

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 162/11-12

**Paper for the House Committee meeting
of 25 November 2011**

**Questions scheduled for the
Legislative Council meeting of 30 November 2011**

Questions by:

- | | | |
|------|--|--------------------------------|
| (1) | Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po | (Oral reply) |
| (2) | Hon IP Wai-ming | (Oral reply) |
| (3) | Hon Vincent FANG Kang | (Oral reply) |
| (4) | Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (5) | Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai | (Oral reply) |
| (6) | Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee | (Oral reply) |
| (7) | Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee | (Written reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing her previous question)</i> | |
| (8) | Hon LEE Wing-tat | (Written reply) |
| (9) | Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him | (Written reply) |
| (10) | Hon Albert HO Chun-yan | (Written reply) |
| (11) | Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip | (Written reply) |
| (12) | Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming | (Written reply) |
| (13) | Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun | (Written reply) |
| (14) | Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai | (Written reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (15) | Hon KAM Nai-wai | (Written reply) |
| (16) | Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him | (Written reply) |
| (17) | Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun | (Written reply) |
| (18) | Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee | (Written reply) |
| (19) | Hon TAM Yiu-chung | (Written reply) |
| (20) | Hon WONG Sing-chi | (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

政府就立法會議員提出的質詢作出的答覆

(4) 謝偉俊議員 (口頭答覆)

本人分別於2009年11月4日、2011年4月13日及2011年6月15日代表受影響的廣大市民和旅行代理商提出質詢，要求政府解釋民航處根據甚麼數據，以及如何計算和審批經常被輿論批評為“加快減慢”的客運燃料附加費。此外，本人亦要求政府解釋民航處基於甚麼理據和準則批准法國航空公司及荷蘭皇家航空公司不按與香港政府簽訂的《民用航空運輸協定》單方面把本港旅行代理商的機票銷售佣金削減至零的申請。雖然質詢措辭已直接清晰要求當局提供理據、數據及審批款額計算方法，但政府最終仍沒有按質詢要求提供資料。部分曾向本人反映意見的旅客和旅行代理商指政府的回應答非所問，敷衍了事。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 政府有否評估，過往各政策局和政府部門在答覆本會議員的質詢時，是否未能回應市民及商界關注的問題，以及使公眾感覺政府刻意迴避問題或敷衍了事，導致行政立法關係裹足不前和削弱市民對政府施政信心；若有，評估結果為何；若沒有作出評估，原因為何，可否馬上評估及研究是否有改善空間；
- (二) 政府有何政策、措施及守則，確保各政策局及政府部門不會敷衍回答或回應議員的質詢；及

(三) 會否責成民航處重新跟進上述問題，回應市民、商界和議員的合理質詢，並提供社會所關注的重要數據？

Government's replies to questions asked by
Legislative Council Members

(4) Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun (Oral reply)

On 4 November 2009, 13 April 2011 and 15 June 2011, I represented the affected general public and travel agents to raise questions to the Government, seeking explanation from it regarding what data and methods the Civil Aviation Department (“CAD”) uses for calculating, vetting and approving passenger fuel surcharges which are often criticized by the public as “quick in going up but slow in coming down”. In addition, I also requested the Government to explain based on what justifications and criteria CAD approved the applications by Air France and KLM Royal Dutch Airlines for not following the Air Services Agreements signed with the Hong Kong Government to unilaterally reduce to zero the commissions paid to travel agents in Hong Kong in respect of air tickets sold. Although the wording of the questions already directly and explicitly requested the authorities to provide the justifications, data and calculating methods for vetting and approving the amounts, the Government ultimately did not provide the information requested in the questions. Some of the passengers and travel agents who had previously relayed their views to me pointed out that the Government's responses were irrelevant and perfunctory. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the Government has assessed if the various policy bureaux and government departments were not able to address the concerns raised by the public and the business sector in their replies to the questions raised by

