

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(3) 791/11-12

**Paper for the House Committee meeting  
of 25 May 2012**

**Questions scheduled for the  
Legislative Council meeting of 30 May 2012**

Questions by:

- |      |   |                                |
|------|---|--------------------------------|
| (1)  | Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long  | (Oral reply)                   |
| (2)  | Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  | (Oral reply)                   |
| (3)  | Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai  | (Oral reply) (New question)    |
|      | <i>(Hon Tanya CHAN has given up<br/>the question slot allocated to her)</i> |                                |
| (4)  | Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  | (Oral reply) (New question)    |
|      | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i>                                    |                                |
| (5)  | Hon LEE Wing-tat  | (Oral reply) (New question)    |
|      | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i>                                    |                                |
| (6)  | Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou  | (Oral reply)                   |
| (7)  | Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau   | (Written reply)                |
| (8)  | Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun  | (Written reply)                |
| (9)  | Hon WONG Kwok-hing  | (Written reply)                |
| (10) | Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah   | (Written reply)                |
| (11) | Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit  | (Written reply)                |
| (12) | Hon WONG Kwok-kin   | (Written reply)                |
| (13) | Hon Fred LI Wah-ming  | (Written reply)                |
| (14) | Hon LAU Wong-fat  | (Written reply)                |
| (15) | Hon CHAN Kin-por  | (Written reply)                |
| (16) | Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che   | (Written reply)                |
| (17) | Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee   | (Written reply)                |
| (18) | Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung   | (Written reply)                |
| (19) | Hon WONG Sing-chi   | (Written reply) (New question) |
|      | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i>                                    |                                |
| (20) | Hon James TO Kun-sun  | (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

## 幫助微型企業和中小型企業的措施

### # (3) 林大輝議員 (口頭答覆)

現時，特區政府所採用的中小型企業(下稱“中小企”)的定義為任何從事製造業而在本港僱用少於100人的企業，或任何從事非製造業而在本港僱用少於50人的企業。隨著經濟發展，香港現時不少企業實際僱用人數少於10人，有些公司甚至只有1名員工，屬於微型企業(下稱“微企”)。當經濟一旦逆轉，這些微企面對生意額減少和成本上漲的情況，將會首當其衝，難以繼續經營。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 政府現行採用的中小企的定義，所參考的準則為何及何時開始使用該定義；會否因應現時的經濟情況，檢討該定義，重新制訂切合市場實際情況的中小企定義(包括訂立微企的定義)；如會，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；
- (二) 會否統計現時全港微企的數目及瞭解它們的營運模式，制訂政策向微企提供更多專項的政策支援(包括協助微企融資和開拓市場)；如會，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；及
- (三) 會否考慮為微企、中小企及大型企業引入不同級別的利得稅率(包括為微企訂立較低的稅率及提供較多的稅務寬免)；如會，詳情為何；如否，原因為何？

Measures to assist micro-enterprises  
and small and medium-sized enterprises

(3) Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai (Oral reply)

At present, under the definition adopted by the SAR Government, a small and medium-sized enterprise (“SME”) is any manufacturing business which employs fewer than 100 persons in Hong Kong, or any non-manufacturing business which employs fewer than 50 persons in Hong Kong. With the development of the economy, quite a number of businesses in Hong Kong at present actually employ fewer than 10 persons, with some of them even employ one staff member only, and such companies are micro-enterprises. As these micro-enterprises will face declining business and increasing costs in times of economic downturn, they will bear the brunt of adversity and can hardly carry on their business. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the criteria to which the Government has made reference in adopting the current definition of SMEs, and when it began using that definition; whether it will, in response to the economic conditions at present, review that definition and formulate afresh a definition for SMEs that suits the actual market conditions (including formulating a definition for micro-enterprises); if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) whether it will compile statistics on the number of micro-enterprises in Hong Kong at present and seek to understand their modes of operation, so as to formulate a policy to provide micro-enterprises with more specific policy support (including assisting micro-enterprises in financing and market exploration); if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) whether it will consider introducing profits tax rates of different levels for micro-enterprises, SMEs and large enterprises (including setting a

lower tax rate and offering more tax concessions for micro-enterprises); if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

