

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 417/12-13

Paper for the House Committee meeting of 15 March 2013

Questions scheduled for the Legislative Council meeting of 20 March 2013

Questions by:

- | | | |
|------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| (1) | Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing | (Oral reply) |
| (2) | Hon SIN Chung-kai | (Oral reply) |
| (3) | Hon MA Fung-kwok | (Oral reply) |
| (4) | Hon WONG Ting-kwong | (Oral reply) |
| (5) | Hon CHAN Han-pan | (Oral reply) |
| (6) | Hon TANG Ka-piu | (Oral reply) |
| (7) | Hon IP Kwok-him | (Written reply) |
| (8) | Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun | (Written reply) |
| (9) | Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok | (Written reply) |
| (10) | Hon WONG Kwok-kin | (Written reply) |
| (11) | Hon POON Siu-ping | (Written reply) |
| (12) | Hon Steven HO Chun-yin | (Written reply) |
| (13) | Hon WONG Kwok-hing | (Written reply) |
| (14) | Hon WONG Yuk-man | (Written reply) |
| (15) | Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen | (Written reply) |
| (16) | Hon NG Leung-sing | (Written reply) |
| (17) | Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung | (Written reply) |
| (18) | Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan | (Written reply) |
| (19) | Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit | (Written reply) |
| (20) | Hon LEUNG Che-cheung | (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

政府就聯合國人權事務委員會提出的問題作出的回應

(1) 劉慧卿議員 (口頭答覆)

2011年4月，香港特別行政區政府(下稱“特區政府”)透過中央人民政府向聯合國人權事務委員會(下稱“委員會”)，提交特區政府參照《公民權利和政治權利國際公約》(下稱“《公約》”)的第三次報告。委員會於2012年11月通過“在審議中國香港第三次定期報告時要考慮的問題清單”(下稱“問題清單”)，並於本月12日及13日在瑞士日內瓦就該報告進行聆訊。就此，行政機關可否告知本會：

- (一) 鑒於問題清單第3段要求特區政府“說明採取了哪些進一步步驟確保下屆行政長官及立法會的選舉按照《公約》規定的普選原則進行”，特區政府就此向委員會所作回應的詳情為何；及
- (二) 鑒於問題清單第3段要求特區政府說明下屆行政長官選舉候選人的“提名條件，諸如年齡限制及任何其他資格要求或限制”，特區政府就此向委員會所作回應的詳情為何，以及鑒於中國人民政治協商會議全國委員會的新聞發言人最近表示，相信香港人會選出一個愛國愛港人士擔任行政長官，當局會否把“愛國愛港”列為下屆行政長官選舉的參選條件之一？

Government's response to the issues raised by
the United Nations Human Rights Committee

(1) Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing (Oral reply)

In April 2011, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (“HKSAR”) Government submitted, through the Central People’s Government, its third report in the light of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (“Covenant”) to the United Nations Human Rights Committee (“Committee”). The Committee adopted a “List of issues to be taken up in connection with the consideration of the third periodic report of Hong Kong, China” (“List of Issues”) in November 2012, and conducted a hearing on that report in Geneva, Switzerland on the 12th and 13th of this month. In this connection, will the Executive Authorities inform this Council:

- (a) given that paragraph 3 of the List of Issues requested the HKSAR Government to “indicate what further steps have been taken to ensure that the next Chief Executive and Legislative Council elections take place by universal suffrage in compliance with the Covenant”, of the details of HKSAR Government’s response to the Committee in this respect; and
- (b) given that paragraph 3 of the List of Issues requested the HKSAR Government to describe “the conditions for nomination, e.g., age limits, and any other qualifications or restrictions” for the candidates for the next Chief Executive election, of the details of HKSAR Government’s response to the Committee in this respect; and given the recent comment of the spokesman of the National Committee of the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference that he believed that Hong Kong people would elect a person who loved the country and Hong Kong to be the Chief Executive, whether the authorities will set “loving the country and Hong Kong” as one of the conditions for candidacy for the next Chief Executive election?

檢討單程證簽發制度

(2) 單仲偕議員 (口頭答覆)

現時，內地居民持《前往港澳通行證》(下稱“單程證”)來港定居的配額為每日150個。行政長官較早前表示，該配額難有壓縮空間，因為涉及港人的內地配偶及其在內地出生的子女來港定居的問題。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 1997年7月1日至今，共有多少名內地居民持單程證來港定居，並按他們獲發單程證的原因列出分項數字；
- (二) 當局會否考慮與內地有關當局商討調整非家庭團聚的單程證配額；會否重新考慮要求內地有關當局檢討現時的單程證簽發制度，包括把審批和簽發單程證的工作交由香港特別行政區政府負責；若否，原因為何；及
- (三) 當局有否評估每年數以萬計的內地居民持單程證來港定居，對香港的人口政策、土地規劃、就業市場、民生事務，以至福利、運輸及房屋等需求帶來甚麼影響；若沒有評估，原因為何？

