

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 563/09-10

**Paper for the House Committee meeting
on 9 April 2010**

**Questions scheduled for the
Legislative Council meeting on 14 April 2010**

Questions by:

- | | | |
|------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| (1) | Hon Paul CHAN Mo-po | (Written reply) |
| (2) | Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun | (Written reply) |
| (3) | Hon LEE Cheuk-yan | (Written reply) |
| (4) | Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah | (Written reply) |
| (5) | Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau | (Written reply) |
| (6) | Hon TAM Yiu-chung | (Written reply) |
| (7) | Hon LAU Wong-fat | (Written reply) |
| (8) | Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung | (Written reply) |
| (9) | Hon James TO Kun-sun | (Written reply) |
| (10) | Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming | (Written reply) |
| (11) | Hon CHAN Hak-kan | (Written reply) |
| (12) | Hon Fred LI Wah-ming | (Written reply) |
| (13) | Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee | (Written reply) |
| (14) | Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo | (Written reply) |
| (15) | Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou | (Written reply) |
| (16) | Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun | (Written reply) |
| (17) | Hon LEE Wing-tat | (Written reply) |
| (18) | Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po | (Written reply) |
| (19) | Hon Starry LEE Wai-king | (Written reply) |
| (20) | Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che | (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

Personnel employed by the United States
in Hong Kong for tax enforcement purposes

(1) Hon Paul CHAN Mo-po (Written Reply)

It was reported that the Criminal Investigation Division (“CID”) of the Internal Revenue Service of the United States (“US”) employed personnel (such as investigators, etc.) to work in its overseas offices for tax enforcement purposes. It was also reported that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the US had said that the number of personnel working in those offices would be increased this year. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it knows if CID personnel have ever worked in Hong Kong for the aforesaid purposes and if they are still working in Hong Kong at present; if they have worked in Hong Kong, of their number in each of the past five years and which category of visa they were granted for entering Hong Kong and carrying out their duties; and
- (b) given that members of the trade have indicated that countries do not normally assist one another in enforcing their respective tax laws and the US has not been willing to enter into negotiations with Hong Kong on a comprehensive double taxation agreement, and that the US had, in seeking to obtain information from a bank in Switzerland for US tax enforcement purposes, used a “fishing expedition” approach which is not permitted under the standards of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development or under the relevant legislation of Hong Kong, whether the Government has assessed if it is in Hong Kong’s best interests to have such CID personnel working in Hong Kong for the aforesaid purposes?

由美國聘用在港執行稅務法規工作的人員

(1) 陳茂波議員 (書面答覆)

據報，美國稅務局刑事調查組曾聘用人員(例如調查員等)在海外辦事處負責執行其稅務法規的工作。有報道亦指出，美國稅務局局長曾說今年將會增加該等辦事處的工作人員數目。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 是否知悉，有否刑事調查組人員曾為上述目的在本港工作，以及該等人員現時是否仍在本港工作；若該等人員曾在本港工作，過去5年，每年的人數，以及讓他們入境和執行職務所批出的簽證類別為何；及
- (二) 鑒於有業內人士曾表示，國與國之間一般不會互相協助執行各自的稅務法律，而美國一直不願意與香港就全面性雙重徵稅協定進行談判，以及美國為執行其國家的稅務法規曾以“任意盤查”的方式向瑞士一所銀行索取資料，這做法並非經濟合作及發展組織的準則或本港相關法例所容許，政府有否評估讓該等刑事調查組人員為上述目的在港工作是否符合香港的最佳利益？

舊式工廠大廈的消防安全問題

(2) 梁美芬議員 (書面答覆)

本年3月8日在長沙灣青山道發生的工廠大廈火警，造成1名消防隊員殉職及3名消防員受傷的慘劇。據報，發生火警的工廠大廈於1961年建成，而且沒有安裝自動噴灑系統。雖然現行法例並沒有規定60年代或之前落成的工廠大廈必須安裝自動噴灑系統，但是次火警帶出了本港若干舊式工廠大廈潛在的消防安全問題。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 按區議會分區劃分，現時全港分別有多少幢工廠大廈、貨倉及倉庫並沒有安裝自動噴灑系統；
- (二) 當局會否研究強制要求全港所有60年代或之前建成的舊式工廠大廈安裝自動噴灑系統的可行性；若否，原因為何；
- (三) 當局會否檢討《消防安全(建築物)條例》(第572章)，並擴大條例的相關適用範圍，以涵蓋在1987年3月1日或之前建成，並由“工廠或工業經營、貨倉、倉庫或用作貯存大量物品的地方組成”其非住用用途部分的綜合用途建築物；
- (四) 針對60年代或之前建成的舊式工廠大廈無須安裝自動噴灑系統的情況，當局現時有何特別措施補救該消防安全漏洞；在發生上述奪命火警後，當局會否實施更多新措施，以加強舊式工廠大廈的消防安全；及
- (五) 鑒於有報道指出，2007年至今已先後發生3次奪命火警，造成共4名消防員在救火期間殉職的悲劇，而該等火警均發生在舊式商住大廈或工廠大廈內，消防處會否檢討現時針對該等建築物的救火策略有否出現漏洞？

Fire safety of old industrial buildings

(2) Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun (Written Reply)

The fire which occurred on 8 March this year at an industrial building at Castle Peak Road in Cheung Sha Wan caused a tragedy in which one senior fireman died on duty and three firemen were injured. It was reported that the industrial building at which the fire occurred was constructed in 1961, and had no automatic sprinkler system installed. Although the existing legislation does not require that industrial buildings which were constructed in or before the 1960s must be installed with automatic sprinkler systems, this fire has revealed the potential problems of fire safety of certain old industrial buildings in Hong Kong. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the respective numbers, broken down by District Council district, of industrial buildings, godowns and warehouses in Hong Kong which do not have automatic sprinkler systems installed at present;
- (b) whether the authorities will explore the feasibility of making it a mandatory requirement for all old industrial buildings, which were constructed in or before the 1960s in Hong Kong, to be installed with automatic sprinkler systems; if they will not, of the reasons for that;
- (c) whether the authorities will review the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance (Cap. 572) and expand its relevant scope of application to cover composite buildings which were constructed on or before 1 March 1987, and of which the part for non-domestic purposes consists of “a factory or industrial undertaking, godown, warehouse or place of bulk storage”;
- (d) focusing on the situation where old industrial buildings which were constructed in or before the 1960s are not required to be installed with automatic sprinkler systems, what special measures the authorities have at present to plug the loophole in fire safety; whether the authorities will implement

more new measures to enhance the fire safety of old industrial buildings after the aforesaid fatal fire; and

- (e) given that it was reported that three fatal fires had occurred one after another since 2007, causing tragedies in which a total of four firemen died on duty during fire-fighting operations, and all such fires had occurred at old commercial/residential or industrial buildings, whether the Fire Services Department will review if there are loopholes in its current strategy on fire-fighting in such buildings?

