

立法會

Legislative Council

立法會CB(3) 485/11-12號文件

2012年2月24日內務委員會會議文件

定於2012年2月29日立法會會議上提出的質詢

提問者：

- (1) 鄭家富議員 (口頭答覆)
- (2) 葉劉淑儀議員 (口頭答覆)
- (3) 李慧琼議員 (口頭答覆)
- (4) 梁家傑議員 (口頭答覆) (新的質詢)
(取代其原先提出的質詢)
- (5) 張國柱議員 (口頭答覆)
- (6) 潘佩璆議員 (口頭答覆) (新的質詢)
(取代其原先提出的質詢)
- (7) 劉江華議員 (書面答覆)
- (8) 梁國雄議員 (書面答覆)
- (9) 石禮謙議員 (書面答覆)
- (10) 余若薇議員 (書面答覆) (新的質詢)
(取代其原先提出的質詢)
- (11) 陳淑莊議員 (書面答覆) (新的質詢)
(取代其原先提出的質詢)
- (12) 謝偉俊議員 (書面答覆)
- (13) 馮檢基議員 (書面答覆)
- (14) 張國柱議員 (書面答覆)
- (15) 梁國雄議員 (書面答覆)
- (16) 李慧琼議員 (書面答覆) (新的質詢)
(取代其原先提出的質詢)
- (17) 甘乃威議員 (書面答覆) (新的質詢)
(取代其原先提出的質詢)
- (18) 林大輝議員 (書面答覆) (新的質詢)
(取代其原先提出的質詢)
- (19) 謝偉俊議員 (書面答覆)
- (20) 馮檢基議員 (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

規管一手私人住宅物業的銷售

(4) 梁家傑議員 (口頭答覆)

據報，有市民以700萬元購入馬鞍山樓盤“天宇海”一個設於平台層的“海畔花園大宅”單位。由於該名市民購入時單位為預售樓花，直至兩個月前收樓才得知該單位實際上位於地面，懷疑售樓書有誤導成分。該售樓書列明住宅單位設於平台層、5樓至30樓，不設地下及1至4、13、14和24樓；而樓層圖只有英文說明，沒有標示平台層與地面的距離；另外會所圖中顯示平台層設於1樓會所之上。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 屋宇署在審批上述樓盤的建築圖則時，有否考慮售樓書的內容會否令平台層單位的買家誤以為自己購買的單位並非位於地面；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 鑒於屋宇署在2010年5月修訂《認可人士、註冊結構工程師及註冊岩土工程師作業備考》(下稱“《作業備考》”)，接受售樓書中將“4”、“13”及尾數是“4”的層數刪去，但刪除其他層數的做法不會獲得允許，亦不接納採用非數字名稱、別號、另類層數(例如“亦稱X樓”)，以及不合邏輯或非順序的層數編排，以免令物業的準買家、訪客及提供緊急服務的政府部門感到混亂，當局在審批“天宇海”的建築圖則時，有否評估發展商將5樓以下的單位列為設於非數字的“平台層”，以及刪去1至3樓等做法有否違反《作業備考》；若有，詳情為何，以及有否要求發展商適當地修改圖則；若沒有作出評估，原因為何；及

- (三) 根據政府就規管一手住宅物業銷售事宜草擬的建議法例，上述“天宇海”的個案會否觸犯建議法例中的任何部分；若會，詳情為何；若否，會否考慮加入相關規定，以使條例更能保障消費者？

Regulation of the sales of first-hand
private residential properties

(4) Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit (Oral reply)

It has been reported that a member of the public bought an “Oceanaire Garden Residence” flat situated on the podium floor of a residential property named “Oceanaire” in Ma On Shan at a price of \$7 million. As the member of the public bought the flat during the pre-sale of uncompleted flats of the property, it was not until two months ago when he took possession of the flat that he came to know that it is actually situated on the ground level, and he suspects that the contents of the sales brochure of the property are misleading. The sales brochure states that the residential flats are situated on the podium floor and on the fifth to the 30th floors, and there is no ground floor, first to fourth floors, 13th, 14th and 24th floors in the property. The floor plans are only in English and the distance between the podium floor and the ground level is not indicated; further, the layout plan of the clubhouse shows that the podium floor is situated above the clubhouse which is on the first floor. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) when approving the building plans of the aforesaid residential property, whether the Buildings Department (“BD”) had considered if the contents of the sales brochure would mislead buyers into believing that the flats on the podium floor which they bought are not on the ground level; if it had, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) given that according to the Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical

Engineers (“Practice Note”) amended by BD in May 2010, omission of floor numbers “4”, “13” and those ending with a “4” may be accepted, but assigning floor numbers with other omissions would not be allowed, and the use of non-numerical names, alias names, alternative floor numbers (e.g. in the form of “also known as x/F”), illogical or non-consecutive numbers would also not be accepted for assigning floor numbers, so as to avoid causing confusion to potential property buyers, visitors and government departments which provide emergency services, whether the authorities had, when approving the building plans of “Oceanaire”, assessed if the developer had violated the Practice Note by stating that flats located below the fifth floor are on a non-numerical floor of “podium floor” and omitting the first to third floors; if so, of the details and whether they had requested the developer to amend the plans properly; if no assessment had been made, the reasons for that; and

- (c) according to the Government’s proposed legislation to regulate the sales of first-hand residential properties, whether the aforesaid “Oceanaire” case has violated any provision in the proposed legislation; if so, of the details; if not, whether it will consider including the relevant requirements, so that the proposed legislation can better protect the consumers?

延長香港證券市場的交易時間

(6) 潘佩璆議員 (口頭答覆)

香港交易及結算所有限公司(下稱“港交所”)繼去年實行第一階段延長證券市場交易時間後，計劃在2012年3月5日起進一步推行第二階段延長交易時間，而原來一個半小時的午休時間將進一步縮短至一小時。不少業內工會及從業員對有關安排表示不滿，要求港交所維持一個半小時的午休。可是港交所對此置若罔聞，並按計劃在3月份推行第二階段延長交易時間。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 是否知悉，港交所推行第二階段計劃之前，有否主動與業界磋商，瞭解業界就進一步縮減午休時間而面對的困難；如有，困難為何；如否，原因為何；
- (二) 財經事務及庫務局和證券及期貨事務監察委員會有否評估港交所減少午休時間時，對業內從業員的影響，以及有關配套是否足夠；如有評估，結論是甚麼；及
- (三) 鑒於根據港交所2010年11月的諮詢總結，支持縮短午休至一個半小時的業內人士數目其實較多，加上現時不少從業員反對將午休時間進一步縮短，當局會否要求港交所暫時擱置計劃，並考慮以其他方式(例如提早開市及延後收市等)代替縮短午休至一小時的決定；如否，原因為何？

Extending trading hours of the Hong Kong securities market

(6) Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou (Oral reply)

After the Hong Kong Exchanges and Clearing Limited (“HKEx”) implemented the first phase of the extension of trading hours of the securities market last year, HKEx has planned to take forward the second phase trading hour extension as from 5 March 2012 in which the lunch break will be further shortened from one and a half hours to one hour. Quite a number of workers unions and practitioners of the trade have expressed their dissatisfaction with such an arrangement and request HKEx to maintain a lunch break of one and a half hours. However, HKEx has brushed aside the request and will implement the second phase of trading hour extension in March as planned. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it knows if HKEx has proactively held discussions with the trade before it implements the second phase of the plan to understand the difficulties the trade will encounter upon the further shortening of the lunch break; if it has, what the difficulties are; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) whether the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau and the Securities and Futures Commission have assessed the impact of HKEx shortening the lunch break on the practitioners of the trade, and whether the relevant supporting facilities are sufficient; if such assessment has been made, of the outcome; and
- (c) given that according to the consultation conclusions published by HKEx in November 2010, there were in fact more members of the

trade supporting the plan to shorten the lunch break to one and a half hours, plus the fact that quite a number of practitioners now object to further shortening the lunch break, whether the authorities will require HKEx to temporarily suspend the plan and consider other options (e.g. opening the market earlier and closing the market later, etc.) to replace the decision of shortening the lunch break to one hour; if they will not, of the reasons?