## 為精神病患者和精神病康復者提供的社區支援服務

### # (4) 何俊仁議員 (口頭答覆)

當局表示治療精神病的國際趨勢逐漸著重社區及日間護理，故政府近年讓更多患者在社區接受治療。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 是否知悉，過去5年，本港患上各類精神病的人數，以及當中在社區接受治療的人數分別為何；每年醫院管理局精神科病人的出院人數為何，當中直接回到社區居住的人數和百分比為何；當中獲安排獨居於公共屋邨單位，以及租住私人樓宇單位並以綜合社會保障援助金支付租金的人數分別為何；出院後入住各類資助和私人院舍，以及其後離開院舍獨立生活的人數分別為何；各類院舍宿位的流動比率分別為何；若知悉，以表列出資料；若否，當局如何評估各種精神病社區健康服務的需求和成效；會否作出追蹤研究，並建立全面的資料庫；
- (二) 就本會議員建議制訂社區治療令，規定對社區構成威脅的已出院精神病患者服藥和接受治療、輔導、護理及監察，當局作詳細研究的進展及具體時間表為何；是否知悉，制訂社區治療令後，提供服務及跟進個案所需人手為何；按現時精神健康綜合社區中心和個案經理等的人手和服務量，能否足以提供該等服務和應付跟進工作；及
- (三) 鑒於平等機會委員會(下稱“平機會”)多年來不斷倡議由政府成立一個高層次和有廣泛基礎的精神健康局，最好由政務司司長負責，以統籌和監察精神健康支援服務，並制訂及推行短期和長期的政策和行動方案，但建議不獲政府接納，而本年9月聯合國殘疾人權利委員會將審議香港特別行政區落實《殘疾人

《權利公約》的報告，是否知悉，平機會  
會否向該委員會反映有關建議？

Community support services for  
mental patients and ex-mental patients

(4) Hon Albert HO Chun-yan (Oral reply)

The authorities have indicated that it is the international trend to gradually focus on community and ambulatory services in the treatment of mental illness, and therefore the Government has allowed more patients to receive treatment in the community in recent years. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it knows the respective numbers of people suffering from various types of mental illnesses in Hong Kong in the past five years, and among them, the number of those who had received treatment in the community; the number of psychiatric patients discharged from hospitals under the Hospital Authority each year, and among them, the number and percentage of those who directly returned to and lived in the community; among them, the respective numbers of those who were arranged to live alone in public housing units, as well as those who rented and lived in private housing units and paid the rents with Comprehensive Social Security Assistance payments; the respective numbers of patients who had, after being discharged from hospitals, lived in various types of subsidized and private residential institutions, as well as those who then left the residential institutions and lived on their own; of the respective turnover rates of the places of various types of residential institutions; if it knows, list the information in table form; if not, how the authorities assess the demand for and effectiveness of various types of community mental health services; whether they will conduct longitudinal studies and set up a comprehensive database;
- (b) regarding the suggestion by a Member of this Council on formulating a community treatment



order to require discharged mental patients who pose a threat to the community to receive medication and therapy, counselling, follow-up care and supervision, of the progress and specific timetable of the authorities to conduct detailed study in this regard; whether it knows the manpower required for service provision and case management after a community treatment order is formulated; based on the existing manpower and service capacity of the Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness and case managers, whether it is sufficient for providing such services and dealing with the follow-up work; and

- (c) given that the Equal Opportunities Commission (“EOC”) has over the years continuous to advocate the establishment of a high powered and broad based Mental Health Council, preferably taken charge by the Chief Secretary for Administration, with a view to coordinating and monitoring mental health support services, and formulating and implementing both short-term and long-term policies and action plans, but the proposal has not been accepted by the Government, and in September this year, the United Nations Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (“UNCRPD”) will examine the report of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in implementing the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, whether it knows if EOC will relay the relevant proposal to UNCRPD?