香港的住戶收入分布

(3) 李卓人議員 (書面答覆)

關於綜合住戶統計調查按季統計所得的家庭住戶入息的統計數字，政府可否提供過去6年下列的有關數字：

- (一) 對於全港住戶數目，按每年住戶入息(不包括外籍家庭傭工並由低至高排列)劃分的10個等分組別，每年每個組別的入息範圍、入息中位數和入息平均數；及
- (二) 對於全港市民的人數，按人均住戶(不包括外籍家庭傭工)入息(由低至高排列)劃分的10個等分組別，每年每個組別的人均住戶入息的範圍、中位數和平均數？

Household income distribution in Hong Kong

(3) Hon LEE Cheuk-yan (Written Reply)

Regarding the statistics collected from household income quarterly General Household Surveys, will the Government provide the relevant data for the past six years:

- (a) the range, median and mean of the annual income for each of the 10 decile groups obtained by dividing the number of all Hong Kong households according to their annual income (excluding foreign domestic helpers (“FDHs”) and listed in ascending order); and
- (b) the range, median and mean of the annual per capita household income for each of the 10 decile groups obtained by dividing the number of all Hong Kong people (excluding FDHs) according to their per capita household income (listed in ascending order)?

透過短訊服務提供的收費流動內容服務

(4) 湯家驊議員 (書面答覆)

近日有報道指出，有流動網絡用戶投訴，近日其流動電話收到一些“不請自來”的“蠱惑短訊”，向他們提供流動內容服務，如果他們不作出回覆表示拒絕接受該等服務，有關的流動網絡營辦商(“營辦商”)便會開始向他們徵收服務費用，有些服務費用高達每個短訊收費\$24。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 去年，電訊管理局(“電訊局”)有否接獲有關上述收費短訊的投訴；如有，投訴的數目為何；電訊局採取了甚麼跟進行動，以及結果為何；
- (二) 有否評估上述營辦商的收費行為有否違反現行《非應邀電子訊息條例》(第593章)的條文；如評估的結果為有違反，詳情為何；如評估的結果為沒有違反，當局會否考慮修訂法例，以加強對該等行為的規管；及
- (三) 除了依賴業界遵守於本年1月11日推出的業界守則外，電訊局會否考慮採取其他措施杜絕上述的行為？

Chargeable mobile content services
delivered through short messaging services

(4) Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah (Written Reply)

It has been recently reported that some mobile network users have complained that recently their mobile phones received some unsolicited “tricky short messages” which sought to provide mobile content services to them, and if they did not reply to indicate their refusal to receive such services, the mobile network operators (“MNOs”) concerned would start charging them service fees, some of which were as high as \$24 per message. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the Office of the Telecommunications Authority (“OFTA”) had received complaints related to the aforesaid chargeable short messages last year; if it had, of the number of such complaints, the follow-up actions taken by OFTA and the outcome thereof;
- (b) whether it has assessed if the aforesaid charging practice of the MNOs concerned constitutes a breach of the existing provisions in the Unsolicited Electronic Messages Ordinance (Cap. 593); if the assessment outcome indicates that it constitutes a breach, of the details; if not, whether the authorities will consider amending the legislation to step up the regulation of such practice; and
- (c) apart from relying on compliance by the industry with the code introduced on 11 January this year, whether OFTA will consider adopting other measures to curb the aforesaid practice?

2009年收入及工時按年統計調查

(5) 梁家驩議員 (書面答覆)

政府統計處在本年3月18日發表了2009年收入及工時按年統計調查報告(“調查報告”),載錄本港僱員在2009年第2季的每小時工資水平及分布。就此,政府可否根據調查報告的數據,列出有關2009年第2季僱員每周工作時數的下列分項數字:

(一) 所有僱員的工作時數分布(按下表列出);

| 百分位數 | 每周工作時數 | 實際每周工作多於該每周工作時數百分位數的僱員人數 |
|----------------|--------|--------------------------|
| 第10個 | | |
| 第25個 | | |
| 第50個 | | |
| 由第75至第99個每個百分位 | | |

(二) 按每周工作時數劃分的所有僱員人數分布(按下表列出);

| 每周工作時數 | 實際每周工作多於該時數的僱員人數 |
|--------|------------------|
| 40 | |
| 44 | |
| 48 | |
| 52 | |
| 56 | |
| 60 | |
| 64 | |
| 68 | |
| 72 | |

(三) 按下列特徵劃分的第10、25、50、75、80、85、90及95個百分位數的僱員每周工作時數分布(分別按調查報告的表九至表十三的方式列出):

2009 Annual Earnings and Hours Survey

(5) Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau (Written Reply)

On 18 March this year the Census and Statistics Department released the 2009 Report on Annual Earnings and Hours Survey (the “Survey Report”), which set out the hourly wage level and distribution of Hong Kong employees in the second quarter of 2009. In this connection, will the Government provide the following breakdown of the weekly working hours of employees in the second quarter of 2009 according to the data in the Survey Report:

(a) distribution of working hours of all employees (set out in the table below):

| Percentile | Weekly working hours | Number of employees whose actual weekly working hours were more than that of the percentile |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---|
| 10th | | |
| 25th | | |
| 50th | | |
| Each one from 75th to 99th | | |

(b) distribution of the total number of employees analysed by weekly working hours (set out in the table below):

| Weekly working hours | Number of employees whose actual weekly working hour was more |
|----------------------|---|
| 40 | |
| 44 | |
| 48 | |
| 52 | |
| 56 | |
| 60 | |
| 64 | |
| 68 | |
| 72 | |