Review of the system for the issuance of One-way Permits

(2) Hon SIN Chung-kai (Oral reply)

At present, the daily quota for mainland residents coming to Hong Kong for settlement on Permits for Proceeding to Hong Kong and Macao (“One-way Permits” or “OWPs”) is 150. The Chief Executive indicated earlier that there was hardly any room for reducing this quota because it involved the issue of Hong Kong people’s mainland spouses and their children born in the Mainland coming to Hong Kong for settlement. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the total number of mainland residents who came to Hong Kong for settlement on OWPs since 1 July 1997, together with a breakdown by the reason for which they were granted OWPs;
- (b) whether the authorities will consider discussing with the relevant mainland authorities the adjustment of the OWP quota granted for reasons other than family reunion; whether they will consider afresh requesting the relevant mainland authorities to review the existing system for the issuance of OWPs, including handing over to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government the work of vetting and approving as well as issuing OWPs; if they will not, of the reasons for that; and
- (c) whether the authorities have assessed the impact brought about by tens of thousands of mainland residents coming to Hong Kong for settlement on OWPs every year on the population policy, land planning, job market, livelihood issues of Hong Kong, as well as the demand for welfare, transport and housing, etc.; if no assessment has been made, of the reasons for that?

西九文化區的規劃及建設費用

(3) 馬逢國議員 (口頭答覆)

根據《西南九龍分區計劃大綱草圖》的發展參數，西九文化區(下稱“文化區”)的最高地積比率是1.81。有意見指出，該地積比率過低(試比較：九龍區的最高住用地積比率為7.5)，以致文化區未能地盡其用和難以容納文化藝術界一直倡議的設施(包括文學館、更多的藝術工作者創作空間，以及供訪港藝團入住的酒店)。此外，有市民認為，西九文化區管理局(下稱“管理局”)根據“城市中的公園”的設計概念制訂的發展圖則，將公共車輛總站和車站設於地底，而各文化藝術設施則分散於文化區內，會令文化區的人流不足。另一方面，計劃於文化區興建的戲曲中心的預算費用，已由2006年的13億元上升一倍至27億元，令人憂慮管理局於2008年獲得的216億元撥款不足以應付文化區的建設費用。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 政府有否根據清晰而科學化的準則，把文化區的最高地積比率定於1.81；如有，準則的詳情為何；如否，政府以何理據採用該地積比率；
- (二) 政府會否考慮在不影響文化區發展進度的前提下，調高文化區的地積比率，藉以增設文化藝術界倡議的上述場地和設施，以及增加區內的住宅及商業樓面面積，一方面可為文化區帶來充足的人流，另一方面可為管理局增加財政收入；如會考慮，詳情為何；如否，當局將會如何回應文化藝術界上述的訴求；及
- (三) 政府有否為文化區的建設費用進行評估，以瞭解文化區的造價會否超出216億元的撥款；如有，詳情為何，以及政府有否制訂處理超支情況的方法；政府

有何措施嚴控文化區的建設費用並同時維持各項設施的建造質素？

Planning and capital cost of the West Kowloon Cultural District

(3) Hon MA Fung-kwok (Oral reply)

According to the development parameters in the draft South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan, the maximum plot ratio for the West Kowloon Cultural District (“WKCD”) is 1.81. There have been comments that such a plot ratio is too low (cf. the maximum domestic plot ratio for Kowloon being 7.5), rendering the WKCD site not being fully utilized and difficult to incorporate facilities (including literary museum, more space for artists’ creative work and hotels for accommodating arts groups visiting Hong Kong) which have all along been advocated by the arts and cultural sectors. Moreover, some members of the public consider that the development plan drawn up by the WKCD Authority based on the Conceptual Plan “City Park”, under which the public transport terminus and station are to be provided underground and the various arts and cultural facilities to be scattered within WKCD, will result in an insufficient flow of visitors in WKCD. On the other hand, the estimated cost for building the proposed Xiqu Centre in WKCD has doubled from \$1.3 billion in 2006 to \$2.7 billion, arousing concern that the \$21.6 billion funding allocation to the WKCD Authority in 2008 will be insufficient to meet the capital cost of WKCD. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the Government had based on clear and scientific criteria for setting the maximum plot ratio of WKCD at 1.81; if it had, of the details of such criteria; if not, of the Government’s justifications for adopting that plot ratio;
- (b) whether the Government will consider, on the premise of not affecting the development progress of WKCD, raising the plot ratio for WKCD so as to add the aforesaid venues and facilities advocated by the arts and cultural sectors and to increase the floor areas for residential and commercial uses in the district, thereby bringing sufficient flow of visitors to WKCD on the one hand and boosting WKCD Authority’s income on the other; if it will consider, of the details; if not, how the

authorities will address the aforesaid demand of the arts and cultural sectors; and

- (c) whether the Government has assessed the capital cost of WKCD to find out if the construction costs of WKCD will exceed the \$21.6 billion funding allocation; if it has, of the details, and whether the Government has formulated measures for dealing with any over-budget situation; of the measures put in place by the Government to strictly control the capital cost of WKCD and at the same time maintain the building quality of various facilities?

