

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 649/11-12

**Paper for the House Committee meeting
of 20 April 2012**

**Questions scheduled for the
Legislative Council meeting of 25 April 2012**

Questions by:

- | | | |
|------|--|--------------------------------|
| (1) | Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung | (Oral reply) |
| (2) | Hon James TO Kun-sun
<i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| (3) | Hon CHAN Hak-kan | (Oral reply) |
| (4) | Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che | (Oral reply) |
| (5) | Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai
<i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| (6) | Hon Paul CHAN Mo-po | (Oral reply) |
| (7) | Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan | (Written reply) |
| (8) | Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee | (Written reply) |
| (9) | Hon Fred LI Wah-ming
<i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | (Written reply) (New question) |
| (10) | Hon TAM Yiu-chung | (Written reply) |
| (11) | Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po | (Written reply) |
| (12) | Hon LAU Kong-wah | (Written reply) |
| (13) | Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai
<i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | (Written reply) (New question) |
| (14) | Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun | (Written reply) |
| (15) | Hon IP Wai-ming | (Written reply) |
| (16) | Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee | (Written reply) |
| (17) | Hon Tanya CHAN
<i>(Replacing her previous question)</i> | (Written reply) (New question) |
| (18) | Hon KAM Nai-wai | (Written reply) |
| (19) | Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun | (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

在公共屋邨張貼海報

(2) 涂謹申議員 (口頭答覆)

早前有報章報道，有區議會議員(下稱“區議員”)擬在房屋署(下稱“房署”)管理的公共屋邨張貼某些海報(例如關於“捍衛廉潔香港，要有廉潔政府”、“上街‘反英抗暴’遊行”，以及“抗議港鐵加價”的海報)，呼籲居民關注社會事件，但不獲房署批准。本人亦收到投訴，指房署不批准投訴人在公共屋邨張貼有關立法會動議引用《立法會(權力及特權)條例》所賦予的權力調查行政長官接受款待事宜，以及載有批評運輸署政策混亂和反對取消巴士線內容的海報，這做法與房署以往一直容許張貼各類海報的做法不同。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 房署為何不批准在公共屋邨張貼上述海報，為何與以往的做法不同；房署曾否修訂其審批張貼海報申請的內部指引或收緊指引的具體解釋；若否，為何按照同樣的內部指引但做法卻前後不同，這是否涉及政策改變、當局有否進行自我政治審查、改變做法是否涉及政治考慮，以及審查海報內容的準則為何；
- (二) 當局有否評估現時的做法的影響(包括對本會議員及區議員批評和監察政府，及向市民交待議會的工作，以及對公屋居民接收社會訊息的權利的影響)；及
- (三) 會否檢討政府的內部指引，以保障廣大市民接收本會議員及區議員發放社會訊息的權利？

Posting of posters in public housing estates

(2) Hon James TO Kun-sun (Oral reply)

It has earlier been reported in the press that some District Council (“DC”) members intended to put up certain posters (e.g. posters about “Safeguarding of a corruption-free Hong Kong requires a clean government”, “A march to protest against ‘Ying and violence’” and “Protest against MTR fare increase”) in public housing estates (“PHEs”) managed by the Housing Department (“HD”) to draw residents’ attention to social issues, but HD refused to give permission. I have also received complaints alleging that HD refused to give permission for the complainant to put up in PHEs posters on a motion moved in the Legislative Council to exercise the powers conferred by the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance for the purpose of inquiring into the acceptance of entertainment by the Chief Executive, as well as those posters which criticize the Transport Department’s policies as confusing and object the cancellation of bus routes, and pointing out that such practice deviates from the past practice of HD which had all along permitted the posting of various kinds of posters. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the reasons why HD did not permit the aforesaid posters to be posted in PHEs, and why the current practice deviates from that in the past; whether HD has revised its internal guidelines on vetting and approving applications for putting up posters, or tightened the specific interpretation of such guidelines; if not, of the reason for the differences between the current and past practices which are both following the same internal guidelines, whether any policy change is involved, whether the authorities have exercised political self-censorship, whether the change in practice involves political consideration, and of the criteria for vetting the contents of posters;

- (b) whether the authorities have assessed the impact of the current practice, including the impact on the work of Members of this Council and DC members in criticizing and monitoring the Government and accounting for the work of the councils to members of the public, as well as the impact on the right of public rental housing tenants to receive social information; and
- (c) whether the internal guidelines of the Government will be reviewed to safeguard the right of the general public to receive social information from Members of this Council and DC members?