海外港人的國籍變更申報及其子女的居留權

(10) 余若薇議員 (書面答覆)

據悉，不少移居海外的香港居民十分關心其國籍申報及子女的香港居留權(“居港權”)等問題，並於網上親子討論區掀起熱烈討論。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 移居海外後希望回流香港工作或定居的香港居民是否擁有居港權；他們是否須要向入境事務處(“入境處”)申報國籍變更；如是，原因為何；如否，原因為何；
- (二) 自1997年香港主權移交後，每年香港居民向入境處申報國籍變更的個案數目為何；
- (三) 香港居民移居海外並成為當地居民後，他們在海外所生的子女有沒有居港權；如有，原因為何；如沒有，原因為何；及
- (四) 自1997年主權移交後，每年香港居民移居海外後所生的子女向入境處申請居港權的數目為何；每年獲批及被拒的個案數目分別為何？

Declaration of change of nationality by
overseas Hong Kong people and right of abode of their children

(10) Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee (Written reply)

It has been learnt that quite a number of Hong Kong residents who have emigrated overseas are very concerned about issues such as their declaration of nationality and their children's right of abode in Hong Kong ("ROA"), etc. and it has aroused heated discussions in online parent-child discussion forums. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether Hong Kong residents who wish to return to Hong Kong for employment or settlement after emigrating overseas are entitled to ROA; whether they are required to make declaration of change of nationality to the Immigration Department ("ImmD"); if so, of the reasons; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) of the number of declarations of change of nationality made by Hong Kong residents to ImmD in each year since the handover of sovereignty over Hong Kong in 1997;
- (c) whether children born overseas to Hong Kong residents who have emigrated overseas and become local residents there are entitled to ROA; if so, of the reasons; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (d) of the number of applications for ROA made to ImmD in each year since the handover of sovereignty in 1997 by children born to Hong Kong residents who have emigrated overseas; and the numbers of cases approved and rejected each year?

過境私家車一次性特別配額

(11) 陳淑莊議員 (書面答覆)

粵港過境私家車一次性特別配額試驗計劃(“自駕遊計劃”)第一階段將於下月實行，政府一再強調會在檢討第一階段的成效後，才決定第二階段的細節。鑒於不少市民對應否實行自駕遊計劃仍表示有保留，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 現時5類可以過境的車輛(即兩地巴士、特區出租汽車、特區私家車、內地公務／商務車和兩地貨車)，平均每月的過境車次分別為何；有否評估實行自駕遊計劃後，該等車次的變化為何；
- (二) 政府將根據哪些準則評估自駕遊計劃第一階段的成效，以及採納該等準則的理據為何，並舉例說明將會基於甚麼具體情況判定第一階段已取得良好成效，而落實開展第二階段；
- (三) 當局與廣東省政府就自駕遊計劃進行商討時，有否向其承諾在第一階段落實後，必須落實計劃的第二階段；若有，該承諾的詳情為何；若否，政府會否因為市民對實行計劃第二階段的強烈反響而擱置自駕遊計劃；若否，原因為何；及
- (四) 當局是否已經與廣東省政府建立溝通和協商機制，處理自駕遊計劃落實後的各種問題，以及收集兩地的公眾對自駕遊計劃的意見，並就他們的意見和憂慮進行磋商；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何？

One-off ad hoc quotas for cross-boundary private cars

(11) Hon Tanya CHAN (Written reply)

The first phase of the trial scheme on one-off ad hoc quotas for Guangdong/Hong Kong cross-boundary private cars (“Self-drive Tour Scheme”) will be launched next month. The Government has repeatedly stressed that details of the second phase will be determined only after reviewing the effectiveness of the first phase. Given that quite a number of members of the public still have reservations about whether the Self-drive Tour Scheme should be launched, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the respective average monthly numbers of cross-boundary vehicle trips of the five types of boundary crossing vehicles (i.e. HKSAR/mainland coaches, HKSAR hire cars, HKSAR private cars, mainland official/enterprise vehicles and HKSAR/mainland goods vehicles) at present; whether it has assessed the changes in such numbers upon the launch of the Self-drive Tour Scheme;
- (b) of the criteria to be adopted by the Government in assessing the effectiveness of the first phase of the Self-drive Tour Scheme, and the justifications for adopting such criteria, together with examples to demonstrate the specific circumstances under which the first phase will be judged to be effective, and the second phase will be taken forward;
- (c) whether the authorities had given any undertaking to the Guangdong Provincial Government during their discussion on the