規管旅行社及導遊

(4) 黃定光議員 (口頭答覆)

有旅遊業人士指出，政府積極發展旅遊業，但旅行社良莠不齊，近年亦發生多宗損害旅遊業的利益及聲譽的事件。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 是否知悉在過去3年，香港旅遊業議會(下稱“議會”)接獲遊客投訴旅行社及導遊的數字為何，並按投訴內容(例如強迫購物及行程貨不對辦)列出分項數字；當中向違規旅行社或導遊作出懲處的個案有多少宗，並按處罰列出分項數字；
- (二) 政府及議會有否檢討在2011年推出的10項加強規管措施(包括記分制)的成效；若有，檢討的結果為何；若否，原因為何；及
- (三) 鑒於獨立的旅遊業監管局預計最快要到2014年才成立，在該局成立前，當局會如何加強監管工作；鑒於來港的內地旅行團一般由兩地的旅行社合作接待，當局會否與內地有關當局進一步聯繫及合作，以加強監管兩地的旅行社；若會，詳情為何；若否，原因為何？

Regulation of travel agents and tourist guides

(4) Hon WONG Ting-kwong (Oral reply)

Some members of the tourism industry have pointed out that while the Government has been actively developing the tourism industry, travel agents vary in standard, and a number of incidents detrimental to the interests and reputation of the tourism industry have occurred in recent years. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it knows the number of complaints received from tourists by the Travel Industry Council of Hong Kong (“TICHK”) against travel agents and tourist guides in the past three years, together with a breakdown by the content of such complaints (e.g. coerced shopping, and itineraries not matching the descriptions); the number of such complaints in which the travel agents or tourist guides who had breached the rules were penalized, together with a breakdown by the penalty imposed;
- (b) whether the Government and TICHK have reviewed the effectiveness of the 10 enhanced regulatory measures introduced in 2011 (including the Demerit Point System); if they have, of the review results; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) given that an independent Travel Industry Authority is expected to be established in 2014 at the earliest, how the authorities will enhance their regulatory work before the Authority is established; given that inbound mainland tours are in general received jointly by the travel agents of Hong Kong and those of the Mainland, whether the authorities will further liaise and collaborate with the relevant mainland authorities to enhance the regulation of travel agents in the two places; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

《消防安全(建築物)條例》的執行情況

(5) 陳恒鑾議員 (口頭答覆)

有不少舊樓業主接到當局根據《消防安全(建築物)條例》發出的消防安全指示(下稱“指示”)，須在某限期前提升其樓宇的消防設施。然而，部分樓宇未成立業主立案法團(下稱“法團”)而且業權分散，業主統籌有關工程有困難；有法團的樓宇亦由於業主之間意見分歧、業主(當中多數為清貧長者)無法負擔有關費用，以及有一小撮業主拒絕分攤費用等原因，以致無法開展工程。該等業主難以遵從指示，並可能因此遭政府檢控。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 目前未符合消防安全規定的樓宇數目為何；當局至今向多少幢該等樓宇的業主發出指示，以及當中有多少幢是樓高7層或以下的唐樓或樓齡40年或以上的舊樓；在該等唐樓或舊樓當中，已成立及未成立法團的樓宇數目，以及已遵從指示的樓宇數目分別為何；
- (二) 自上述條例於2007年實施至今，當局對違例人士提出檢控的數目為何；當中涉及唐樓或舊樓的個案數目為何；是否知悉有關人士未有遵從指示的原因，以及當中有否包括未有法團統籌有關工程，以及有一小撮業主拒絕分攤費用；若有包括該等原因，鑒於當局會向未有遵從指示的樓宇的全體業主提出檢控，有否研究此舉會否對願意進行改善工程的業主不公平；及
- (三) 針對部分業主拒絕分攤有關費用和沒有法團因而未能開展工程的個案，當局現時有何措施協助有關的業主遵從指示；政府會否考慮推出類似“樓宇更新大行動”的資助計劃，加快改善樓宇消防設施；若會，具體的安排為何；若否，原因為何；鑒於上述條例適用於不同樓齡和高度等類別的綜合用途建築物及

住用建築物，當局會否考慮修訂該條例，以便對不同類型的樓宇作出更適切的規管？

Enforcement of the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance

(5) Hon CHAN Han-pan (Oral reply)