(c) the 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, 80th, 85th, 90th and 95th percentiles of the weekly working hour distribution analysed by the following profiles (set out in the

私人發展項目範圍內行人天橋的維修事宜

(6) 譚耀宗議員 (書面答覆)

近日，有不同私人屋苑的居民向本人反映，他們就須承擔在其屋苑範圍內興建供公眾使用的行人天橋的管理及保養的責任表示關注。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 現時全港共有多少條行人天橋是根據土地契約列明的要求在私人發展項目範圍內興建，以供公眾使用；並列出當中哪些天橋的管理及保養的責任根據土地契約或公用契約的規定，須由項目的發展商或業主承擔；及
- (二) 自1980年以來，當局有否寬免發展商或業主對上述類別的行人天橋的管理及保養的責任，並改由相關政府部門承擔該等責任；若有，該等行人天橋的清單，作出寬免的年份和原因，以及當局所考慮的因素為何？

Maintenance of footbridges within the areas of private developments

(6) Hon TAM Yiu-chung (Written Reply)

Recently, some residents of various private housing estates have relayed to me that they are concerned that they are required to take on the responsibilities to manage and maintain the footbridges which were built for public use within the areas of their housing estates. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the current total number of footbridges in Hong Kong which were built, for public use under the requirements of the land lease, within the areas of private developments, and among them, a list of those the management and maintenance responsibilities for which are to be borne by the developers or property owners of the developments concerned, according to the land lease or deed of dedication; and
- (b) whether the authorities have, since 1980, granted waivers to developers or property owners in respect of their responsibilities to manage and maintain the aforesaid types of footbridges, and re-assigned the responsibilities to the government departments concerned; if they have, of a list of such footbridges, the year in which and the reasons why such waivers were granted, as well as the factors considered by the government departments concerned?

打擊酒後駕駛的措施

(7) 劉皇發議員 (書面答覆)

《2008年道路交通法例(修訂)條例》(“《修訂條例》”)於2008年制定，以推行授權警方對司機進行隨機呼氣測試，以及加重酒後駕駛違例事項的刑罰等措施，從而加強打擊酒後駕駛的行為。《修訂條例》於去年2月9日生效。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 《修訂條例》生效前及後的12個月，每月因酒後駕駛而引致的交通意外的宗數分別為何；及
- (二) 當局有否計劃評估上述措施的成效，以及有否需要進一步加強打擊酒後駕駛的措施？

Measures to combat drink driving

(7) Hon LAU Wong-fat (Written Reply)

The Road Traffic Legislation (Amendment) Ordinance 2008 (“the Amendment Ordinance”) was enacted in 2008 to implement measures such as empowering police officers to conduct random breath test on drivers and raising the penalties on drink driving offences, in order to step up efforts in combating drink driving. The Amendment Ordinance came into operation on 9 February last year. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the respective numbers of traffic accidents caused by drink driving in each of the 12 months before and after the Amendment Ordinance came into operation; and
- (b) whether the authorities have any plan to assess the effectiveness of the aforesaid measures, and whether it is necessary to further step up measures to combat drink driving?

在歐盟II期和III期巴士安裝選擇性催化還原器

(8) 林健鋒議員 (書面答覆)

環境保護署署長於本年3月16日回覆本人就審核2010-2011財政年度開支預算提出的問題時表示，正與專營巴士公司商討開展一項由政府資助的試驗計劃，在歐盟II期和III期巴士安裝選擇性催化還原器，以減少氮氧化物排放量。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 上述計劃的最新進展及實施時間表為何；
- (二) 有否研究其他地方使用選擇性催化還原器的經驗，包括減少氮氧化物排放的效用及售價；
- (三) 會否考慮優先在現時行走繁忙區域(例如旺角、中環及銅鑼灣等)的巴士安裝選擇性催化還原器；及
- (四) 除安裝選擇性催化還原器外，現時有否其他有助減少歐盟II期和III期巴士排放廢氣的方法？

Retrofitting Euro II and III buses
with selective catalytic reduction devices

(8) Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung (Written Reply)

In her reply on 16 March this year to my question in relation to the examination of the Estimates of Expenditure 2010-2011, the Director of Environmental Protection indicated that discussions were being held with franchised bus companies about launching a Government-funded trial of retrofitting Euro II and III buses with selective catalytic reduction devices to reduce nitrogen oxides emissions. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the latest progress of and the implementation timetable for the aforesaid trial;
- (b) whether it has studied the experience of other places in using selective catalytic reduction devices, including the effectiveness of such devices in reducing nitrogen oxides emissions and the prices;
- (c) whether it will consider giving priority to retrofitting selective catalytic reduction devices on buses which at present run in busy areas (such as Mong Kok, Central and Causeway Bay, etc.); and
- (d) apart from retrofitting selective catalytic reduction devices, whether at present there are other means to help reduce emissions from Euro II and III buses?

在海濱範圍興建建築物的申請

(9) 涂謹申議員 (書面答覆)

本人得悉，當局早前表示，希望以“自然流失”方式(即在營辦商結束業務後不再就相關業務進行招標)減少新油麻地公眾貨物裝卸區(“貨物貨卸區”)的營辦商數目，以縮減貨物裝卸區的面積，並計劃最終將其發展為海濱綠化帶。行政長官在2008年10月15日發表的施政報告中提出美化維港兩岸，探討中長期重新規劃的可行性，改善海濱的暢達程度，並與相關的區議會合作，落實海濱長廊的工程。此外，發展局局長亦曾多次表示，正檢討重置位於海濱範圍的公眾設施。然而，本人得悉當局於去年9月批准了海事處於貨物裝卸區興建一個控制中心的計劃，而當局事前從未於本會任何會議上交代計劃的詳情。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 海事處就興建該控制中心的計劃諮詢了哪些政府部門及其他組織，以及在諮詢過程中有否收到反對意見或其他意見；若有收到，意見的內容為何；
- (二) 鑒於當局早前決定把有關的政府設施向內陸搬遷，以配合土瓜灣發展海濱長廊，現時政府部門於海濱範圍內興建建築物的計劃須符合甚麼原則，以避免建築物妨礙美化維港兩岸的工作；現時有否任何指引，訂明政府部門提出有關的興建計劃時須諮詢當區區議會及其他組織；
- (三) 過去3年，每年有多少個營辦商結束其在貨物裝卸區的業務；當局有否再就相關業務進行招標；若有，共有多少個新營辦商加入，以及現時營辦商的總數為何；
- (四) 鑒於本人得悉上述控制中心會參與貨物裝卸區的管理運作，當局有否評估興建該控制中心有否違反其早前表示以“自然流失”方式減少營辦商的數目，並縮減貨物裝卸區面積的原意，以及阻礙貨物裝卸區