促進科技研究及發展

(5) 何鍾泰議員 (口頭答覆)

政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 當局有否就本港及新加坡的科技研究及發展的情況作出研究；若有，兩地在這方面的優勢及弱點如何比較；
- (二) 除“投資研發現金回贈計劃”外，當局有否制訂其他具體措施鼓勵本港的大學參與創新科技業界及工業界的科技研發項目，以提升本港整體的科技研發能力；及
- (三) 是否知悉，現時本港的大學有否與創新科技業界及工業界共同合作發展科技研發項目；若有，該等項目的數目、研究範圍及涉及的資金為何？

Promotion of research and development in
science and technology

(5) Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai (Oral reply)

Will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the authorities have studied the research and development (“R&D”) situation in science and technology in Hong Kong and Singapore; if they have, how the two places compare with each other in respect of their strengths and weaknesses in this regard;
- (b) apart from the Research and Development Cash Rebate Scheme, whether the authorities have formulated other specific measures to encourage local universities to participate in R&D projects in science and technology undertaken by the innovation and technology sector and the industrial sector, so as to enhance Hong Kong’s overall capability in R&D in science and technology; and
- (c) whether it knows if local universities at present collaborate with the innovation and technology sector and the industrial sector in the development of R&D projects in science and technology; if they do, of the number and scopes of research of such projects, as well as the amounts of investment involved?

輪候編配租住公屋的時間

(9) 李華明議員 (書面答覆)

近年本人接獲不少4人或以上正申請租住公屋的家庭投訴輪候時間很長，遲遲未獲編配公屋單位，就算家有長者也未能於3年內獲編配公屋單位，更遑論長者優先配屋。政府今年2月在回覆本會議員的質詢時表示，現時仍有不少對大型公屋單位的需求，而可容納家庭人數較多的大型公屋單位的供應仍然緊絀。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去3年，每年當局編配多少個大型公屋單位予4人或以上家庭申請者；獲編配單位的4人或以上家庭的平均輪候時間為何，有多少輪候超過3年；如沒有相關數字，原因為何；
- (二) 現時在公屋輪候冊上有多少個4人或以上家庭申請者(並按輪候時間少於3年，3年至少於4年，4年至少於5年及5年或以上提供分項數字)；如沒有相關數字，原因為何；
- (三) 當局會否透過每年1次的公屋輪候冊住戶統計調查，蒐集公屋輪候冊上4人或以上家庭申請者的輪候時間的資料；如否，原因為何；
- (四) 根據當局估計，未年5年每年有多少個新建或翻新大型公屋單位可供編配予4人或以上家庭申請者，並按地區提供分項數字；及
- (五) 當局有何方法加快提供大型公屋單位(包括會否檢討現時的建屋安排，增建多些大型公屋單位)，以供編配予4人或以上家庭申請者？

Waiting time for allocation of public rental housing units

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

In recent years, I have received complaints from quite a number of families of four persons or more which are applying for public rental housing (“PRH”) that they have been waiting for a very long time but have yet to be allocated PRH units, and that even those with elderly family members are not allocated PRH units within three years, let alone priority allocation for elderly persons. In reply to a question from a Member of this Council in February this year, the Government indicated that at present, the demand for large units remained strong and PRH units accommodating larger households were in short supply. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of large PRH units allocated to family applicants with four or more members in each of the past three years; the average waiting time of those family applicants with four or more members which were allocated PRH units, and the number of those which had waited for more than three years; if the relevant figures are not available, of the reasons for that;
- (b) of the current number of family applicants with four or more members on the Waiting List for PRH (together with a breakdown by their waiting time, i.e. less than three years, three to less than four years, four to less than five years, and five years or more); if the relevant figures are not available, of the reasons for that;
- (c) whether the authorities collect information on the waiting time of family applicants with four or more members on the Waiting List through the annual Survey on Waiting List Applicants for Public Rental Housing; if not, of the reasons for that;
- (d) of the numbers of newly completed or refurbished large PRH units available for

allocation to family applicants with four or more members in each of the next five years according to the authorities' projection, together with a breakdown by district; and

- (e) of the means (including whether existing construction arrangements will be reviewed with a view to building more large PRH units) by which the authorities can accelerate the provision of large PRH units for allocation to family applicants with four or more members?