Quite a number of owners of old buildings have received fire safety directions (“directions”) issued by the authorities under the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance, requiring them to improve the fire service facilities of their buildings by a certain deadline. However, for some buildings for which owners’ corporations (“OCs”) have not been formed and with fragmented ownerships, the owners have difficulties in coordinating the relevant works; and for some buildings with OCs, such works cannot commence either for reasons such as divergent views among owners, the owners (most of them being indigent elderly) being unable to afford the relevant expenses, and a small number of owners refusing to share the expenses. These owners have difficulties in complying with the directions, and are liable to prosecution by the Government as a result. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of buildings which have not met the fire safety requirements at present; the number of such buildings the owners of which have been issued with the directions so far; among them, the respective numbers of tenement buildings of seven or less storeys, or old buildings aged 40 years or above; among such tenement buildings or old buildings, the respective numbers of buildings with and without OCs, as well as those having complied with the directions;
- (b) of the number of prosecutions instituted by the authorities against the offenders since the implementation of the aforesaid Ordinance in 2007; among them, the number of cases involving tenement buildings or old buildings; whether the Government knows the reasons for non-compliance with the directions by the relevant parties, and whether the reasons include the absence of OCs to coordinate the relevant works, or the refusal by a small number of owners to share the expenses; if such reasons are included, and as the authorities will institute prosecutions against all owners of the buildings for non-compliance

with the directions, whether they have examined if this is unfair to those owners who are willing to carry out improvement works; and

- (c) regarding the cases in which the works cannot commence because of refusal of some owners to share the relevant expenses and the absence of OCs, what measures the authorities currently have to assist the owners concerned to comply with the directions; whether the Government will consider introducing any subsidy schemes similar to the “Operation Building Bright”, so as to expeditiously improve the fire service facilities of buildings; if it will, of the specific arrangements; if not, the reasons for that; given the application of the aforesaid Ordinance to different types of composite buildings and domestic buildings of different ages and heights, etc., whether the authorities will consider amending the Ordinance, so as to exercise regulation for different types of buildings more appropriately?

加強監管升降機承辦商及培訓升降機從業人員

(6) 鄧家彪議員 (口頭答覆)

本月2日，北角一座樓宇的升降機從一樓直墜地面，引致多名乘客受傷。據報，該部升降機的4條鋼纜全部斷裂，情況十分嚴重。有業界人士指出，近年涉及升降機的意外時有發生，反映現行的監管機制有漏洞，而這些意外亦與負責維修和保養升降機的人手短缺有關。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 當局會否全面檢討“註冊升降機承辦商表現評級”的制度，並考慮將該制度與執法工作掛鉤，以加強該制度的效用，例如直接吊銷表現獲得零分的承辦商的牌照；
- (二) 是否知悉，過去3年，有多少個註冊升降機承辦商向新入行的升降機工人提供培訓，以及分別有多少人完成培訓及之後繼續從事該行業；又有哪些機構提供該類工人的入職培訓課程，以及分別有多少人完成課程及之後繼續從事該行業；鑒於“升降機及自動梯工程實務守則”規定，維修和保養升降機的工作須由兩名或以上的升降機工人一同進行，而新建樓宇的樓層數目越來越多，當局有否評估已完成培訓的工人的數目是否足以應付需求；當局有否新措施吸引新血投身該行業；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；及
- (三) 現時機電工程署每月巡查多少部升降機；對於由評分排名偏低的承辦商負責維修和保養的升降機，有否進行更頻密的巡查和突擊檢查；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何？

Stepping up regulation of lift contractors
and training for lift practitioners

(6) Hon TANG Ka-piu (Oral reply)

On the 2nd of this month, a lift in a building in North Point plunged from the first floor to the ground, injuring several passengers. It has been reported that the situation was very serious as all four suspension cables of the lift had snapped. As pointed out by some members of the trade, lift accidents have occurred from time to time in recent years, reflecting loopholes in the existing regulatory mechanism, and such accidents are also related to the shortage of manpower for lift repair and maintenance. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the authorities will conduct a comprehensive review of the Registered Lift Contractors' Performance Rating Scheme and consider linking the Scheme to law enforcement work to enhance its effectiveness, e.g. revoking directly the licence of a contractor whose performance score is zero;
- (b) whether it knows the number of registered lift contractors who had provided training to lift workers who newly joined the trade and the respective numbers of new entrants who had completed the training and those who stayed in the trade afterwards, in the past three years; and which institutions had provided training courses for such entrants and the respective numbers of entrants who had completed the courses and those who stayed in the trade afterwards; as the "Code of Practice for Lift Works and Escalator Works" stipulates that lift maintenance and repair works must be carried out by two or more lift workers together, and the number of storeys of new buildings has been increasing, whether the authorities have assessed if the number of trained workers can meet the demand; whether the authorities have any new measures to attract new blood to the trade; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) of the number of lifts inspected each month by the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department

("EMSD") at present; whether EMSD has conducted more frequent inspections and spot checks on lifts which are maintained and repaired by contractors with low ranking in performance rating; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

自訂車輛登記號碼計劃

(7) 葉國謙議員 (書面答覆)