Members of this Council in the past, hence making the public feel that the Government had deliberately averted the problems or acted in a perfunctory manner, thereby leading to the stagnant relationship between the executive authorities and the legislature as well as undermining public confidence in the Government's governance; if it has, of the outcome of assessment; if it has not conducted such an assessment, the reasons for that, and whether it can assess right away and study if there is any room for improvement;

- (b) of the polices, measures and codes of practice the Government has in place to ensure that the various policy bureaux and government departments will not reply or respond to Members' questions in a perfunctory manner; and
- (c) whether it will instruct CAD to follow up the aforesaid issues again, so as to respond to the reasonable questions raised by the public, the business sector and Members, as well as providing important data that are of public concern?

公營及私人住宅單位的供求

(7) 余若薇議員 (書面答覆)

在本年11月7日本會的房屋事務委員會會議上，政府表示根據公屋輪候冊的等候人數、香港人口增長分布、過去10年私人住宅的成交量，以及“香港2030－規劃遠景與策略”最後報告的數據，推算出未來平均每年共4萬個公營及私人住宅單位的供應量的規劃目標。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 鑒於政府因樓宇安全問題，正採取措施逐漸取締分間樓宇單位(俗稱“劏房”)，另一方面，行政長官在本年的施政報告中指出，“劏房”同時也是為未符合上樓資格的基層市民提供居住地方，而亦有評論指“劏房”是其中一項反映本港潛在房屋需求的指標，現行推算房屋需求的方法有否將該項潛在的房屋需求計算在內；若有，政府是根據哪些數據作出推算；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 現時政府統計全港的“劏房”數目為何(按現居於“劏房”的住戶人數、每月平均入息及職業列出分項數字)；及
- (三) 政府在推算上述供應量所根據的數據中，有否涵蓋本港的各類潛在房屋需求；若否，政府會否因應本港的潛在房屋需求，重新檢討現行推算房屋需求的方法，並按檢討結果調整預期未來公營和私人住宅單位的供應量？

Supply of and demand for public and private residential units

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

At the meeting of the Panel on Housing of this Council on 7 November this year, the Government indicated that the projected planning target of an average annual supply of 40 000 public and private residential units in the future was derived based on the number of people on the Waiting List for public rental housing, the distribution of population growth in Hong Kong, the volume of private residential property transactions over the past 10 years, as well as the data in the final report of the “Hong Kong 2030: Planning Vision and Strategy”. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) given that the Government is implementing measures to gradually ban the sub-division of flat units (commonly known as “sub-divided units”) on the ground of building safety issues, and on the other hand, the Chief Executive pointed out in this year’s Policy Address that, such “sub-divided units” at the same time provide accommodation for low-income people not eligible for public housing, and there have also been comments that “sub-divided units” are one of the indicators which reflect the potential housing demand in Hong Kong, whether the current methods for projecting housing demand have taken into account such potential housing demand; if so, based on what data the Government made its projection; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) of number of “sub-divided units” in Hong Kong according to the existing statistics compiled by the Government, with a

breakdown by the size of households living in “sub-divided units”, average monthly income and occupation; and

- (c) whether the data based on which the Government made the aforesaid housing supply projection have covered the various types of potential housing demand in Hong Kong; if not, whether the Government will review afresh the current methods adopted for projecting the housing demand in the light of the potential housing demand in Hong Kong, and adjust the projected future supply of public and private residential units based on the outcome of the review?

\$6,000計劃

(14) 林大輝議員 (書面答覆)

“\$6,000計劃”(“計劃”)於本年8月28日啟動的分批登記期，已於本年11月5日完結，當局共收到超過400萬份登記表格。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 各個年齡組別、本地或境外合資格人士和有特別需要人士的登記人數為何(以表列形式分項列出)；
- (二) 已提出登記但不符資格準則的登記人數目，以及他們不符資格的原因為何；當中有多少是因為沒持有有效香港永久性居民智能身份證而不符資格；多少人提出覆核及上訴，以及結果為何(以表列形式分項列出)；
- (三) 多少市民已領取支票；65歲或以上的市民選擇於各區郵局領取支票的人數；以及當局有否作出任何安排，協助他們於郵局領取支票；如有，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；
- (四) 除上述的市民外，其他已登記的市民何時會收到款項(列出時間表)；
- (五) 預計有多少市民選擇領取6,000元連200元獎賞；政府因此而增加多少開支；
- (六) 至今，計劃熱線186000接獲的查詢數目及內容為何(以表列形式分項列出)；

