  | Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah                    | (Oral reply)    |                |
| (4)  | Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun                    | (Oral reply)    |                |
| (5)  | Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou                     | (Oral reply)    |                |
| (6)  | Hon WONG Sing-chi                        | (Oral reply)    | (New question) |
|      | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> |                 |                |
| (7)  | Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee            | (Written reply) |                |
| (8)  | Hon CHAN Kin-por                         | (Written reply) |                |
| (9)  | Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo                 | (Written reply) |                |
| (10) | Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che                      | (Written reply) |                |
| (11) | Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po                  | (Written reply) |                |
| (12) | Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing                   | (Written reply) |                |
| (13) | Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai                       | (Written reply) |                |
| (14) | Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long               | (Written reply) |                |
| (15) | Hon KAM Nai-wai                          | (Written reply) |                |
| (16) | Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee               | (Written reply) |                |
| (17) | Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee            | (Written reply) |                |
| (18) | Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou                     | (Written reply) |                |
| (19) | Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che                      | (Written reply) |                |
| (20) | Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing                   | (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

## 青少年吸毒問題

### # (2) 李慧琼議員 (口頭答覆)

根據保安局禁毒處上月底公布的《2008-2009年學生服用藥物情況調查》(下稱“調查”),曾吸毒的中學生人數較2004-2005年度調查急增三成至2萬人,曾吸毒的高年級小學生超過3 000名,而在抽選作調查的中學當中有九成學校有學生曾吸毒。有團體表示,調查結果顯示毒品已攻陷全港九成中小學,反映小學已經取代中學成為這場抗毒戰的最前線,但政府直至去年7月才宣布推行全民抗毒運動。此外,調查發現大部分曾吸毒的中學生相信吸毒會令外表變得難看、損害健康及學業受到影響。就此,政府可否告知本會:

- (一) 過去10年,政府在中小學校園內分別採取了甚麼措施,以對抗毒品入侵校園;為了及早辨識和支援吸毒的小學生,政府有何具體措施協助小學以更正面的態度處理學生吸毒問題,以免校方因擔心校譽而影響校園抗毒工作;
- (二) 針對大部分吸毒的中學生相信吸毒的禍害但仍然吸毒,當局會否重新檢討現時的禁毒宣傳策略和對抗毒禍蔓延的方法,包括加強在不同層面教導青少年如何面對負面情緒;若會,詳情如何;若不會,原因為何;會否重新檢討現時協助青少年戒毒的配套措施,包括對戒毒學校的政策;若會,詳情為何;若不會,原因為何;及
- (三) 鑒於調查結果反映青少年吸毒情況十分嚴重及正在學校蔓延,而在大埔區自去年12月實行的“校園驗毒試行計劃”至今,仍未有學生被驗出曾吸毒,當局會否考慮提早檢討該計劃的成效,以更有效達到及早辨識的目標?

## Youth drug abuse problem

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

According to the 2008-2009 Survey of Drug Use among Students (“the Survey”) released by the Narcotics Division of the Security Bureau at the end of last month, the number of secondary school students who had abused drugs soared 30% to 20 000 when compared to the 2004-2005 Survey. The number of senior primary school students who had abused drugs exceeded 3 000, and among the schools sampled in the Survey, 90% of them had students who had abused drugs. Some organizations indicated that as shown by the Survey results, 90% of the primary and secondary schools in Hong Kong have been infiltrated by drugs, indicating that primary schools have replaced secondary schools as the front line of this anti-drug war. Yet, it was not until July last year that the Government announced the launch of the community-wide campaign against drug abuse. Moreover, as revealed by the Survey, most of the secondary schools students who had abused drugs believed that using drugs would affect their appearance, harm their health and affect their studies. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the respective measures adopted in primary and secondary schools in the past 10 years for combating the infiltration of drugs into school campus; for early identification and provision of support for primary school students who abuse drugs, of the specific measures put in place by the Government to help primary schools take a more positive attitude in dealing with the problem of drug abuse among their students, so as to avoid the anti-drug efforts on school campus being affected by the worries of schools about their reputation;
- (b) focusing on the fact that most of the secondary school students who abuse drugs keep on doing so although they recognize the harm of drug addiction, whether the authorities will review afresh the

existing anti-drug publicity strategies and means to fight against the spread of drug abuse, including enhancement of the efforts at different levels in teaching teenagers how to face negative emotions; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; whether they will review afresh the existing supporting measures for assisting teenagers in rehabilitation from drug addiction, including the policy on rehabilitation centres-cum-schools; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

