

立法會
Legislative Council

立法會 CB(3)662/98-99 號文件

1998 年 11 月 20 日內務委員會會議文件

定於 1998 年 11 月 25 日立法會會議上提出的質詢

提問者：

- | | | |
|------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| (1) | 陳鑑林議員
(取代其原先提出的質詢) | (口頭答覆)(新的質詢) |
| (2) | 蔡素玉議員
(取代其原先提出的質詢) | (口頭答覆)(新的質詢) |
| (3) | 呂明華議員 | (口頭答覆) |
| (4) | 張永森議員 | (口頭答覆)(質詢的措辭已作修改) |
| | (質詢的重訂本隨附於後) | |
| (5) | 陳榮燦議員
(取代其原先提出的質詢) | (口頭答覆)(新的質詢) |
| (6) | 楊耀忠議員 | (口頭答覆) |
| (7) | 何敏嘉議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (8) | 劉千石議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (9) | 黃容根議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (10) | 羅致光議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (11) | 單仲偕議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (12) | 何俊仁議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (13) | 梁耀忠議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (14) | 陸恭蕙議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (15) | 劉江華議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (16) | 劉慧卿議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (17) | 李華明議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (18) | 李家祥議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (19) | 蔡素玉議員 | (書面答覆) |
| (20) | 楊耀忠議員 | (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

#(1) 陳鑑林議員 (口頭答覆)

據報道，社會福利署署長在今年 7、8 月期間離港公幹時順道休假，因選擇迂迴路線，致令由公帑支出的有關機費較採取最直接路線的機費為多。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (a) 就公務員離港公幹時所選取的路線及航班有何規定；
- (b) 就公務員在離港公幹前後或其間休假有何規定；及
- (c) 公務員在往返港外公幹目的地途中，在其他地點逗留處理私人事務或休假，因而導致機票費用多於直接往返公幹的目的地的有關費用，則有關差額是否須由該公務員承擔；若否，原因為何及當局有否計劃修訂有關規定？

(1) Hon CHAN Kam-lam (Oral Reply)

It is reported that the Director of Social Welfare chose to take indirect flights on duty visits overseas and took the opportunity to take leave during the period between July and August this year, incurring an extra amount of public money on air tickets as compared with the fare for taking the most direct routes. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the regulations governing the routes and flights to be taken by civil servants on duty visits outside Hong Kong;
- (b) of the regulations governing the vacation arrangements for civil servants before or after their duty visits outside Hong Kong or during the period of their duty visits; and
- (c) where a civil servant on duty visits outside Hong Kong stops over in some other places for private business or vacation, thus incurring more expenses on air tickets than flying on direct routes, whether the civil servant in question will be required to bear the extra amount incurred; if not, the reasons for it and whether the Administration has any plan to amend the relevant regulations?

#(2) 蔡素玉議員 (口頭答覆)

政府在 11 月 11 日答覆本會質詢時，曾表示會詳細而認真地考慮可否透過出售或在香港聯合交易所上市，將其擁有的一些資產局部或全部私有化。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (a) 會根據甚麼準則考慮決定將哪些資產私有化；
- (b) 會否就個別的資產私有化進行顧問研究；若然，研究的重點為何；及
- (c) 在決定將該等資產私有化時，會否設置機制確保不會由於需為該等資產的股東爭取最高回報而令公眾利益受損？

(2) Hon CHOY So-yuk (Oral Reply)

In its reply to a question raised by this Council on 11 November, the Government said that it would give careful and serious consideration to the possibility of privatization, either in part or in whole, of some of its assets through selling or listing on the Hong Kong Stock Exchange. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the criteria for consideration in deciding what assets will be privatized;
- (b) whether consultancy studies will be conducted for the privatization of individual assets; if so, of the central issues of such studies; and
- (c) whether, when deciding to privatize the assets, a mechanism will be in place to ensure that public interest will not be jeopardized as a result of the need to seek maximum returns for shareholders of these assets after their sale or privatization?

#(4) 張永森議員 (口頭答覆)

在 7 月 31 日財務委員會會議上，房屋局局長曾承諾會就未能完成物業交易的私人樓宇準業主被視為不符合首次置業貸款計劃申請資格一事，徵詢法律意見，然後再作回覆。房屋局局長其後回應本人所作的書面跟進時，更承諾會進一步研究該項問題。然而，本會至今尚未接獲政府的具體回覆。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (a) 有否徵詢法律意見及進行研究；若有，有關進展為何，以及何時向本會提交答覆；
- (b) 把未能完成物業交易的私人樓宇準業主視作擁有物業，而不讓其根據上述計劃提出貸款申請的理據為何；及
- (c) 上述貸款計劃就擁有物業所訂的定義，與香港房屋委員會推行協助市民置業的各項計劃所訂有關定義是否相同；若否，原因為何？

(4) Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum (Oral Reply)

At the Finance Committee meeting on 31 July, the Secretary for Housing undertook to seek legal advice on the matter concerning private property buyers who had failed to complete property transactions being regarded as not being eligible for the Home Starter Loan Scheme ("HSLs"), and to reply afterwards. In response to my follow-up in writing later on, the Secretary further undertook to look into the issue in greater depth. However, this Council has not yet received any specific reply from the Government. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether legal advice has been sought and studies been conducted; if so, of the progress made, and the time for submitting the reply to this Council;
- (b) of the rationale for regarding private property buyers who have failed to complete property transactions as property owners and thus excluding them from applying for the loan under the HSLs; and
- (c) whether the definition of property ownership under the HSLs is the same as those under various subsidized home ownership schemes implemented by the Hong Kong Housing Authority; if not, the reasons for that?

#(5) 陳榮燦議員 (口頭答覆)

政府可否告知本會，僱主可否根據《僱傭條例》(第 57 章) 第 9 條，解僱罷工或採取工業行動的僱員，並無須給予通知或代通知金；若然，當局會否考慮修訂該條例，以落實《基本法》第二十七條所訂明香港居民享有的罷工權利和自由？

(5) Hon CHAN Wing-chan (Oral Reply)

Will the Government inform this Council whether, under section 9 of the Employment Ordinance (Cap. 57), employers may dismiss their employees who go on strike or take industrial action without notice or payment in lieu of notice; if so, whether it will consider amending the Ordinance to give effect to the right and freedom of Hong Kong residents to strike as stipulated in Article 27 of the Basic Law?