香港特別行政區政府駐內地的辦事處

(13) 林大輝議員 (書面答覆)

有本港中小型企業向本人反映，隨著中國經濟迅速發展，內地市場的發展潛力豐厚，許多港資企業都希望能夠把握《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》(“十二五”規劃)帶來的商機及拓展內銷業務，但由於香港特區政府駐內地辦事處(“駐內地辦事處”)的支援不足，使他們對內地市場的實況和進入市場的渠道缺乏瞭解，因此遇到不少困難。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去5年，各個駐內地辦事處每年共接獲多少宗港資企業在內地發展業務的求助個案，以及當中有多少宗獲得協助；
- (二) 過去5年，各個駐內地辦事處每年共為多少間港資企業就業務發展提供支援服務，並按服務類別列出分項數字；
- (三) 對於港資企業在內地發展業務時要求協助，駐內地辦事處的一般處理程序和做法為何；
- (四) 有否計劃因應內地市場龐大和港資企業要求支援的需求上升，而增加駐內地辦事處的數目和擴大它們的職能；如有，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；
- (五) 駐內地辦事處會否就內地不同省、市的市場情況定期進行調查，並向港資企業提供詳盡的相關資料；如會，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；
- (六) 駐內地辦事處會否協助擬在內地發展的港資企業聯絡和認識適合的內地政府部門和相關監管機構，以及告知進入市場的渠道；如會，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；

- (七) 駐內地辦事處會否考慮為在內地發展的港資企業提供法律和稅務服務；如會，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；
- (八) 駐內地辦事處有何具體計劃進一步協助港資企業拓展內銷及把握“十二五”規劃帶來的商機；
- (九) 鑒於商務及經濟發展局局長於本年2月29日回覆本人質詢時表示，個別港資企業在進入內地市場時有任何問題，可提供具體詳情，各駐內地辦事處會根據個案的內容，向內地有關當局反映及跟進，各駐內地辦事處在過去5年每年共收到及轉介至內地政府部門的個案數字為何，以及當中有多少個案已獲解決；及
- (十) 有否比較，各駐內地辦事處與特區政府駐海外辦事處在協助港資企業發展業務的工作上有何差別；如有，詳情為何；如否，原因為何？

The offices of the Government of the HKSAR on the Mainland

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

A number of small and medium-sized enterprises in Hong Kong have relayed to me that, with the rapid development of the Chinese economy, the mainland market has profound potential for development, and quite a number of Hong Kong enterprises hope to seize the business opportunities brought by the “Outline of the Twelfth Five-Year Plan for the National Economic and Social Development of the People’s Republic of China” (“the 12th Five-Year Plan”) and expand domestic sales on the Mainland. However, due to inadequate support from the offices of the Hong Kong SAR Government on the Mainland (“Offices on the Mainland”), they lack understanding of the actual situation of the mainland market and the channels to access the market. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the total number of requests for assistance from Hong Kong enterprises in developing businesses on the Mainland received by various Offices on the Mainland in each of the past five years, and the number of such cases in which assistance had been provided;
- (b) of the total number of Hong Kong enterprises which had received support services for business development from various Offices on the Mainland in each of the past five years, with a breakdown by type of service;
- (c) of the general procedure and practices of the Offices on the Mainland for handling requests for assistance made by Hong Kong enterprises when developing businesses on the Mainland;
- (d) whether it plans to increase the number of Offices on the Mainland and expand their functions in response to the huge market on the Mainland and rising demand for support from

