

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 894/10-11

**Paper for the House Committee meeting
of 17 June 2011**

**Questions scheduled for the
Legislative Council meeting of 22 June 2011**

Questions by:

- | | | |
|------|--|--------------------------------|
| (1) | Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen
<i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| (2) | Hon TAM Yiu-chung | (Oral reply) |
| (3) | Hon LAU Kong-wah
<i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| (4) | Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyau | (Oral reply) |
| (5) | Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
<i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| (6) | Hon Starry LEE Wai-king
<i>(Replacing her previous question)</i> | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| (7) | Dr Hon Samson TAM Wai-ho | (Written reply) |
| (8) | Hon IP Wai-ming | (Written reply) |
| (9) | Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah | (Written reply) |
| (10) | Hon CHAN Kin-por | (Written reply) |
| (11) | Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit | (Written reply) |
| (12) | Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long | (Written reply) |
| (13) | Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong | (Written reply) |
| (14) | Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung | (Written reply) |
| (15) | Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee | (Written reply) |
| (16) | Hon CHAN Hak-kan | (Written reply) |
| (17) | Hon WONG Kwok-hing
<i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | (Written reply) (New question) |
| (18) | Hon LEE Wing-tat | (Written reply) |
| (19) | Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip | (Written reply) |
| (20) | Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee | (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

離岸人民幣業務的發展

(1) 梁君彥議員 (口頭答覆)

《中華人民共和國國民經濟和社會發展第十二個五年規劃綱要》已於本年3月公布，港澳部分單獨成章(下稱“《專章》”)，內容強調中央支持香港發展成為離岸人民幣業務中心和國際資產管理中心。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 在發展離岸人民幣業務方面，當局有何具體措施回應《專章》的內容，以發揮香港在國家發展戰略中作為離岸人民幣業務中心及國際資產管理中心的功能定位，以及目前的進度為何；
- (二) 鑒於最近有報道指新加坡揚言要爭取成為離岸人民幣業務中心，當局有何措施保持香港在離岸人民幣業務方面的優勢；及
- (三) 鑒於財經事務及庫務局副局長最近指出人民幣國際化進程要成功，離岸人民幣中心需加強“內循環”(海外人民幣回流內地的政策)及“外循環”(搭建往海外市場的金融平台)的功能，政府在這兩方面有甚麼計劃？

Development of Renminbi offshore business

(1) Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen (Oral Reply)

The “Outline of the Twelfth Five-Year Plan for the National Economic and Social Development of the People’s Republic of China” was promulgated in March this year, with an individual chapter dedicated to Hong Kong and Macao (the “dedicated chapter”), the contents of which put emphasis on the Central Authorities’ support for Hong Kong to develop into an offshore Renminbi (“RMB”) business centre and an international asset management centre. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) regarding the development of offshore RMB business, of the specific measures the authorities have to respond to the contents of the dedicated chapter, in order to make use of the functions and positioning of Hong Kong in the overall national development strategy as an offshore RMB business centre and an international asset management centre, as well as the progress at present;
- (b) as it has been reported recently that Singapore has declared that it will strive to become an offshore RMB business centre, what measures the authorities have to maintain Hong Kong’s competitive edge in offshore RMB business; and
- (c) as the Under Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury has pointed out recently that, for the internationalization of RMB to be successful, the offshore RMB centre has to strengthen its functions of “inner circulation” (i.e. the policy for overseas RMB to flow back into the Mainland) and “outer circulation” (i.e.

the construction of a financial platform to access overseas markets), of the Government's plans in these two aspects?