發展為海濱綠化帶；若有評估，結果為何；

- (五) 過去3年，當局有否評估興建上述控制中心對發展連接大角咀區至西九文化藝術區的海濱長廊有何影響，以及有否考慮將現時發展計劃配合未來海濱長廊的發展；若有，詳情為何；及
- (六) 除上述的興建計劃外，過去3年，每年當局分別批准了多少項政府部門及私人發展商於海濱範圍興建建築物的計劃，以及詳細資料為何？

Application for building development in the harbourfront areas

(9) Hon James TO Kun-sun (Written Reply)

I have learnt that the authorities have indicated earlier that they hope to reduce the number of operators in the New Yau Ma Tei Public Cargo Working Area (“PCWA”) through “natural wastage” (i.e. by not inviting tenders for the business concerned after the operators closed down their business), in order to reduce the area of PCWA, and they plan to ultimately develop PCWA into a harbourfront green belt. In his Policy Address delivered on 15 October 2008, the Chief Executive proposed to beautify the harbourfront, study the feasibility of conducting medium and long-term re-planning of the harbour, improve the accessibility of the harbourfront and, in consultation with District Councils, proceed with the construction of waterfront promenades. Moreover, the Secretary for Development has indicated on a number of occasions that the relocation of the public facilities within the harbourfront areas is under review. Yet, I have learnt that in September last year, the authorities approved a project of the Marine Department to construct a control centre at PCWA, and the authorities had never accounted for the project details at any meeting of this Council beforehand. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) what government departments and other organizations the Marine Department had consulted in relation to the project to construct the control centre, and whether it had received any objection or other comments during the consultation process; if so, of the contents of the comments;
- (b) given that the authorities have earlier decided to move the relevant government facilities inward, so as to tie in with the development of a waterfront promenade in To Kwa Wan, of the principles which at present have to be met by projects of government departments to construct buildings within the harbourfront areas, in order to prevent the buildings from impeding efforts to beautify the harbourfront; whether there is any guideline specifying that

government departments have to consult District Councils and other organizations in the respective districts in putting forward the construction projects concerned;

- (c) of the respective numbers of operators which closed down their business in PCWA in each of the past three years; whether the authorities had invited tenders again for the business concerned; if so, of the number of new operators which have joined as well as the total number of operators at present;
- (d) given that I have learnt that the aforesaid control centre will be involved in the management and operation of PCWA, whether the authorities have assessed if the construction of the control centre has violated the original intention of reducing the number of operators through “natural wastage” and reducing the area of PCWA as they have indicated earlier, as well as hampered PCWA’s development into a harbourfront green belt; if an assessment has been conducted, of the outcome;
- (e) whether the authorities had, in the past three years, assessed the impact of the construction of the aforesaid control centre on the development of a waterfront promenade connecting the Tai Kok Tsui area and the West Kowloon Cultural District, and whether they had considered dovetailing the existing development plan with the future development of a waterfront promenade; if they had, of the details; and
- (f) apart from the aforesaid construction project, of the respective numbers of projects approved by the authorities in each of the past three years for government departments and private developers to construct buildings within the harbourfront areas, as well as their details?

樓宇更新大行動

(10) 張學明議員 (書面答覆)

政府與香港房屋協會及市區重建局合作，在2009年以20億元推行樓宇更新大行動(“更新行動”)，提供津貼及一站式技術支援，協助約2 000幢30年樓齡或以上的目標樓宇的業主進行維修工程。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 自更新行動推行以來，當局有否評估有關目標樓宇的維修工程的費用有否因工程數量急增而有所調整；若有評估，具體情況為何；及
- (二) 鑒於更新行動的目標樓宇須符合的其中一項準則是“樓宇的住用單位數目不多於400個”，當局會否考慮放寬有關規定，讓更多樓宇符合準則？

Operation Building Bright

(10) Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming (Written Reply)

The Government, in collaboration with the Hong Kong Housing Society and the Urban Renewal Authority, launched a two-billion dollar Operation Building Bright (“OBB”) in 2009 to provide subsidies and one-stop technical assistance to help owners of some 2 000 target buildings which are 30 years old or over to carry out repair works. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the authorities has, since the implementation of OBB, assessed if there have been adjustments in the costs of the repair works of the target buildings due to the upsurge in the amount of works; if such an assessment has been conducted, of the specific details; and
- (b) given that one of the criteria to be met by target buildings of OBB is “the buildings comprise no more than 400 residential units”, whether the authorities will consider relaxing such a requirement so as to enable more buildings to meet the criteria?

公眾泳池的使用情況

(11) 陳克勤議員 (書面答覆)

康樂及文化事務署(“康文署”)曾在2008年進行一項問卷調查，以瞭解市民參與體能活動和運動的模式。根據調查結果，游泳在受訪市民最常參與的運動中排列第二位，亦是他們最希望學習的運動。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 在撇除於2008年推行“免費使用康樂設施計劃”期間的數字後，過去3年，每月公眾泳池的平均入場人數(以列表形式列出)；
- (二) 自2008年完成上述問卷調查後，當局有否再進行調查，以瞭解市民使用公眾泳池的情況(包括每星期的使用次數)，以及他們對公眾泳池服務的滿意程度；若有，結果為何；若否，原因為何，以及會否考慮進行該等調查；
- (三) 按現時的規劃，在未來3年，將有多少個公眾泳池落成和投入服務；針對上述的調查結果，當局會否加快興建公眾泳池的步伐；
- (四) 當局基於甚麼準則釐訂公眾泳池的入場費；
- (五) 鑒於現時新界區的公眾泳池於周末、周日及公眾假期的入場費較平日為高，當局會否考慮劃一每天收取於平日的入場費水平，以鼓勵更多市民使用公眾泳池；及
- (六) 鑒於康文署去年曾向多個區議會(包括沙田區議會)表示，會就推出公眾泳池月票的建議進行可行性研究，該研究的進展為何，以及何時能決定是否推出該等月票？

