

# 立法會

## Legislative Council

立法會CB(3) 793/10-11號文件

2011年5月27日內務委員會會議文件

定於2011年6月1日立法會會議上提出的質詢

提問者：

- |      |                     |               |
|------|---------------------|---------------|
| (1)  | 黃國健議員               | (口頭答覆)        |
| (2)  | 王國興議員               | (口頭答覆) (新的質詢) |
|      | <i>(取代其原先提出的質詢)</i> |               |
| (3)  | 陳健波議員               | (口頭答覆)        |
| (4)  | 張國柱議員               | (口頭答覆)        |
| (5)  | 梁耀忠議員               | (口頭答覆)        |
| (6)  | 黃成智議員               | (口頭答覆)        |
| (7)  | 葉國謙議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (8)  | 譚耀宗議員               | (書面答覆) (新的質詢) |
|      | <i>(取代其原先提出的質詢)</i> |               |
| (9)  | 張文光議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (10) | 梁君彥議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (11) | 林健鋒議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (12) | 李國寶議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (13) | 潘佩璆議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (14) | 張學明議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (15) | 李永達議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (16) | 馮檢基議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (17) | 梁國雄議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (18) | 甘乃威議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (19) | 謝偉俊議員               | (書面答覆)        |
| (20) | 林大輝議員               | (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

## 對港鐵範圍內意外受害者的賠償

### # (2) 王國興議員 (口頭答覆)

有多位市民向本人求助，表示他們在港鐵車站、車廂或其管理範圍內意外受傷，他們要求香港鐵路有限公司(下稱“港鐵公司”)賠償，都被無理拖延及拒絕；他們也沒有如一般交通意外的傷亡者般，不論有關的意外是否由他們的過失而造成，都得到“交通意外傷亡援助計劃”的援助，令他們感到非常無奈和不滿。本人亦得悉，政府部門沒有協助傷者追討有關賠償。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 是否知悉，自兩鐵合併以來，在港鐵的範圍內，共發生多少宗涉及港鐵乘客傷亡的意外；涉及的人數為何；港鐵公司或其委託的保險機構有否對該等傷者作出賠償或各種名目的補償；若有，涉及的金額為何；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 是否知悉，港鐵公司有否就保障乘客購買足夠的意外保險；若有，對乘客保障的範圍和保額的詳情為何，以及第(一)項的賠償個案中，有多少宗屬保險賠償個案和涉及的金額為何；若否，原因為何；及
- (三) 社會福利署的“交通意外傷亡援助計劃”的保障範圍是否涵蓋在港鐵範圍內發生的任何意外；若是，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；當局會否擴大該計劃的保障範圍，例如修訂《交通意外傷亡者(援助基金)條例》，以將因在港鐵範圍內發生意外而受傷的乘客或市民納入保障範圍內；或者由港鐵公司自行成立類似基金，以彌補該計劃的不足；若會，詳情為何；若否，當局有何措施保障因鐵路事故受傷，卻得不到任何賠償或各種名目的補償的乘客？

Compensation to victims of accidents  
occurred in the MTR network

(2) Hon WONG Kwok-hing (Oral Reply)

A number of members of the public have approached me for assistance, indicating that they had sustained injuries in accidents in MTR stations, train compartments and controlled areas, and when they requested for compensation from the MTR Corporation Limited (“MTRCL”), it had unreasonably delayed its response and rejected their requests; they also feel very helpless and dissatisfied because they are unlike victims of ordinary traffic accidents who are able to receive assistance under the Traffic Accident Victims Assistance Scheme (“TAVAS”) regardless of whether the accidents concerned were caused by their faults. I have also learnt that government departments have not assisted the injured persons in recovering the compensation in question. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it knows the total number of accidents which occurred in the MTR network involving casualties among MTR passengers since the rail merger; the number of persons involved; whether MTRCL and its appointed insurance providers have paid damages or made different kinds of compensation under various categories to such injured persons; if yes, the amount involved; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) whether it knows if MTRCL has taken out adequate accident insurance to safeguard passengers’ interests; if yes, of the details of the protection coverage for passengers and the sum insured, and among the compensation cases in (a), the number of cases involving insurance compensation and the amount involved; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) whether TAVAS of the Social Welfare Department covers any accident which

occurred in the MTR network; if yes, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; whether the authorities will extend the coverage of the scheme, e.g. by amending the Traffic Accident Victims (Assistance Fund) Ordinance to also cover passengers or members of the public injured in accidents which occurred in the MTR network, or whether MTRCL will establish a similar fund to make up for the deficiencies of TAVAS; if yes, of the details; if not, what measures the authorities have to protect passengers who were injured in railway incidents but have not received any damages or different kinds of compensation?

## 學童牙科保健計劃

### # (8) 譚耀宗議員 (書面答覆)

現時政府只為小學生提供學童牙科保健服務，但近期有不少市民向本人反映，初中(中一至中三)學生對牙科診治服務的需求亦很大，因而要求政府將牙科保健服務擴展至初中學生。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去3年，每年在學童牙科保健計劃下接受牙科治療的人次；
- (二) 政府有否計劃將牙科保健服務擴展至初中學生，以加強他們的牙齒及口腔健康護理；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；及
- (三) 政府有否計劃引入私家牙科醫生參與學童牙科保健計劃，並從而為初中學生提供牙科服務；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何？

## School Dental Care Service

(8) Hon TAM Yiu-chung (Written Reply)

At present, the Government only provides dental care services to primary school students, but quite a number of members of the public have recently relayed to me that junior secondary school (Form 1 to Form 3) students also have strong demand for dental treatment services, and they thus request the Government to extend the dental care services to junior secondary school students. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of attendances for dental treatment under the School Dental Care Service in each of the past three years;
- (b) whether the Government has planned to extend the dental care services to junior secondary school students in order to enhance the dental and oral health care for them; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) whether the Government has planned to bring in private dental practitioners to join the School Dental Care Service so as to provide dental services to junior secondary school students; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?