Self-drive Tour Scheme that the second phase must be launched after implementation of the first phase; if they had, of the details of such undertaking; if not, whether the Government will shelve the Self-drive Tour Scheme in view of the strong public reaction against the launch of the second phase of the Scheme; if not, of the reasons for that; and

- (d) whether the authorities have established any mechanism of communication and consultation with the Guangdong Provincial Government to deal with various problems arising after the launch of the Self-drive Tour Scheme, to collect views from the public of the two places on the Scheme and to discuss their views and worries; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

空置的租住公屋單位

(16) 李慧琼議員 (書面答覆)

據報，東涌一個入伙近7年的公共屋邨，有近百個可容納6至9人的大房單位懷疑從未有人入住，部分單位簇新至連門上的防盜眼及門柄的膠紙亦未“開封”。報道指大量單位空置多年，造成公屋資源浪費。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 撇除“特快公屋編配計劃”下的不受歡迎租住公屋單位，現時每個屋邨分別有多少個可供出租單位已空置1年、1年至2年、2年至4年和4年以上而仍未編配予公屋申請人；當中分別有多少個屬於1人家庭、2人家庭、3至4人家庭、5人及以上家庭的單位，並以表列出分項數字；
- (二) 造成上述租住公屋單位長期空置的原因；
- (三) 過去5年，每年房屋署因上述單位空置而損失的租金收入為何；及
- (四) 過去5年，當局曾經採用甚麼方法減少租住公屋單位長期空置的情況；有否計劃將長期空置的大單位改裝成細單位；若有，詳情為何；若否；原因為何？

Vacant public rental housing units

(16) Hon Starry LEE Wai-king (Written reply)

It has been reported that in a public housing estate in Tung Chung which has been in occupation for almost seven years, nearly one hundred large units which can accommodate six to nine persons are suspected to have been unoccupied, and some flats are in such brand new state that even the plastic tapes over the door viewers and plastic wrappers over the handles have not been taken off. The report indicated that a large number of units have been left vacant for years, resulting in a waste of public housing resources. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) in each public housing estate, other than those unpopular public rental housing (“PRH”) units to be allocated under the Express Flat Allocation Scheme, of the respective current numbers of units available for lease which have been left vacant for one year, one to two years, two to four years and over four years and not yet been allocated to public housing applicants; among them, the respective numbers of those units for families of one person, two persons, three to four persons, and five persons and more, and set out the breakdown in table form;
- (b) of the causes for the aforesaid PRH units being left vacant for a long time;
- (c) of the amounts of rental income foregone by the Housing Department in each of the past five years as a result of the aforesaid PRH units being left vacant; and
- (d) of the measures taken by the authorities in the past five years to minimize the circumstances of

PRH units being left vacant for a long time; whether they have plans to convert large units which have been left vacant for a long time into smaller ones; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

涉及政府高級官員的違例建築工程

(17) 甘乃威議員 (書面答覆)

據報，行政長官辦公室發言人於本年2月13日回覆傳媒的查詢時表示，行政長官曾經提醒各司局長檢視他們擁有的物業有沒有僭建物，如有需要，他們要自行委託專業認可人士視察單位，尋求專業意見，行政長官並沒有要求有關官員匯報處理進度。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 行政長官何時就上述事宜提醒各司局長；為何並沒有要求他們匯報處理進度；
- (二) 至今有多少及哪些司局長(或前司局長)曾向行政長官或當局匯報他們擁有的物業有否僭建物，以及有哪些沒有作出匯報；
- (三) 根據第(二)項所述曾作出匯報的司局長(或前司局長)，他們的物業有否僭建物；若有，詳情(包括物業的地點、是甚麼僭建物、所佔面積、何時僭建、當局的處理方法、有否清拆和何時清拆，以及現時的情況等)為何；及
- (四) 就第(二)項沒有作出匯報的司局長(或前司局長)，當局有否調查或是否知悉他們的物業有否僭建物；若根據調查結果或當局知悉其物業有僭建物，詳情(包括物業的地點、是甚麼僭建物、所佔面積、何時僭建、當局的處理方法、有否清拆和何時清拆，以及現時的情況等)為何；若當局至今沒有進行調查或並不知悉有關情況，會否要求他們盡快作出匯報，並公布匯報內容(包括如有僭建