縮減邊境禁區的覆蓋範圍

(3) 劉江華議員 (口頭答覆)

政府於2008年公布，將邊境禁區的覆蓋範圍，由原來的2 800公頃縮減至400公頃。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 上述計劃目前的進度為何，以及哪些邊境地區會最快獲開放；
- (二) 政府會否加強交通配套設施(包括巴士等公共交通，並增設自駕遊)，以促進開放地區的發展；以及會否容許公共交通工具駛進臨近羅湖火車站獲開放的範圍，讓當地居民及過境旅客有更多乘車選擇；及
- (三) 鑒於跨境學童的交通需求日益增加，政府開放邊境後，會否考慮增加中港汽車的配額，讓本港學校與深圳方面有更多點對點聯繫，方便跨境學童往返兩地上學？

Reduction of the coverage of the Frontier Closed Area

(3) Hon LAU Kong-wah (Oral Reply)

The Government announced in 2008 that the coverage of the Frontier Closed Area would be reduced from its original 2 800 hectares to 400 hectares. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the current progress of the aforesaid plan, and which boundary areas will be opened up at the earliest;
- (b) whether the Government will enhance the associated transport facilities (including public transport such as buses, etc. and providing an additional option of self-drive tour) so as to facilitate the development of the opened up areas; and whether it will allow various modes of public transport to access the opened up areas in the vicinity of Lo Wu Station so that the local community and transit passengers will have more commuting options; and
- (c) given the increasing demand for transport from cross-boundary students, whether the Government will consider increasing the quotas for cross-boundary vehicles after opening up the boundary areas so as to allow local schools to have more point-to-point connections with the Shenzhen side, and facilitate cross-boundary students to commute between the two areas to attend school?

課本、教材和學材分拆訂價事宜

(5) 何俊仁議員 (口頭答覆)

為解決教科書價格高企的問題，教育局要求書商將課本、學材和教材分拆訂價。教育局局長在本年5月底表示，假如書商在一年後仍然拒絕就教材分拆訂價，教育局屆時會招標出版課本和教材，或由大學研發及出版教材。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 當局如何確保有一個獨立、公正並具公信力的委員會，審批和資助出版商、大學或教育機構出版多元版本的教科書及需要的教材，供學校選擇，以降低成本及減輕家長的壓力；當局如何保證招標不會僅以“價低者得”為唯一原則，避免投標者“將貨就價”，從而保證教科書及相關教材的質素不會受到影響；
- (二) 當局會否考慮以環保和循環再用的原則評審教科書，避免經常改版；若會，詳情是甚麼；若否，原因是甚麼；及
- (三) 鑒於購買教科書是基層市民一項日常重大的開支，當局會否重新考慮增加學校書簿津貼計劃的津貼額，以減輕家長的經濟負擔？

Debundling of textbooks and
teaching and learning resources for pricing

(5) Hon Albert HO Chun-yan (Oral Reply)

To address the issue of high prices of textbooks, the Education Bureau (“EDB”) has requested publishers to debundle textbooks from learning and teaching materials for pricing. Moreover, the Secretary for Education stated at the end of May this year that if publishers still refused to debundle teaching materials for pricing after one year, EDB would then tender out the publication of textbooks and teaching materials, or it would commission universities to develop and publish teaching materials. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) how the authorities ensure that an independent and impartial committee with credibility will be set up for vetting, approving and funding publishers, universities or educational institutes to publish a wide variety of textbooks and necessary teaching materials for schools to choose from, so as to lower the costs and alleviate the burden on parents; how the authorities guarantee that the condition of “the lowest bidder wins” will not be the only selection principle in the tendering process, with a view to preventing tenderers from “providing inferior products at lower prices”, and ensuring that the quality of textbooks and relevant teaching materials will not be affected;
- (b) whether the authorities will consider assessing textbooks according to the principles of environmental protection and recycling so as to avoid frequent issue of new textbook editions; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

- (c) given that the purchase of textbooks is a major item of daily expenses for the grassroots, whether the authorities will consider afresh increasing the grant rates under the School Textbook Assistance Scheme, so as to alleviate the financial burden on parents?