據報，運輸署於本年2月16日舉行的自訂車輛登記號碼(“登記號碼”)拍賣會上，售出一個組合為“CSD HK”的登記號碼。由於該組合相當近似香港懲教署的英文縮寫，懲教署於拍賣會前曾要求運輸署抽起該登記號碼但不果。有懲教署的職員表示擔心，若此登記號碼被別有用心的人士投得而展示該登記號碼的車輛被用於非法活動，將會損害執法部隊的形象，甚至會破壞治安。另一方面，自訂車輛登記號碼計劃的審批準則訂明，若申請的登記號碼相當可能會令合理的人相信展示該登記號碼的汽車是屬於任何政府部門或某指明機構，或相信使用該車輛的人是代表該部門或機構，有關申請會被拒絕。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 當局如何按照既定準則審批上述的登記號碼申請；及
- (二) 鑒於發生了上述事件，當局會否檢討自訂登記號碼的審批準則，訂明不接受包含“CSD”的登記號碼申請？

Personalized Vehicle Registration Marks Scheme

(7) Hon IP Kwok-him (Written reply)

It has been reported that at the auction of personalized vehicle registration marks (“PVRMs”) held on 16 February this year, the Transport Department (“TD”) sold a PVRM with the combination of “CSD HK”. Since that combination was very similar to the English abbreviation of the Hong Kong Correctional Services Department (“CSD”), CSD had requested TD to withdraw the PVRM from sale before the auction, but to no avail. Some CSD staff members had expressed the worry that had the PVRM been successfully bid by people with ulterior motives and the PVRM been displayed on a motor vehicle used in illegal activities, the image of law enforcement agencies would be tarnished, and law and order problems might even be caused. On the other hand, the vetting criteria of the PVRM Scheme prescribe that an application will be refused if the PVRM in the application is likely to cause a reasonable person to believe that the motor vehicle on which the PVRM is displayed belongs to any department of the Government or any specified organization, or to believe that the person using the vehicle represents such a department or organization. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) how the authorities had vetted the application for the aforesaid PVRM in accordance with the established criteria; and
- (b) in light of the aforesaid incident, whether the authorities will review the vetting criteria for PVRMs and specify in the criteria that applications for PVRMs with a combination containing “CSD” will not be accepted?

處理住宅單位滲水的投訴

(8) 田北辰議員 (書面答覆)

有很多市民向本人投訴，他們居住的單位的牆壁或天花滲水。有一名投訴人的單位自2003年起一直有滲水的問題，雖然他曾向多個政府部門和機構(包括水務署、食物環境衛生署(“食環署”)、屋宇署、申訴專員公署，以及由屋宇署和食環署成立專責處理有關大廈滲水的投訴的聯合辦事處(“聯辦處”))投訴，但滲水問題至今仍未有解決。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 聯辦處由2006年成立至今，共接獲多少宗投訴及查詢，以及有多少宗尚未處理，並按區議會分區及樓宇類別(住宅、工業及商業樓宇)列出分項數字；最長的等候處理時間及有關個案需長時間等候的原因為何；平均每個個案所需的處理時間為何；當局會否檢討聯辦處的工作效率，務求在某時間內把平均等候時間縮短某個百分比，並制訂有關的服務承諾；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 聯辦處已處理的個案中，有多少宗被界定為“未能確證滲／漏水源頭”的個案；檢測人員根據甚麼工作指引作出該等界定；對於被聯辦處界定為“未能確證滲／漏水源頭”而終止調查的個案，有關的投訴人可否要求覆核；政府有否具體方法進一步協助該等市民解決問題；若否，原因為何；
- (三) 在聯辦處接獲的投訴中，有多少宗涉及食水管滲漏；當局為何沒有接納申訴專員公署於2008年就上述3個政府部門處理滲水投訴發表的調查報告第42段提出的建議，把水務署納入聯辦處；
- (四) 鑒於當局只曾於2008年就聯辦處的運作模式作中期檢討，當局會否於2013年

內就聯辦處的運作及管理進行詳細的研究和檢討；若否，原因為何；

(五) 現時聯辦處的人手架構為何；當局會否成立一個專責部門正式掌管聯辦處，並確立其權力，以及就人手借調及辦公室管理訂出明確的統屬關係，避免出現兩署合作關係鬆散的情況；若否，原因為何；及

(六) 當局會否就聯辦處現時採用的滲水測試方法和儀器進行檢討和研究，並考慮引入其他測試方法(例如微波濕度測試及聲學檢測等)，以提升測試效率？

Handling of complaints about water seepage in residential units

(8) Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun (Written reply)