物，詳情為何)；若會，詳情為何；若否，原因為何？

Unauthorized building works involving
senior government officials

(17) Hon KAM Nai-wai (Written reply)

It has been reported that in response to media enquiries, a spokesman for the Chief Executive's Office stated on 13 February this year that the Chief Executive ("CE") had reminded various Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux to review whether there was any unauthorized building work ("UBW") in the properties owned by them, and that if necessary, they should appoint authorized persons themselves to inspect their property units and seek professional advice, while CE had not requested the officials concerned to report the progress of handling. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) when CE reminded the Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux of the aforesaid issue; why he did not request them to report the progress of handling;
- (b) how many and which Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux (or former Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux) have reported to CE or the authorities so far whether there are UBWs in the properties owned by them, and which of them have not yet done so;
- (c) whether there are UBWs in the properties owned by the Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux (or former Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux) who have reported to CE or the authorities as mentioned in (b); if so, of the details (including the locations of the properties, the types and sizes of UBWs, when such UBWs were erected,

the means of handling by the authorities, whether and when such UBWs were removed, as well as the current situation, etc.); and

- (d) regarding the Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux (or former Secretaries of Departments and Directors of Bureaux) in (b) who have not reported to CE or the authorities, whether the authorities have investigated or whether they know if there is any UBW in their properties; if the investigation results reveal that or if the authorities know that there are UBWs in their properties, of the details (including the locations of the properties, the types and sizes of UBWs, when such UBWs were erected, the means of handling by the authorities, whether and when such UBWs were removed, as well as the current situation, etc.); if so far the authorities have not carried out any investigation or do not know the relevant situation, whether they will request them to give reports as soon as possible, and make public the contents (including the details of UBWs if there is any) of their reports; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

協助香港企業在內地拓展業務的措施

(18) 林大輝議員 (書面答覆)

內地與香港於2003年簽訂《內地與香港關於建立更緊密經貿關係的安排》(“《安排》”)後，至今共簽訂8份補充協議，以逐步實施在《安排》下的市場開放措施。可是，本港不少中小型企業(“中小企”)和專業服務界別人士向本人反映，內地市場實際仍存在“大門開，小門未開”的情況，使他們在內地拓展業務時面對一定困難。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 有否評估，本港不同行業於內地面對“大門開，小門未開”的實際情況；如有，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；
- (二) 鑒於有中小企反映，內地的公司註冊手續繁複和需時甚長，是否知悉內地有關程序和一般審批所需的時間；如知悉，詳情為何；如否，會否深入瞭解；
- (三) 鑒於有中小企反映，在內地一些城市申請註冊開業前，需要設立辦事處和向當地註冊部門提供詳細地址，但地址只可供申請註冊的公司單獨使用，不能分拆予多間公司使用，故對申請註冊的公司帶來投資風險，是否知悉詳情，以及有否與內地協商解決方法；
- (四) 鑒於有本港稅務專業人士反映，國家稅務總局訂下的法規在不同城市會有不同的詮釋，是否知悉詳情，以及有否與內地協商解決方法；
- (五) 鑒於有本港會計業人士反映，在內地開展的業務範圍仍受到一定限制及聘請