- (七) 各政府部門有否接獲任何與計劃相關的投訴；若有，投訴的詳情為何(以表列形式分項列出)；
- (八) 有否評估現時計劃的進度及安排是否令人滿意，以及令人滿意的原因為何；會否就計劃進行檢討；如會，何時進行，以及會否向本會提交檢討報告；如否，原因為何；
- (九) 鑒於澳門特區政府宣布會連續第5年於2012年繼續向澳門居民派發款項，有否評估這有否對香港特區政府構成壓力；如有構成壓力，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；
- (十) 會否考慮於2012-2013財政年度，再次向市民派發現金；如會，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；
- (十一) 鑒於國際貨幣基金組織的代表團於本年11月16日發表意見，認為香港如果沒有出現重大的外來衝擊，來年的預算案可終止向全民發放款項的措施，政府有否就該項意見作出評估；如有，詳情為何；如否，原因為何；及
- (十二) 鑒於有社會人士認為，計劃並非一項善用社會資源的措施，建議政府應該集中資源幫助社會上較需要援助的市民，政府有否就該等意見作出評估；如有，詳情為何；如否，原因為何？

Scheme \$6,000

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

The batching period of “Scheme \$6,000” (“the Scheme”), which commenced on 28 August this year, ended on 5 November this year, and the authorities have received a total of over 4 million registration forms. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the respective numbers of registrants in various age groups, those who are eligible persons living in Hong Kong or outside Hong Kong, and those who are persons with special needs (with a breakdown set out in table form);
- (b) of the number of registrants who have submitted registrations but do not meet the eligibility criteria, and the reasons for their ineligibility; among them, how many are ineligible because they do not hold a valid smart Hong Kong permanent identity card; the number of people who have filed for review and appeal, and the outcome (with a breakdown set out in table form);
- (c) of the number of people who have collected their cheques; the number of people aged 65 or above who have opted to collect their cheques at the post offices in various districts; and whether the authorities have made any arrangement to assist them in collecting cheques at post offices; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (d) apart from the aforesaid people, when the other registrants will receive the payment (list the timetable);

- (e) of the estimated number of people who opt to receive \$6,000 plus a bonus of \$200; the resultant increase in government expenditure;
- (f) of the number of enquiries received through the Scheme hotline 186000 so far and their contents (with a breakdown set out in table form);
- (g) whether the various government departments have received any complaint relating to the Scheme; if they have, of the details of such complaints (with a breakdown set out in table form);
- (h) whether it has assessed if the present progress and arrangements of the Scheme are satisfactory, and the reasons for their being satisfactory; whether it will conduct a review on the Scheme; if it will, when the review will be conducted, and whether it will submit a review report to this Council; if not, of the reasons for that;
- (i) since the Macao SAR Government has announced that it will continue to hand out money to Macao residents for the fifth consecutive year in 2012, whether it has assessed if this has imposed pressure on the Hong Kong SAR Government; if it has imposed pressure, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (j) whether it will consider handing out cash to members of the public again in the 2012-2013 financial year; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

- (k) given the view expressed by the International Monetary Fund Staff Mission on 16 November this year that in the absence of a major external shock in Hong Kong, measures taking the form of universal transfers could be discontinued in the upcoming Budget, whether the Government has assessed such a view; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (l) given that some members of the public consider that the Scheme is not a measure which makes good use of social resources and suggest that the Government should focus the resources on helping people in society who are in greater need of assistance, whether the Government has assessed such views; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?