Many members of the public have complained to me about water seepage on the walls or ceilings of their residential units. There is one complainant whose unit has been plagued by the water seepage problem since 2003, and the problem has remained unresolved even though he has complained to various government departments and bodies, including the Water Supplies Department (“WSD”), the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”), the Buildings Department (“BD”), the Office of The Ombudsman and the dedicated Joint Office (“JO”) set up by BD and FEHD to handle complaints about water seepage in buildings. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the total number of complaints and enquiries received by JO since its establishment in 2006 and the number of cases which have not yet been processed, with a breakdown by District Council district and type of buildings (residential, industrial and commercial buildings); the longest waiting time for processing and the reasons for those cases having to wait for so long; the average processing time per case; whether the authorities will review the work efficiency of JO with a view to shortening the average waiting time by a certain percentage within a particular period of time and formulate the relevant performance pledges; if they will not, of the reasons for that;
- (b) among the cases processed by JO, of the number of those classified as cases in which “the source of water seepage/leakage cannot be identified”; of the operational guidelines based on which the inspecting personnel made such classification; whether the relevant complainants may request for a review of the cases which were classified by JO as those in which “the source of water seepage/leakage cannot be identified” and the investigation into which was terminated; whether the Government has any specific ways to further assist such

members of the public in resolving their problems; if it has not, of the reasons for that;

- (c) among the complaints received by JO, of the number of those involving seepage/leakage of fresh water mains; why the authorities have not accepted the recommendation of including WSD in JO, made in paragraph 42 of the investigation report published by the Office of The Ombudsman in 2008 on handling of water seepage complaints by the aforesaid three government departments;
- (d) given that the authorities conducted an interim review of the operation mode of JO only in 2008, whether they will conduct thorough examinations and reviews of the operation and management of JO within 2013; if they will not, of the reasons for that;
- (e) of the existing staffing structure of JO; whether the authorities will set up a dedicated department to head JO officially, establish its power and provide clear lines of command regarding staff deployment and office management to prevent the occurrence of a loose cooperative relationship between the two departments; if they will not, of the reasons for that; and
- (f) whether the authorities will review and examine the methods and equipment currently used by JO for testing water seepage as well as consider introducing other testing methods (e.g. microwave moisture and acoustics tests), so as to enhance the testing efficiency?

加強升降機安全的措施

(9) 盧偉國議員 (書面答覆)

在本月初一宗升降機墜下的意外中，肇事升降機的4條鋼纜全部斷裂，而其機械制停裝置亦未有發揮設計效用，制停下墜中的升降機。當局其後巡查由有關的承辦商保養的其他升降機，並發現有多部升降機有問題而需立即暫停使用。據悉，該承辦商在機電工程署的“註冊升降機承辦商表現評級”中的排名一直偏低。有市民指出，該等事件反映監管升降機維修保養的制度問題多多，未能確保承辦商妥善維修和保養升降機。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 對於評分排名長期偏低而且屢出安全問題的註冊升降機承辦商，當局除了向他們發出警告信外，有否針對該等承辦商採取其他的跟進措施；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 機電工程署會否因應上述的升降機意外，全面檢討監管升降機維修保養的制度，並相應地增加所需資源和增聘專業人員，以加強監管工作；若會，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；
- (三) 當局有否考慮加強宣傳和推廣工作，指導物業擁有人及物業管理公司在甄選維修保養升降機的承辦商時需要考慮哪些因素(包括承辦商的人手安排、過往表現和所得評分等)；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；
- (四) 當局有否全面檢視全港有多少部升降機已過於殘舊而必須更換；當局有否考慮資助有經濟困難的業主支付更換該等升降機的工程費用，以免他們被迫繼續使用該等升降機；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；及

- (五) 當局除了制定已於2012年12月17日全面實施的《升降機及自動梯條例》(第618章),以提高維修和保養升降機的安全標準和加強監管外,有否配套措施協助業界解決其主要的經營困難(例如惡性的價格競爭等),並理順行業的結構性問題;若有,詳情為何;若否,原因為何?

Measures to enhance safety of lifts

(9) Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok (Written reply)

In an accident earlier this month in which a lift dropped suddenly, all four suspension cables of the lift involved had snapped, and its safety protection system had not functioned as designed to stop the lift from dropping. The authorities subsequently inspected the other lifts which were maintained by the contractor concerned, and found that quite a number of them had problems and had to suspend service immediately. It has been learnt that the ranking of the contractor in the “Registered Lift Contractors’ Performance Rating” of the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (“EMSD”) has all along been low. Some members of the public have pointed out that such incidents reflect that the regulatory system for the repair and maintenance of lifts is plagued with problems, and it fails to ensure proper repair and maintenance of lifts by contractors. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether, apart from issuing warning letters to the registered lift contractors with low ranking in performance rating for a long period of time and repeatedly involved in safety problems, the authorities have taken other follow-up measures targeting at such contractors; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) whether EMSD will, in light of the aforesaid lift accident, conduct a comprehensive review of the regulatory system for the repair and maintenance of lifts, and correspondingly increase the resources needed and employ additional professional staff so as to step up its monitoring work; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (c) whether the authorities have considered stepping up publicity and promotion work, so as to provide guidance for property owners and property management companies on the factors (including the contractor’s manpower arrangements, past performance and performance scores, etc.) to be considered when selecting contractors for the repair and maintenance of their lifts; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