出租“棺材房”及分間樓宇單位

(6) 李慧琼議員 (口頭答覆)

據報，深水埗的舊樓出現“棺材房”，有人將原來的“劏房”一劏為六，再分別把每間只有棺材般大小的細房出租。“棺材房”疊成3層，頂層的租客要爬梯上落，環境惡劣，住客不能在房間內站立或坐着，出入亦要像動物般爬行。報道指每間“棺材房”的租金若換算為每呎月租高達300元，較中環國際金融中心更貴；“棺材房”的招租廣告隨處可見，但負責人沒有與租客簽訂正式租約，以逃避政府的監管和調查。此外，據本人瞭解，區內有地產代理主動提供一站式服務，每月向業主支付固定租金，並改建其單位成“劏房”或“棺材房”出租，收取巨額租金圖利。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去3年，民政事務總署按區議會分區每年分別接獲多少宗涉及觸犯《床位寓所條例》及《旅館業條例》的投訴，有多少宗投訴成立，以及判罰和跟進情況為何，而當中涉及“棺材房”的情況為何；另外，針對“棺材房”的經營模式，目前還有甚麼法例監管；署方有否採用“放蛇”的方式主動調查“棺材房”是否符合有關法例；若有，調查結果為何；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 屋宇署有否調查上述“棺材房”的負責人是否涉及僭建或違規改建，或因未能符合有關安全及衛生設施的規定而觸犯《建築物條例》；若有，調查結果為何；若否，原因為何；及
- (三) 對於有地產代理主動提供一站式服務，是否知悉，地產代理監管局有否主動調查有關做法是否違反專業守則；若有，調查結果為何；若否，原因為何？

“Coffin-sized units” and sub-divided flat units for lease

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

It has been reported that in the old buildings in Sham Shui Po, there are “coffin-sized units”, which are separate units of the size of a coffin converted from further dividing the original “sub-divided units” into six smaller units for leasing purpose. “Coffin-sized units” are stacks of three levels and the occupants of the uppermost level have to climb up and down ladders, the conditions are appalling, and the occupants can neither stand up nor sit inside the units, but have to crawl like animals when going into or out of the units. It has been reported that the monthly rental per square foot for each “coffin-sized unit” can reach as much as \$300, which is more expensive than that of the International Finance Centre in Central; and that while lease advertisements for “coffin-sized units” can be seen everywhere, the persons in charge of such units do not sign any formal tenancy agreements with tenants so as to evade monitoring and investigation by the Government. Moreover, I have learnt that some estate agents in the district are proactively providing one-stop services by paying fixed monthly rentals to flat owners and converting the flats into “sub-divided units” or “coffin-sized units” for lease, thereby reaping profits by charging hefty rentals. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) in each of the past three years, of the respective numbers of complaints, broken down by District Council district, involving the breaches of the Bedspace Apartments Ordinance and the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance received by the Home Affairs Department (“HAD”), as well as the number of substantiated cases, the penalties imposed and what follow-up actions were taken, and among

these complaints, the situation of those involving “coffin-sized units”; what other legislation is currently in place to regulate the mode of operation of “coffin-sized units”; whether HAD has initiated investigations using “undercover” operations to ascertain if these “coffin-sized units” comply with the relevant legislation; if it has, of the investigation results; if not, the reasons for that;

- (b) whether the Buildings Department (“BD”) has investigated if the aforesaid persons in charge of “coffin-sized units” are involved in erecting unauthorized building works or making unauthorized alterations, or in breach of the Buildings Ordinance because of non-compliance with the relevant safety and sanitation requirements; if it has, of the investigation results; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) regarding some estate agents proactively providing one-stop services, whether it knows if the Estate Agents Authority (“EAA”) has initiated investigations to ascertain if such practices are in breach of their professional codes; if it has, of the investigation results; if not, the reasons for that?