Utilization of public swimming pools

(11) Hon CHAN Hak-kan (Written Reply)

The Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”) conducted a questionnaire survey in 2008 so as to study the participation patterns of members of the public in physical activities and sports. According to the findings of the survey, swimming ranked second among the sports in which the public had participated most frequently and was also the sport which they were most eager to learn. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the average monthly attendances at public swimming pools in the past three years (set out in table form) after discounting the numbers during the implementation of the Free Admission Scheme of LCSD Leisure Facilities in 2008;
- (b) whether the authorities have conducted surveys again after completing the aforesaid questionnaire survey in 2008 so as to study the utilization of public swimming pools by members of the public (including the weekly number of attendances) and their satisfaction levels towards the services in public swimming pools; if so, of the findings; if not, the reasons for that, and whether it will consider conducting such surveys;
- (c) of the number of public swimming pools which will be completed and commissioned in the next three years according to the existing plan; focusing on the findings of the aforesaid survey, whether the authorities will expedite the pace of constructing public swimming pools;
- (d) of the criteria based on which the authorities set the admission fees for public swimming pools;
- (e) given that the admission fees for the public swimming pools in the New Territories during weekends, Sundays and public holidays are higher than those for weekdays, whether the authorities will consider standardizing the admission fees based

on those for weekdays, so as to encourage more members of the public to use public swimming pools; and

- (f) given that LCSD has indicated to quite a number of District Councils (including Sha Tin District Council) last year that it would conduct a feasibility study on the proposal to launch monthly tickets for public swimming pools, of the progress of the study, and when it will decide on whether or not such monthly tickets will be launched?

領匯管理有限公司轄下零售及停車場設施
的消防裝置改善工程的進度

(12) 李華明議員 (書面答覆)

據悉，作為上市要求的一部分，領匯房地產投資信託基金（“領匯基金”）曾向香港房屋委員會（“房委會”）承諾就其轄下零售及停車場設施分期進行改善消防設施工程，以符合《消防安全(商業處所)條例》(第502章)的最新規定。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 是否知悉，管理領匯基金的領匯管理有限公司（“領匯公司”）原先承諾分期完成的改善消防安全設施工程的數目、工程分多少期完成、當中已完成及未完成的工程數目分別為何，以及按設施的所在屋邨分別列出該等工程項目的詳細資料(包括工程內容、原先承諾的完成日期及實際或預計的完成日期)；當中有多少設施包括公共空間；按現時進度，將於何時完成所有改善工程；
- (二) 消防處有否因領匯公司轄下商場及停車場設施未符合《消防安全(商業處所)條例》的規定而向其發出消防安全指示；若有，詳情為何，包括領匯公司須於何時完成所需的消防設施改善工程，並按設施的所在屋邨列出該等項目的資料；及
- (三) 當局有否評估市民使用仍未完成消防設施改善工程的商場或停車場設施時面對的火警危險；若有，房委會作為公契經理人，有否要求領匯公司須於指定限期前完成改善工程；若有，詳情為何？

Progress of the upgrading of the fire safety installations in retail and car parking facilities under The Link Management Limited

(12) Hon Fred LI Wah-ming (Written Reply)

It has been learnt that as part of the listing requirements, The Link Real Estate Investment Trust (“The Link REIT”) had given an undertaking to the Hong Kong Housing Authority (“HA”) that it would carry out in phases the upgrading of the fire safety installations in the retail and car parking facilities under its management, so as to comply with the latest requirements under the Fire Safety (Commercial Premises) Ordinance (Cap. 502). In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it knows the number of the upgrading projects of fire safety installations that The Link Management Limited (“The Link”), which manages The Link REIT, has originally undertaken to carry out in phases, and in how many phases the projects will be completed; among them, the respective numbers of projects which have been completed and have not yet been completed and the details (including the contents of the projects, the completion dates originally pledged, and the actual or expected completion dates) of the projects, listed by the housing estate where the facilities are located; among them, the number of facilities which comprise public space; according to current progress, when all the upgrading projects will be completed;
- (b) whether the Fire Services Department has issued any fire safety direction to The Link on grounds that the shopping arcades and car parking facilities under its management have failed to comply with the requirements under the Fire Safety (Commercial Premises) Ordinance; if so, of the details, including when The Link was required to complete all the necessary upgrading projects of fire safety installations and the details of such projects, listed by the housing estate where the facilities are located; and

- (c) whether the authorities have assessed the fire hazards the public face in using shopping arcades or car parking facilities for which the upgrading projects of fire safety installations have not yet been completed; if so, whether HA, as the manager of the Deed of Mutual Covenant, has required The Link to complete the upgrading projects by a specified deadline; if so, of the details?

駕駛訓練及駕駛測驗制度

(13) 劉健儀議員 (書面答覆)

關於駕駛訓練及駕駛測驗制度，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去3年，每年涉及持有暫准駕駛執照的司機的交通意外宗數及其造成的傷亡人數為何；
- (二) 過去3年，當局有否研究其他地方的駕駛訓練及駕駛測驗制度；若有研究，結果為何，以及該等制度與本港現時的如何比較；若沒有研究，原因為何；及
- (三) 會否檢討本港現時的駕駛訓練及駕駛測驗制度，藉加強駕駛訓練減少交通意外；若會，詳情為何；若否，原因為何？

Driving training and driving test systems

(13) Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee (Written Reply)

Regarding driving training and driving test systems, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of traffic accidents in each of the past three years which involved drivers holding a probationary driving licence and the resultant casualties;
- (b) whether the authorities had, in the past three years, studied the driving training and driving test systems in other places; if they had, of the results, and how such systems compare with those in Hong Kong; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) whether it will review the existing driving training and driving test systems in Hong Kong, with a view to reducing traffic accidents through enhancing driving training; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

油站及石油氣加氣站收費出錯

(14) 鄭家富議員 (書面答覆)