Hong Kong enterprises; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

- (e) whether the Offices on the Mainland will conduct regular surveys on the market conditions in various mainland provinces and cities, and provide Hong Kong enterprises with the relevant and detailed information; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (f) whether the Offices on the Mainland will assist Hong Kong enterprises which intend to develop their businesses on the Mainland in liaising and acquainting with the appropriate government departments and relevant regulatory authorities on the Mainland, and inform them of the channels to access the market; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (g) whether the Offices on the Mainland will consider providing legal and taxation services to the Hong Kong enterprises developing businesses on the Mainland; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (h) of the specific plans put in place by the Offices on the Mainland to further assist Hong Kong enterprises in expanding domestic sales in the mainland market and seizing the business opportunities brought by the 12th Five-Year Plan;
- (i) given the reply of the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development to my question on 29 February this year that should individual Hong Kong enterprises encounter problems in accessing the mainland market, they can provide the specific details to the Offices on the Mainland, which will relay the cases with reference to their contents to the relevant mainland authorities and then pursue follow-up action, of the total number of cases received by various Offices on the Mainland and referred to the mainland government departments in each of

the past five years, and among such cases, the number of those which had been settled; and

- (j) whether comparison has been made on the difference between the work of various Offices on the Mainland and that of the overseas offices of the SAR Government in helping Hong Kong enterprises develop their businesses; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

美容業營商實務守則

(17) 陳淑莊議員 (書面答覆)

據報，消費者委員會(“消委會”)於2006年已開始與美容業界進行商討，並已完成《美容業營商實務守則》(“《守則》”)，希望透過美容業的經營者自我規管，提高行業服務質素和加強消費者信心。近日，消委會又發表了《公平條款互利共贏》－標準格式消費合約不公平條款報告，建議標準格式消費合約(“標準合約”)應採用公平條款及加入冷靜期保障消費者權益。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 是否知悉，過去3年，消委會接獲有關預繳式消費的投訴數字、涉款總額及跟進結果分別為何，並按行業(包括美容、健身及其他行業)分項列出；
- (二) 當局會否配合消委會的宣傳推廣活動，採取具體的措施鼓勵美容及其他行業採用消委會建議的標準合約；若會，有關詳情為何；若否，原因為何；當局會否考慮加強相關的公眾教育，讓市民認識消委會最新推出的標準合約範本，鼓勵他們向商戶倡議使用有關的標準合約；若會，詳情為何；及
- (三) 現時當局會否考慮把消委會的《守則》的原則及／或具體條款，納入規管營商手法的法律框架，以及以立法的形式，具體落實消委會建議的“美容業標準格式消費合約草擬指引”和預繳式消費的冷靜期安排；若會，有關的立法研究和公眾諮詢工作的具體安排為何；若否，原因為何？

Beauty Industry Code of Practice

(17) Hon Tanya CHAN (Written reply)

It has been reported that the Consumer Council (“CC”) has started discussions with the beauty industry in 2006 and drawn up a Beauty Industry Code of Practice (“CoP”) with a view to enhancing service quality of the industry and consumer confidence through self-regulation by the practitioners in the beauty industry. Recently, CC has also published the Report on Unfair Terms in Standard Form Consumer Contract, in which CC recommends that fair terms be adopted and a cooling-off period be provided in standard form consumer contracts (“standard contracts”) to protect the rights and interests of consumers. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it knows the number of complaints received by CC in the past three years regarding the pre-payment mode of consumption, the total amounts of money involved and follow-up results, together with a breakdown by industry (including beauty, fitness and other industries);
- (b) whether the authorities will take specific measures to encourage the beauty and other industries to adopt the standard contract proposed by CC so as to tie in with the publicity and promotion campaign of CC; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; whether the authorities will consider stepping up relevant public education to enable members of the public to know about the latest sample of standard contract released by CC, and encourage them to advocate the use of relevant standard contracts among the traders; if they will, of the details; and
- (c) whether at present the authorities will consider incorporating the principles and/or specific terms of CC’s CoP into the legal framework for regulating trade practices, and implementing specifically the “Guidelines on drafting standard

form consumer contracts for beauty industry” and the cooling-off period arrangement recommended by CC for the pre-payment mode of consumption through enacting legislation; if they will, of the specific arrangements for the legislative study and public consultation concerned; if not, the reasons for that?