公屋擠迫戶的調遷計劃

(17) 王國興議員 (書面答覆)

香港房屋委員會(“房委會”)每年都會推出“公屋住戶紓緩擠迫調遷計劃”及“改善居住空間調遷計劃”，讓居住面積分別少於每人5.5平方米及7平方米(以室內樓面面積計算)的公屋住戶，申請調遷到較大單位。但有公屋居民向本人反映，他們查詢有關計劃時，房屋署職員指他們只能獲編配往天水圍及東涌等偏遠地區的較大單位，而並非調遷往原區或同一編配區域的較大單位。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 按市區、擴展市區、新界及離島4個編配區域劃分，現時居住面積分別少於每人5.5平方米及7平方米的公屋住戶的數目；
- (二) 過去3年，房委會接獲“公屋住戶紓緩擠迫調遷計劃”及“改善居住空間調遷計劃”的申請數目、成功調遷的住戶數目、以及當中獲原區調遷及調遷往同一編配區域的住戶數目分別為何；
- (三) 當局每年就上述兩個計劃預留多少個公屋單位作調遷之用；是否在每個編配區域都預留該等單位；如是，按編配區域列出每年可供擠迫戶調遷的單位數目；如否，原因為何；
- (四) 房屋署有否指引，指示職員在上述兩個計劃申請人所屬區域的可供擠迫戶調遷的單位滿額或不足時，限制申請人只能被調往偏遠地區的公屋單位；如有，原因為何；如否，申請人是否仍可透過計劃輪候調遷至原區或同一編配區域的較大單位，以及平均輪候時間為何；及

- (五) 房委會未來會否主動發信予居住密度少於每人5.5平方米及7平方米的公屋住戶，邀請他們參加上述兩個計劃，以解決公屋擠迫戶的問題；當局會否加強前線職員的培訓，以及向居民多加宣傳，讓他們瞭解擠迫戶調遷計劃的詳情，以免他們被誤導？

Transfer schemes for
overcrowded public rental housing households

(17) Hon WONG Kwok-hing (Written Reply)

The Hong Kong Housing Authority (“HA”) launches the Territory-wide Overcrowding Relief (“TWOR”) transfer exercises and Living Space Improvement Transfer Scheme (“LSITS”) every year to enable public rental housing (“PRH”) tenants living below 5.5 square metres (“m²”) and 7 m² internal floor area (“IFA”) per person respectively to apply for transfer to larger flats. Yet, some PRH tenants have relayed to me that when they inquired about such exercises and scheme, HA staff said that they could only be allocated larger flats in remote areas such as Tin Shui Wai and Tung Chung, etc., instead of being transferred to larger flats in the same area where they are living (“same area”) or in the same district for PRH allocation (“same district”). In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the numbers of PRH tenants living below 5.5 m² and 7 m² IFA per person respectively at present, with a breakdown by the four districts of urban, extended urban, the New Territories and the islands;
- (b) in the past three years, of the respective numbers of “TWOR” and “LSITS” applications received by HA, the tenants successfully transferred, and among such tenants, those who were transferred to flats in the same area or the same district;
- (c) of the numbers of PRH flats set aside every year by the authorities for transfer under the aforesaid exercises and scheme; whether such flats are set aside in every district; if so, of the

number of flats available for transferring overcrowded households every year, with a breakdown by district; if not, the reasons for that;

- (d) whether the Housing Department has guidelines to instruct its staff to restrict applicants of the aforesaid exercises or scheme to be transferred to PRH flats in remote areas only when the flats available for transferring overcrowded households in the applicants' districts are occupied or insufficient; if it has, of the reasons for that; if not, whether applicants can still wait for transfer under such exercises and scheme to larger flats in the same area or the same district, and of the average waiting time; and
- (e) whether HA will proactively issue letters in the future to PRH tenants living below 5.5 m² and 7 m² IFA per person to invite them to participate in the aforesaid exercises and scheme, so as to resolve the problem of overcrowdedness of PRH households; whether the authorities will enhance training for frontline staff and step up publicity among tenants, so that they will understand the details of the transfer schemes for overcrowded households and will not be misled?