## 本地免費電視節目服務牌照

### # (5) 李永達議員 (書面答覆)

前廣播事務管理局(即通訊事務管理局前身)(下稱“前廣管局”)已完成審核3間公司(包括城市電訊(香港)有限公司、奇妙電視有限公司及香港電視娛樂有限公司)的本地免費電視節目服務牌照(下稱“牌照”)申請。然而，近日現有的免費電視台強烈反對政府增發牌照，指此舉會分薄該等電視台的廣告收益，拉高營運成本，電視台有可能因而倒閉。就此，行政機關可否告知本會：

- (一) 政府將會在何時向上述3間公司發出牌照；估計行政長官會同行政會議會在何時作出決定；
- (二) 鑒於上述3間公司分別於2009年年底及2010年年初向前廣管局申請營辦免費電視節目服務，政府曾表示在2011年的上半年內完成對申請的審批工作，但至今已經1年多，仍未批出牌照，是否因為該3間公司有技術問題，財政問題或其他問題令政府需要推遲發牌；及
- (三) 亞洲電視有限公司及電視廣播有限公司對政府打算增發牌照表達不滿，有否影響政府考慮不加快向3間公司發牌；政府有否評估前廣管局考慮公眾諮詢的結果時，是否只顧及現有電視台的利益，而忽視市民的意見？

## Licences for domestic free television programme services

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

The former Broadcasting Authority (“former BA”), the predecessor of the Communications Authority, has completed its assessment of the applications for domestic free television programme service licences (“the licences”) from three companies (including City Telecom (Hong Kong) Limited, Fantastic Television Limited and Hong Kong Television Entertainment Company Limited). Yet, an existing free television broadcaster recently raised strong objection to the issuance of additional licences by the Government, pointing out that this would dilute the advertising revenue of such television broadcasters and increase their operating costs, and some television broadcasters might close down as a result. In this connection, will the Executive Authorities inform this Council:

- (a) when the Government will issue the licences to the aforesaid three companies, and the expected time when the Chief Executive in Council will make the decision;
- (b) given that the aforesaid three companies separately applied to the former BA between end-2009 and early-2010 for operating free television programme services and the Government has indicated that vetting and approval of the applications would be completed within the first half of 2011, and that it has been over a year since then but the licences have not yet been granted, whether the Government needs to postpone the issuance of licences because of technical, financial or other problems of the three companies; and
- (c) whether the dissatisfaction expressed by Asia Television Limited and Television Broadcasts Limited over the Government’s plan to issue additional licences has affected the Government’s consideration of not issuing licences to the three companies at a faster pace,

and whether the Government has assessed if the former BA only took into account the interests of existing television broadcasters but ignored the views of the public when considering the results of public consultation?

## 香港鐵路有限公司的票價調整機制及票價優惠計劃

### # (19) 黃成智議員 (書面答覆)

香港鐵路有限公司(“港鐵公司”)利用票價調整機制(“機制”),從2010年起,連續3年加價,累積加幅接近10%。而港鐵公司亦將於本年再加價,加幅為5.4%。就此,政府可否告知本會:

- (一) 鑒於現時通脹嚴重、物價高企,是否知悉,港鐵公司會否考慮擱置加價,或下調票價,以履行企業社會責任,減輕市民負擔;若會,詳情為何;若否,原因為何,以及有何更佳方法回饋社會、照顧民生;
- (二) 鑒於不少市民向本人表示,港鐵公司過往推出的推廣計劃(例如於2011年7月推出的“搭一百賞一票”),並未為市民帶來實際的優惠和好處,是否知悉:
  - (i) 港鐵公司計劃於本年度推出的優惠計劃的詳情、所涉金額及預計受惠人數分別為何;
  - (ii) 港鐵公司會否推出更實際的優惠計劃(例如就所有鐵路路線設立日票、週票及月票計劃,及為乘搭“長程車”的乘客推出“即日回程半價”等優惠);若會,詳情及實施時間表為何;若否,原因為何;
  - (iii) 於港鐵公司推行“搭一百賞一票”推廣計劃期間,乘客持有的於一週內(星期一至五)乘搭港鐵未滿100元的八達通卡的數目,以及該數目佔八達通卡總數的百分比分別為何;該等於一週內乘搭港鐵未滿100元的八達通卡當中,累積車費達90元至94元9角,及95元至99元9角的百達通卡數目,以及該