內地會計師遇到困難，是否知悉詳情，以及有否與內地協商解決方法；

- (六) 鑒於有本港從事建築及相關工程的中小企反映，內地某些城市的公司註冊和資質評定的門檻十分嚴格，是否知悉詳情，以及有否與內地協商解決方法；
- (七) 鑒於有法律業界人士反映，本港律師事務所在內地開展的業務範圍受到一定限制和不能聘用內地執業律師，是否知悉詳情，以及有否與內地協商解決方法；
- (八) 鑒於有本港醫療業人士反映，內地城市對於本港私人執業醫生在當地行醫、開設醫務所或租用內地醫務設施均有嚴格的規限，是否知悉詳情，以及有否與內地協商解決方法；
- (九) 是否知悉本港藥廠於內地註冊所面對的困難；如知悉，詳情為何，以及有否與內地協商解決方法；
- (十) 鑒於有本港保險業人士反映，本港保險經紀現時仍難以在內地城市提供服務，是否知悉詳情，以及有否與內地協商解決方法；
- (十一) 有否評估內地與香港在各項專業資格互認的進展；如有，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；及
- (十二) 有否計劃進一步降低進入內地市場的門檻，以及加強兩地的專業資格互認？

Measures to help Hong Kong enterprises to explore business opportunities on the Mainland

(18) Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai (Written reply)

A total of eight supplements have been signed since the Mainland and Hong Kong signed the Mainland and Hong Kong Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement (“CEPA”) in 2003 to gradually implement the market liberalization measures under CEPA. Yet, quite a number of small and medium-sized enterprises (“SMEs”) and members of the professional service sector in Hong Kong have reflected to me that the situation of “big doors are open, but small doors are not yet open” in fact still exists in the mainland market, and they face considerable difficulties in exploring business opportunities on the Mainland. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it has assessed the actual situation of “big doors are open, but small doors are not yet open” faced by various Hong Kong industries on the Mainland; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) given that some SMEs have reflected that the mainland company registration procedures are complicated and time-consuming, whether it knows such procedures and the time generally required for vetting and approval on the Mainland; if it knows, of the details; if not, whether it will seek an in-depth understanding of the matter;
- (c) given that some SMEs have reflected that before applying for registration for the commencement of business in some mainland cities, they need to set up an office and provide its detailed address

to the local registration department but the address may only be used by the company which applies for registration and may not be shared use by several companies, hence creating investment risks for the company which applies for registration, whether it knows the details and whether it has discussed the solutions with the Mainland;

- (d) given that some tax professionals in Hong Kong have reflected that the rules and regulations made by the State Administration of Taxation are subject to different interpretations in different cities, whether it knows the details and whether it has discussed the solutions with the Mainland;
- (e) given that some members of the accounting profession in Hong Kong have reflected that there are still certain restrictions on the scope of the business they may develop on the Mainland and they encounter difficulties in employing mainland accountants, whether it knows the details and whether it has discussed the solutions with the Mainland;
- (f) given that some SMEs providing construction and related engineering services in Hong Kong have reflected that the thresholds for company registration and qualification assessment in certain mainland cities are very strict, whether it knows the details and whether it has discussed the solutions with the Mainland;
- (g) given that some members of the legal profession have reflected that there are certain restrictions on the scope of the practice to be set up by Hong Kong law firms on the Mainland and they

cannot employ mainland practising lawyers, whether it knows the details and whether it has discussed the solutions with the Mainland;

- (h) given that some members of the medical profession in Hong Kong have reflected that there are strict regulations and restrictions on the practice of medicine, setting up medical clinics or renting mainland medical facilities by Hong Kong private medical practitioners in mainland cities, whether it knows the details and whether it has discussed the solutions with the Mainland;
- (i) whether it knows the difficulties faced by Hong Kong pharmaceutical manufacturers in registration on the Mainland; if so, of the details and whether it has discussed the solutions with the Mainland;
- (j) given that some members of the insurance industry in Hong Kong have reflected that it is still difficult for Hong Kong insurance brokers to provide services in mainland cities at present, whether it knows the details and whether it has discussed the solutions with the Mainland;
- (k) whether it has assessed the progress of the mutual recognition of various professional qualifications between the Mainland and Hong Kong; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (l) whether it has any plan to further lower the threshold to enter the mainland market and strengthen the mutual recognition of professional qualifications between the two places?