- (d) whether the authorities have conducted a comprehensive review to ascertain the number of lifts in Hong Kong which are so dilapidated that their replacement is required; whether the authorities have considered providing subsidies for property owners with financial hardship to pay the costs for such lift replacement works, to obviate the continued use of those lifts compellably; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (e) apart from enacting the Lifts and Escalators Ordinance (Cap. 618), which came into full operation on 17 December 2012, to enhance the safety standards for the repair and maintenance of lifts and to strengthen regulatory control, whether the authorities have any complementary measures to assist the trade in tackling its major business difficulties (e.g. vicious price competition, etc.), and to sort out the structural problems of the trade; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

安達臣道石礦場未來發展的交通配套設施

(10) 黃國健議員 (書面答覆)

根據當局於今年2月提交本會的《安達臣道石礦場未來土地用途規劃研究》的最終建議發展大綱圖，該石礦場用地將會提供9 410個住宅單位供25 000人居住。鄰近的一個現正開展的“安達臣道發展計劃”則會提供約18 000個公屋單位供48 300人居住。該兩個發展項目完成後，秀茂坪區的人口將增加約73 000。就有關的交通配套設施，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 石礦場用地附近的道路在過去兩年的車流量，以及今年至2016年的預計車流量(按下表列出)；

車流量		連德道／將軍澳道交界	連德道連接秀茂坪道	秀茂坪道(近寶琳路)	新清水灣道(近翠雅花園)	安達臣道／清水灣道交界	安達臣道／寶琳路交界
2011	繁忙時段						
	非繁忙時段						
2012	繁忙時段						
	非繁忙時段						
2013							
2014							
2015							
2016							

*預計車流量

- (二) 當局會如何加強石礦場用地一帶的公共交通服務(包括專營巴士及公共小巴等)，以配合該兩個發展項目，並以表列

出有關詳情；若現時沒有詳情，政府將於何時訂定有關的詳情；

- (三) 有否評估協和街及康寧道能否應付由石礦場用地往觀塘道的車輛及觀塘區重建計劃所帶來的額外車流量；若評估結果為否，政府會否擴闊該兩條道路；若會擴闊，施工時間表為何；若不會，原因為何；
- (四) 鑒於當局計劃興建行人天橋連升降機塔及／或自動扶手電梯，以連繫石礦場用地與附近地區，有關工程的詳細計劃和施工時間表為何；及
- (五) 鑒於石礦場用地遠離現時的鐵路網絡，當局會否考慮將該處納入構思中的“九龍東環保連接系統”的服務範圍(該系統擬採用高架單軌列車，將啟德發展區、觀塘和九龍灣與現有港鐵觀塘線和日後的沙田至中環線連接起來)，以加強該處的對外交通設施；若會，詳情為何；若否，原因為何，以及當局會否重新研究興建觀塘鐵路延線的可行性，使該處受鐵路網絡覆蓋；若會研究，時間表為何？

Ancillary transport facilities for the future development at
Anderson Road Quarry

(10) Hon WONG Kwok-kin (Written reply)

According to the Final Recommended Outline Development Plan for the Planning Study on Future Land Use at Anderson Road Quarry submitted to this Council by the authorities in February this year, the Quarry site will provide 9 410 residential units housing 25 000 people. The Development at Anderson Road, a neighbouring project which is underway, will provide about 18 000 public rental housing units housing 48 300 people. Upon the completion of these two development projects, the population of Sau Mau Ping district will increase by about 73 000. Regarding the ancillary transport facilities concerned, will the Government inform this Council:

(a) of the traffic volume of the roads in the vicinity of the Quarry site in the past two years, and the projected traffic volume of these roads from this year to 2016 (set out in the table below);

Traffic volume		Junction at Lin Tak Road / Tseung Kwan O Road	Lin Tak Road leading to Sau Mau Ping Road	Sau Mau Ping Road (near Po Lam Road)	New Clear Water Bay Road (near Sienna Garden)	Junction at Anderson Road / Clear Water Bay Road	Junction at Anderson Road / Po Lam Road
2011	Peak hours						
	Non-peak hours						
2012	Peak hours						
	Non-peak hours						
2013*							
2014*							
2015*							
2016*							

* Projected traffic volume

(b) how the authorities will enhance the public transport services (including franchised buses and public light

buses, etc.) in the area around the Quarry site to tie in with the two development projects, and of the relevant details (set out in table form); if no details are currently available, when the Government will draw up the details;

- (c) whether it has assessed if Hip Wo Street and Hong Ning Road can cope with the additional traffic volume arising from vehicles travelling from the Quarry site to Kwun Tong Road as well as the Kwun Tong redevelopment project; if the assessment results are in the negative, whether the Government will widen the two roads; if it will, of the work schedule; if not, the reasons for that;
- (d) given that the authorities plan to build footbridges with lift towers and/or escalators to link the Quarry site with the surrounding areas, of the detailed plan and work schedule of such projects; and
- (e) given that the Quarry site is far away from the existing railway network, whether the authorities will consider including that area in the service coverage of the envisaged “environmentally friendly linkage system for Kowloon East” (which is envisaged to adopt an elevated monorail system linking the Kai Tak Development area, Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay with the existing MTR Kwun Tong Line and the future Shatin to Central Link), to enhance the external transport facilities for that area; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that and whether the authorities will examine afresh the feasibility of building the MTR Kwun Tong Line Extension, so as to cover that area by the railway network; if they will examine, of the timetable?