關於油站及石油氣加氣站的收費出錯事故，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去3年，每年當局接獲多少宗關於油站及石油氣加氣站收費出錯的投訴，並按供應商名稱列出分項數字；
- (二) 是否知悉，在油站及石油氣加氣站發現收費出錯的個案後，供應商一般需時多久處理及解決該等問題，以及退還多扣的金額；及
- (三) 鑒於有報道指出，中石化(香港)油站有限公司早前公布，其兩個位於馬鞍山及元朗的石油氣加氣站在本年2月1至28日期間因石油氣價格出錯而多收共兩萬多元的費用，現時有否機制讓供應商主動向政府及市民報告在其油站及石油氣加氣站發生的收費出錯事故；若有，機制運作的詳情為何；若否，原因為何？

Erroneous charging at fuel and liquefied petroleum gas filling stations

(14) Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo (Written Reply)

Regarding incidents of erroneous charging at fuel and liquefied petroleum gas (“LPG”) filling stations, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of complaints about erroneous charging at fuel and LPG filling stations received by the authorities in each of the past three years, broken down by name of suppliers;
- (b) whether it knows the time generally taken by the suppliers concerned to handle and resolve the problems, as well as to refund the overcharged amounts after cases of erroneous charging at fuel and LPG filling stations were uncovered; and
- (c) given that it has been reported that the Sinopec (Hong Kong) Petrol Filling Station Company Limited has announced earlier that owing to erroneous LPG pricing at two of its LPG filling stations in Ma On Shan and Yuen Long between 1 to 28 February this year, it had overcharged by a total of over \$20,000, whether there is a mechanism at present for suppliers to report to the Government and the public on their own initiative incidents of erroneous charging at their fuel and LPG filling stations; if so, of the details of the operation of the mechanism; if not, the reasons for that?

公營中小學的學位教席比例

(15) 潘佩璆議員 (書面答覆)

有教育界人士指出，公營小學和中學的學位教席的比例上限雖已自2009-2010學年起分別增至五成及八成五，但仍有不少持有認可學位或同等資歷的教師擔任中小學的非學位教師職位，故此教育界仍對校內同工不同酬的問題表示憂慮。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 本港的官立和資助中小學的現職教師當中，分別有多少人未持有認可學位或同等資歷，以及多少人持有該等資歷而擔任非學位教師的職位；及
- (二) 當局有否計劃進一步增加公營中小學的學位教席的比例上限，讓所有持有認可學位的教師都能獲得學位教席，以改善校內教師同工不同酬的不公平現況；若有計劃，詳情為何；若沒有計劃，原因為何？

Ratio of graduate teacher posts
in public sector primary and secondary schools

(15) Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou (Written Reply)

Some members of the education sector have pointed out that although the upper limits on the ratio of graduate posts in public sector primary and secondary schools have been raised to 50% and 85% respectively since the 2009-2010 school year, quite a number of teachers with a recognized degree or equivalent qualifications are still occupying non-graduate teacher posts in primary and secondary schools; hence the education sector still expresses worry about the problem of unequal pay for the same work in schools. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) among the serving teachers in government and aided primary and secondary schools in Hong Kong, of the respective numbers of those who do not hold any recognized degree or equivalent qualifications as well as those who have such qualifications and are occupying non-graduate teacher posts; and
- (b) whether the authorities have any plan to further increase the upper limits for the ratio of graduate posts in public sector primary and secondary schools, so that all teachers who possess recognized degrees can obtain graduate posts, with a view to improving the current unfair situation of teachers in schools being paid differently for the same work; if they have such a plan, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

向訪港旅客提供的緊急援助

(16) 謝偉俊議員 (書面答覆)

據報，本年3月9日晚上，一個由菲律賓到港的24人旅行團懷疑被騙，在香港國際機場苦等6個多小時仍不獲有關旅行社的職員接待。該等旅客其後得悉該旅行社及本港接待單位並沒有為他們安排住宿。他們曾先後致電香港旅遊業議會(“議會”)、香港旅遊發展局(“旅發局”)及菲律賓駐港領事館尋求即時協助，但未獲得協助。他們終獲立法會旅遊界功能界別議員安排當晚住宿及提供其他援助。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去3年，每年各有關政府部門收到多少宗訪港旅客緊急求助的個案，以及有何既定機制或措施處理該等個案；
- (二) 有否評估旅發局及議會未能即時處理上述求助個案及向該等旅客提供緊急援助的原因是否與事件發生在非辦公時間有關；若有評估，結果為何；若沒有評估，可否馬上作出評估；及
- (三) 鑒於有業界人士指出，現時旅遊事務署、旅發局及議會均沒有為因涉及類似上述的被騙個案或其他突發事故而滯留本港的旅客在非辦公時間提供緊急援助服務，沒有提供該等服務的原因為何；有否評估欠缺該等服務對本港旅遊業所造成的負面影響；若有評估，結果為何；若沒有評估，可否馬上作出評估；以及有何改善措施？

Emergency assistance for travellers visiting Hong Kong

(16) Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun (Written Reply)

It was reported that a tour group of 24 travellers arriving at Hong Kong from the Philippines in the evening of 9 March this year was suspected to have been deceived, and had to wait miserably at the Hong Kong International Airport for more than six hours, but were still not received by staff of the travel agency concerned. Such travellers had later learnt that the travel agency and the receiving organization in Hong Kong had not made any accommodation arrangements for them. They had called the Travel Industry Council of Hong Kong (“TIC”), the Hong Kong Tourism Board (“HKTB”) and the Consulate-General of the Philippines in Hong Kong respectively to seek immediate assistance, but they did not receive any assistance. Finally, the Member of the Legislative Council returned by the tourism functional constituency had arranged for their accommodation for that night and provided them with other assistance. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the respective numbers of cases received by the various government departments concerned in each of the past three years of travellers visiting Hong Kong who requested for emergency assistance; and what established mechanisms or measures are in place for handling such cases;
- (b) whether it has assessed if the cause of HKTB’s and TIC’s failure to immediately handle the aforesaid case of request for assistance and to provide emergency assistance to such travellers was related to the fact that the incident occurred after office hours; if an assessment has been conducted, of the outcome; if not, whether it will conduct an assessment expeditiously; and
- (c) given that some members of the trade have pointed out that at present, the Tourism Commission, HKTB and TIC do not provide emergency services after office hours to travellers stranded in Hong Kong as

a result of being involved in cases similar to the above deception case or other unexpected incidents, of the reasons for not providing such services; whether it has assessed the adverse impact of the lack of such services on the tourism industry in Hong Kong; if an assessment has been conducted, of the outcome; if not, whether it will conduct an assessment expeditiously; and what improvement measures are in place?