- (c) given that the Survey outcome reflect that the situation of youth drug abuse is very serious and spreading in schools, yet no student has been found to have abused drugs since the implementation of the Trial Scheme on School Drug Testing in the Tai Po District in December last year, whether the authorities will consider reviewing the effectiveness of the scheme earlier, so as to achieve more effectively the objective of early identification?

## 尖沙咀河內道重建項目

### # (6) 黃成智議員 (口頭答覆)

市區重建局(下稱“市建局”)與一私人發展商合作進行的尖沙咀河內道重建項目，其重建和規劃過程及銷售情況最近引起社會關注。就此，政府可否告知本會，鑒於有報道指：

- (一) 城市規劃委員會(下稱“城規會”)批准該項目的土地由商業改為商住用途，以及批准高達12.366的地積比率，而該比率較一般商住用途的地積比率10或9為高，是否知悉城規會作出該等決定的理據、項目中的“酒店式住宅”單位為何獲准出售、該做法有否違反任何規定或指引，以及與一般的審批程序有否不同；
- (二) 上述發展商是以受影響的業主身份與市建局的前身土地發展公司(下稱“土發公司”)合作推行上述項目，而由土發公司或市建局負責的市區重建項目當中，至今只有該項目容許受影響業主參與，是否知悉為何該業主獲准參與、為何沒有透過公開招標的方式決定合作夥伴，以及有關原則或理由是否適用於日後的重建項目；及
- (三) 與該發展商大股東有關的公司曾於項目公開發售初期購入數個單位，但卻沒有公開有關資料，當局會否查核該項目的所有物業交易資料，以瞭解有沒有其他類似的行為，以及調查該發展商有否藉此製造混亂的市場訊息，以吸引買家購買該項目的其他單位？

The redevelopment project at Hanoi Road in Tsim Sha Tsui

(6) Hon WONG Sing-chi (Oral Reply)

The redevelopment and planning processes of the redevelopment project at Hanoi Road in Tsim Sha Tsui, which was jointly undertaken by the Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”) and a private developer, as well as the circumstances surrounding the sales of its flats, have recently aroused public concern. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council, given that it has been reported that:

- (a) the Town Planning Board (“TPB”) has approved a change of land use of the redevelopment site from commercial use to commercial/residential use, and permitted a high plot ratio of 12.366 for the project, which is higher than the plot ratio of 10 or 9 generally granted to sites for commercial/residential use, whether it knows TPB’s justifications for making such decisions, why the sale of serviced apartments under the project was permitted, whether the permission for the sale of such apartments has violated any requirement or guideline, and whether this is at variance with the general procedure for approval;
- (b) the aforesaid developer has entered into a partnership with URA’s predecessor, the Land Development Corporation (“LDC”), to implement the project in its capacity as an owner affected by the redevelopment, and that among the urban redevelopment projects undertaken by LDC or URA, this is so far the only project in which participation by an affected owner is allowed, whether it knows why the owner is permitted to participate in the project, why the project partner was not determined through public tender, and whether the relevant principles or reasons will be applicable to future redevelopment projects; and

- (c) some companies which are connected with the major shareholder of the developer have purchased several residential units under the project during the initial sale in the open market, but the transaction details have never been disclosed, whether the authorities will check all information concerning the property transactions under the project to find out if there are other similar purchases, and investigate the incident to ascertain if the developer has made use of the above purchase to produce confusing market information so as to attract buyers to purchase other residential units under the project?