等數目佔八達通卡總數的百分比分別為何；並分別按月份列出；

(iv) 過去3年，港鐵公司有否先諮詢立法會的意見才推出每種優惠計劃；若否，原因為何，以及將來會否作出此安排；及

(v) 過去3年，港鐵公司每年推出的每項推廣計劃的理據為何，以及有否就該等計劃進行檢討；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；並按年及每項推廣計劃的名稱列出；

(三) 鑒於2010年港鐵公司加價時，約有100個車程是八達通票價較單程車票票價為高，是否知悉，過去3年，每年八達通票價較單程車票票價為高的車程的數目及詳情分別為何；並按年及鐵路路線列出；及

(四) 鑒於港鐵票價及機制涉及重大公眾利益及福祉，過去3年，政府有否以其港鐵公司的大股東身份，就港鐵票價及機制向港鐵公司提出任何意見；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何，以及政府維持其在港鐵公司的大股東身份的理據為何？

Fare Adjustment Mechanism and  
fare concession schemes of the MTR Corporation Limited

(19) Hon WONG Sing-chi (Written reply)

The MTR Corporation Limited (“MTRCL”) has increased its fares under the Fare Adjustment Mechanism (“FAM”) for three consecutive years since 2010, with an accumulative rate of increase of about 10%. MTRCL will increase its fares again this year and the rate of increase is 5.4%. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) given the soaring inflation and prices nowadays, whether it knows if MTRCL will consider putting its fare increases on hold or adjusting its fares downward with a view to fulfilling its corporate social responsibility and alleviating the burden on the public; if it will, the details; if not, the reasons for that; and what better ways it has to pass on the benefits to society and improve the livelihood of the general public;
- (b) given that quite a number of members of the public have indicated to me that the promotional schemes introduced by MTRCL in the past, such as “Ride \$100 Get 1 Free” introduced in July 2011, did not bring them real concessions and benefits, whether it knows:
  - (i) the details of the concession schemes to be introduced by MTRCL this year, the amount involved and the estimated number of beneficiaries;
  - (ii) if MTRCL will introduce more practical concession schemes (e.g. Day Pass, Weekly Pass and Monthly Pass schemes for all railway lines, and providing “same day return half-fare concessions” to “long-haul” passengers); if it will, the details and the implementation timetable; if not, the reasons for that;

- (iii) during the period when the “Ride \$100 Get 1 Free” promotional scheme was implemented by MTRCL, the numbers of Octopus cards whose holders did not take enough MTR journeys to spend \$100 on their Octopus cards from Mondays to Fridays within a week and the percentage of such numbers in the total number of Octopus cards; among such Octopus cards whose holders did not take enough MTR journeys to spend \$100 on their Octopus cards within a week, the numbers of those with an accumulated spending on fares between \$90 and \$94.90 and those between \$95 and \$99.90, as well as the percentages of such numbers in the total number of Octopus cards, together with a breakdown by month;
  - (iv) if MTRCL had consulted the Legislative Council prior to the introduction of each type of concession schemes in the past three years; if it had not, the reasons for that, and if it will adopt such an arrangement in the future; and
  - (v) the justifications for MTRCL to introduce each promotional scheme in the past three years, and if it had reviewed such schemes; if it had, the details; if not, the reasons for that; and set out the information by year and by title of promotional scheme;
- (c) given that when MTRCL increased its fares in 2010, there were around 100 journeys under which Octopus fares were higher than single journey ticket fares, whether it knows the numbers and details of those journeys under which Octopus fares were higher than single journey ticket fares in each of the past three



years, together with a breakdown by year and by railway line; and

- (d) given that MTR fares and FAM involve major public interests and well-being, whether the Government had, in its capacity as the major shareholder of MTRCL, given any advice to MTRCL on matters relating to MTR fares and FAM in the past three years; if it had, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and the justifications for the Government to maintain its status as the major shareholder of MTRCL?