尖沙咀河內道重建項目

(17) 李永達議員 (書面答覆)

關於市區重建局(“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的銷售情況，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 是否知悉，在公開發售上述重建項目前進行的內部認購的詳細安排(包括如何決定就哪些單位進行內部認購及如何訂價)為何；市建局有否與項目發展商議訂特選認購人士名單；若有，準則及限制為何，包括有否限制認購人士不可以“摸貨”交易方式(即一位買家在與原業主簽署正式買賣合約後，在指定成交日期前，將其原先與業主簽署之買賣合約權益轉讓給另一位買家)出售單位；有否規定項目發展商和其他合作夥伴的職員及他們的家屬不可透過個人或公司名義以內部認購方式購買單位，抑或他們須獲得相關書面認可才可進行內部認購；若須要，詳情為何；市建局何時及為何同意為上述重建項目進行內部認購的安排，當中涉及多少個單位；項目發展商何時向市建局提交特選認購人士的名單，涉及的人數、共有多少人落實進行內部認購、何時簽署臨時及正式買賣合約，以及何時完成交易；
- (二) 是否知悉，市建局有否主動向公眾公布上述重建項目的內部認購安排詳情，以及有否回應蘋果日報於去年8月26日作出有關內部認購安排的查詢；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；
- (三) 鑒於有報道指出，有不少富商表示透過內部認購方式購入上述重建項目的單位後，即以“摸貨”方式轉售單位，是否知悉市建局有否跟進該類單位轉售情況；
- (四) 鑒於有報道指出，上述重建項目60樓的相連單位是透過個別人士邀約方式申請出售，是否知悉有關的詳情為何；項目內其他的相連單位及複式單位以何方式發售，以及詳情為何；

- (五) 是否知悉，項目發展商何時及以何方式向公眾公布首批公開發售的上述重建項目單位的售價，以及何時正式公開發售；在正式開售當天及翌日，分別有多少個單位推出發售；以及透過此途徑共售出多少個單位，當中有多少個單位的買家與項目合作夥伴有關連(例如合作夥伴的董事局成員、其親人及公司高級管理人員以個人或公司名義購入等)，以及他們是否經項目發展商轄下的地產代理公司購買；當局會否就事件作出調查；
- (六) 是否知悉上述重建項目至今共出售了多少個單位，當中分別透過公開發售及非公開發售(例如內部認購及個別人士邀約申請等)方式售出的單位數目及百分比為何；以及有多少個單位分別以公司及個人名義購入；
- (七) 為免日後其他重建項目的合作夥伴公司轄下的地產代理公司(即負責銷售項目單位的地產代理)可優先購入首批公開發售的單位，藉此獲利或協助銷情，是否知悉市建局會否考慮採用抽籤方式決定公開發售首批單位的買家；
- (八) 是否知悉市建局會否考慮在日後其他重建項目的網頁上盡快公布售樓書的詳細資料、單位售價，以及每日和累積出售單位數目，並每天更新合約買賣紀錄，以期增加透明度；及
- (九) 根據上述重建項目售樓書的資料，項目共有736.358平方米的面積屬公眾行人通道，須由業主負責其管理、營運及維修保養，是否知悉每年預計該等支出的金額為何；業主如何攤分該等費用；當中608.03平方米屬公用契約部分是否只可用作公眾行人通道，而不可作其他用途(例如出租作臨時擺賣等用途)；業主須否分擔項目範圍內的公眾休憩空間、公共通道、隧道連接及出入口及港鐵車站公共通道和行人隧道連接的管理及維修保養費？

Redevelopment project at Hanoi Road in Tsim Sha Tsui

(17) Hon LEE Wing-tat (Written Reply)

Regarding the sale of the flats in the redevelopment project at Hanoi Road in Tsim Sha Tsui, which was jointly undertaken by the Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”) and a private developer, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it knows the detailed arrangements of the internal sale conducted before the sale of the units of the aforesaid redevelopment project in the open market (including how the decision on which flats were to be put up for internal sale was made and how their prices were set); whether URA has discussed and agreed with the project developer a list of specially-selected buyers; if it has, what the criteria and restrictions were, including whether buyers were prohibited from selling their flats by way of “confirmor sale” (i.e. after signing the formal agreement for sale and purchase with the original property owner, the buyer passes the interests in the agreement to another buyer before the specified date of transaction); whether it has prohibited staff and family members of the project developer and other partners from purchasing flats in their own name or in the names of companies through internal sale, or they were required to obtain the written authorization concerned to participate in internal sale; if they were so required, of the details; when and why URA has agreed to the internal sale arrangements for the aforesaid redevelopment project, as well as the number of flats involved; when the project developer submitted the list of specially-selected buyers to URA, the number of persons involved, and the total number of persons who actually made purchases in the internal sale, when the provisional and formal agreements for sale and purchase were signed, and when the transactions were completed;
- (b) whether it knows if URA has taken the initiative to publicize detailed arrangements for the internal sale

of the aforesaid redevelopment project, and replied to the enquiry on the internal sale arrangements from the Apple Daily on 26 August last year; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

- (c) given that it was reported that quite a number of tycoons indicated that after purchasing flats of the aforesaid redevelopment project through internal sale, they immediately resold the flats by way of “confirmor sale”, whether it knows if URA has followed up the resale situation of such kind of flats;
- (d) given that it was reported that the adjoining flats on the 60th floor of the aforesaid redevelopment project were sold by applications from individual buyers on invitation, whether it knows the relevant details; in what way the other adjoining and duplex flats in the project were sold and its details;
- (e) whether it knows when and in what way in the project developer publicized the prices of the first batch of flats in the aforesaid redevelopment project put up for sale in the open market, and when the sale in the open market officially commenced; the respective numbers of flats put up for sale on the first and second days of the official sale; the total number of flats sold in this way and, among them, the number of those the buyers of which are affiliated with the project partners (such as purchases made in their own name or in the names of companies by the board members, relatives and senior management staff of the partners, etc.), and whether such purchases were executed through the estate agencies under the project developer; whether the authorities will investigate the incident;
- (f) whether it knows the total number of flats in the aforesaid redevelopment project sold to date and, among them, the respective numbers and percentages of those sold through sale in the open market and not through sale in the open market (such as internal sale and applications from individual buyers on invitation, etc.); and the respective numbers of flats purchased in the names of companies and persons;

