

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 335/15-16

**Paper for the House Committee meeting
of 29 January 2016**

**Questions scheduled for the
Legislative Council meeting of 3 February 2016**

Questions by:

- | | | |
|------|--|-------------------------------|
| (1) | Hon Steven HO | (Oral reply) |
| (2) | Hon Albert HO | (Oral reply)(New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (3) | Dr Hon Helena WONG | (Oral reply) |
| (4) | Hon IP Kwok-him | (Oral reply) |
| (5) | Hon Gary FAN | (Oral reply) |
| (6) | Hon Paul TSE | (Oral reply)(New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (7) | Hon Dennis KWOK | (Written reply) |
| (8) | Hon WONG Ting-kwong | (Written reply) |
| (9) | Hon CHAN Han-pan | (Written reply) |
| (10) | Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT | (Written reply) |
| (11) | Hon Mrs Regina IP | (Written reply) |
| (12) | Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG | (Written reply) |
| (13) | Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki | (Written reply) |
| (14) | Hon WU Chi-wai | (Written reply) |
| (15) | Hon KWOK Wai-keung | (Written reply) |
| (16) | Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN | (Written reply)(New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (17) | Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che | (Written reply) |
| (18) | Hon Frederick FUNG | (Written reply) |
| (19) | Hon CHAN Hak-kan | (Written reply) |
| (20) | Hon Kenneth LEUNG | (Written reply) |
| (21) | Hon Emily LAU | (Written reply) |
| (22) | Hon Charles Peter MOK | (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

Surgical outcomes of Tuen Mun Hospital

(2) Hon Albert HO (Oral reply)

The Hospital Authority (“HA”) has implemented the Surgical Outcomes Monitoring and Improvement Programme (“SOMIP”) in 17 public hospitals since 2008. SOMIP benchmarks the performance of a surgical department with other participating surgical departments by measuring their surgical outcomes after full adjustment with the patients’ preoperative risk factors. It has been reported that the SOMIP Report of 2014-2015 released last month by HA indicated that the performance of Tuen Mun Hospital (“TMH”) in elective surgeries was rated, for the third time, as the most unsatisfactory. It has also been reported that after conducting analyses and site inspections, the expert panel of HA was unable to identify the causes of TMH’s unsatisfactory performance. On the other hand, at a meeting of the Panel on Health Services of this Council held in February 2014, the representatives of Tuen Mun Hospital Doctors’ Association considered that heavy workload and medical manpower constraints in TMH were the root causes that had affected its performance in surgeries. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council if it knows:

- (1) the criteria for calculating the mortality rates of elective surgeries in public hospitals; whether HA has revised such criteria since the implementation of SOMIP; if HA has, of the details; if not, whether HA has reviewed if the mortality rates of elective surgeries calculated by using such criteria can accurately reflect the performance of various hospitals in elective surgeries;
- (2) whether, following the aforesaid expert panel’s making its conclusion in respect of the SOMIP Report of 2014-2015, HA has considered the areas in which TMH can make improvements; if HA has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (3) whether HA has assessed the correlation between the manpower constraints of TMH and its performance in elective surgeries being repeatedly rated as the most unsatisfactory; if HA has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

Abolition of the Mandatory Provident Fund Scheme

(6) Hon Paul TSE (Oral reply)

In September 2014, an academic said that the approved trustees and fund managers of the Mandatory Provident Fund (“MPF”) schemes had at least collected more than 70 billion dollars of fees in total in the past 13 years, and such fees had not yet included the fund transaction costs. The academic also pointed out that even though the Government had implemented the “semi-portability” (i.e. “the Employee Choice Arrangement”), the average MPF charging rate was still close to 1.7%, gnawing nearly 10 billion dollars of MPF contributions in a year. Recently, there have been comments that MPF is of no use at all to the low-income people who are most likely to fall into the social welfare safety net after retirement, and that “one is better off without MPF Scheme as it yields low return, offers zero protection against risks and is worse than a cosmetic scheme”. Meanwhile, there has all along been some members of the public questioning if the function of MPF has changed from assisting employees in “accumulating retirement savings” to safeguarding the incomes of trustees and fund managers, and thus calling for the abolition of MPF Scheme. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (1) whether it knows the total amount of fees received by trustees and fund managers from the MPF contributions in the past 15 odd years since MFP came into operation in December 2000;
- (2) given that for years, employees have been forced to make MPF contributions but their contributions have been substantially gnawed by trustees and fund managers, whether the Government has assessed if such situation contradicts the objective of MPF Scheme in assisting employees in accumulating retirement savings; and
- (3) given that both the Tracker Fund and MPF, which were set up in 1999 and 2000, have achieved a rate of return of 2.7%, but the average expense ratio of the Tracker Fund is only 0.1%, which is much lower than MPF’s average expense ratio of 1.69%, and as the Tracker Fund distributes investment income twice per year and its investment return rate has reached 4.08% since its listing, it can play a more effective role in accumulating retirement savings when compared with MPF which does not distribute any dividends, thus highlighting the drawbacks of MPF which are high costs and low profits, whether the Government will, in light of the unreasonably high fees and low effectiveness of MPF Scheme, consider abolishing MPF Scheme so as to alleviate public grievances?

Possible closing down of Ap Lei Chau Driving School

(16) Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN (Written reply)

The Government submitted a proposal to the Town Planning Board in December 2015 to amend the approved Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan, in order to rezone several pieces of land at Ap Lei Chau to residential use, including the site at which New Horizon School of Motoring (“NHSM”) is operating Ap Lei Chau Driving School at present. If the aforesaid rezoning proposal is approved, the driving school will have to be closed down. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (1) of the respective numbers of Hong Kong Island residents who received driving training and applied for driving tests in each of the past three years, together with a breakdown by vehicle class;
- (2) of the respective numbers of persons who (i) received driver training at Ap Lei Chau Driving School, (ii) received private driving instructors’ driving training on Hong Kong Island, and (iii) took driving tests on Hong Kong Island, in each of the past three years;
- (3) given that the Commissioner for Transport renewed the designation of the current site of Ap Lei Chau Driving School as a driving school under section 88K of the Road Traffic Ordinance (Cap. 374) in June 2011, and the validity period of the designation will expire on 15 June this year, while NHSM has reportedly been leasing the site, for operating the driving school, from the Lands Department by way of quarterly-renewed tenancy contracts, whether the authorities will extend the validity period of the aforesaid designation; if they will not, of the reasons for that; and
- (4) given that Ap Lei Chau Driving School is the only designated driving school on Hong Kong Island, whether the authorities are identifying another site on Hong Kong Island at present for relocating the driving school; if they are, of the latest progress; if not, whether the authorities will commence such work within a short period of time; if they will not, of the reasons for that?