- (g) in order to avoid estate agencies under the partners of other future redevelopment projects (i.e. estate agents responsible for the sale of the flats of the project) from having priority in purchasing the first batch of flats put up for sale in the open market, so as to generate profits and boost sales, whether it knows if URA will consider adopting the method of drawing lots to decide on the buyers to purchase the first batch of flats for sale in the open market;
- (h) whether it knows if URA will consider expeditiously publicizing on the web sites of other future redevelopment projects detailed information of the sales brochures, prices of flats, as well as daily and aggregate numbers of flats sold, and updating records of agreements for sale and purchase daily, with a view to enhancing transparency; and
- (i) according to the information in the sales brochure of the aforesaid redevelopment project, dedicated areas of a total of 736.358 square metres (“m²”) are zoned as public pedestrian walkway, the management, operation, repair and maintenance of which will be the responsibilities of property owners, whether it knows such estimated annual expenditure; how the property owners share such expenses; whether 608.03 m² inside the dedicated areas as defined under the Deed of Dedication can only be used for public pedestrian passage, and not for other purposes (such as letting out for temporary hawking activities, etc.); whether property owners are required to shoulder the management and repair and maintenance costs of the open space for the public, public passage, tunnel connections and accesses as well as public passage and pedestrian subway connections leading to MTR stations within the project area?

Statistical surveys conducted by the Census and Statistics Department

(18) Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po (Written Reply)

It has been learnt that the Census and Statistics Department (“C&SD”) makes changes to the types of data it collects in its statistical surveys for publication from time to time, and that C&SD has established channels to obtain views from data users, including conducting customer opinion surveys and holding regular meetings with major statistical data users, so as to assist it in determining the types of data to be collected and published. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of regular meetings held with major statistical data users in each of the past five years, broken down by major subject of the meetings;
- (b) of the subject headings introduced and suspended respectively in the statistical surveys C&SD had conducted in each of the past five years in response to data users’ views;
- (c) of the total number of subjects added to and deleted from the “Hong Kong statistics” in each of the past five years; and
- (d) whether there are objective criteria adopted by C&SD to consider which particular statistics are to be introduced or suspended; if so, of the details of such criteria?

政府統計處進行的統計調查

(18) 李國寶議員 (書面答覆)

據悉，政府統計處(“統計處”)會不時更改其統計調查所收集以供發表的數據種類，而統計處已建立渠道以獲取數據使用者的意見，包括進行顧客意見調查及與主要的統計數據使用者定期舉行會議，以協助該處決定將收集及發表的數據種類。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去5年，每年與主要的統計數據使用者舉行的定期會議的次數，並按會議的主要議題提供分項數字；
- (二) 過去5年，每年統計處在其進行的統計調查中，因應數據使用者的意見引入及暫停使用的類別分目分別為何；
- (三) 過去5年，每年“香港統計資料”加入及刪除的類別的總數分別為何；及
- (四) 統計處有否採用客觀準則，以考慮引入或暫停使用某些特別的統計資料；若有，該等準則的詳情為何？

少數族裔人士的支援服務中心

(19) 李慧琼議員 (書面答覆)

政制及內地事務局在2009年向非政府機構撥款，在觀塘、灣仔、屯門及元朗開設和營辦4個中心，向少數族裔人士提供支援服務，以協助他們融入社區。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 每個中心自成立以來，少數族裔人士參加活動或接受服務的人次，並按居住地區、種族及年齡列出分項數字；及
- (二) 有否計劃增加中心的數目；若有，詳情如何；若否，原因為何？

Support service centres for ethnic minorities

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

In 2009, the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau allocated funds to non-governmental organizations to set up and operate four centres in Kwun Tong, Wan Chai, Tuen Mun and Yuen Long to provide support services for ethnic minorities so as to help them integrate into the community. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of attendances of ethnic minorities participating in activities or receiving services of each centre since its establishment, together with a breakdown by district of residence, race and age; and
- (b) whether it has planned to increase the number of such centres; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

租用青年廣場的辦公室及多功能場地

(20) 張國柱議員 (書面答覆)

行政長官在其1998年的施政報告公布在柴灣興建一所青年發展中心，作為青年發展工作和活動的基地。該中心現稱為青年廣場，並已自去年年底開始分階段投入服務。據悉，設於青年廣場八樓及九樓，面積共約1 300平方米的辦公室及多功能場地已正式啟用，供青年團體租用。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 租用上述的辦公室及多功能場地的申請程序及資格為何；至今接獲的申請數目，當中分別已獲批及被拒的申請數目，以及該等申請被拒的原因為何；
- (二) 上述各辦公室單位的面積、租金、租用團體名稱及租約年期為何(按下表列出)；及

| 辦公室的 單位號碼 | 單位面積 | 租金 | 租用團體名稱 (或空置) | 租約年期 |
|--------------|------|----|-----------------|------|
| | | | | |

- (三) 當局有否機制資助該等資金不足但欲租用上述辦公室的青年團體？

Leasing of offices and multi-function areas in Youth Square

(20) Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che (Written Reply)

The Chief Executive (“CE”) announced in his 1998 Policy Address the construction of a centre for development in Chai Wan to provide a focal point for youth development work and activities. The centre is now called the Youth Square and has been commissioned by phases since the end of last year. It has been learnt that the offices and multi-function areas on the 8th and 9th floors of the Youth Square, which has a total area of about 1 300 square metres, have been officially commissioned for leasing to youth groups. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the application procedure and eligibility for leasing the aforesaid offices and multi-function areas; the number of applications received so far and, among them, the respective numbers of those which have been approved and rejected, as well as the reasons for rejecting such applications;
- (b) of the area, rental, name of the leasing group and lease period of the aforesaid various office units (set out in the table below); and

| Unit number of the office | Area of the unit | Rental | Name of the leasing group (or vacant) | Lease period |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------|--|--------------|
| | | | | |

- (c) whether the authorities have any mechanism in place to subsidize those youth groups which do not have sufficient funds but wish to lease the aforesaid offices?