過海隧道交通分流的措施

(11) 潘兆平議員 (書面答覆)

為紓緩紅磡的海底隧道(“紅隧”)的擠塞情況，政府建議採取交通分流措施，即提高紅隧收費的同時，透過向隧道使用者提供補貼以降低東區海底隧道的收費，而西區海底隧道的收費則維持不變。就此，政府可否告知本會，該3條隧道的連接道路的名稱，以及現時該等道路每條的容車量、在非公眾假期的平日的平均每日行車量、早上繁忙時段(即上午7時至9時)的行車量，以及下午繁忙時段(即下午5時至7時)的行車量為何？

Traffic diversion measures for road harbour crossings

(11) Hon POON Siu-ping (Written reply)

In order to ease the traffic congestion at the Cross Harbour Tunnel (“CHT”) in Hung Hom, the Government has proposed to implement traffic diversion measures, i.e. to increase the tolls at CHT and at the same time reduce the tolls at the Eastern Harbour Crossing through reimbursing the tunnel users, while maintaining the tolls at the Western Harbour Crossing. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council of the names of the connecting roads to the three tunnels, as well as the current capacity and average daily throughput, morning rush hours (i.e. 7 am to 9 am) throughput and afternoon rush hours (i.e. 5 pm to 7 pm) throughput of each of these roads on weekdays which are not public holidays?

改善環境衛生的措施

(12) 何俊賢議員 (書面答覆)

經歷2003年嚴重急性呼吸系統綜合症的爆發後，政府舉辦多項大型清潔活動及進行宣傳，以改善社區的衛生情況。然而，早前有報章報道，有團體在社區進行巡查時發現100多個衛生黑點，反映隨着時間過去，政府及市民的衛生意識逐步減弱、社區的衛生工作變得鬆懈，以及衛生問題仍然嚴峻。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去5年，各政府部門每年分別向干犯公眾地方潔淨罪行人士發出的定額罰款通知書的數目為何；政府有否檢討現時執行相關條例的情況及罰款金額；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；
- (二) 過去5年，政府進行了甚麼工作提高市民的環境衛生意識；有否評估該等工作的成效；政府會就相關工作制訂甚麼新的計劃或發展方向；
- (三) 當局有否定期評估18個區議會分區(“18區”)的衛生情況，並且針對各區的衛生黑點進行清潔工作；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何；
- (四) 當局有否研究再次舉辦“全城清潔大行動”，策動18區攜手提升全港公共衛生水平，並針對公眾地方、公共屋邨及後巷等進行徹底清潔和消毒，以減低疾病傳播風險；若有，計劃為何；若否，原因為何；及
- (五) 當局有否研究舉辦“全港舉報衛生黑點運動”，要求食物環境衛生署制訂服務承諾，規定該署收到市民舉報衛生黑點後，必須在限定時間內處理妥當；若有，計劃為何；若否，原因為何？

Measures to improve environmental hygiene

(12) Hon Steven HO Chun-yin (Written reply)

After weathering the outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome in 2003, the Government has organized a number of large-scale clean-up activities and conducted publicity campaigns with a view to improving the hygiene conditions at the community level. Yet, it has been reported earlier in the press that an organization has located 100-odd hygiene black spots when inspecting various communities, reflecting that with the passage of time, the hygiene awareness of both the Government and the public has been gradually weakening, hygiene efforts at the community level have slackened, and hygiene problems are still severe. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the numbers of Fixed Penalty Notices issued separately by the various government departments to persons committing public cleanliness offences in the past five years; whether the Government has conducted any review of the enforcement of the relevant legislation and the level of the fine; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) of the work carried out by the Government to enhance the environmental hygiene awareness of the public in the past five years; whether it has assessed the effectiveness of such work; of the new planning or development direction that the Government is going to formulate in respect of the relevant work;
- (c) whether the authorities have regularly assessed the hygiene conditions of the 18 District Council districts (“18 districts”) and carried out clean-up work targeting at the hygiene black spots in the various districts; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (d) whether the authorities have conducted studies on holding the “Team Clean” campaign again to mobilize the 18 districts to collaborate with one another in enhancing the overall hygiene level of Hong Kong and carrying out thorough cleaning and disinfecting work targeting at public places, public housing estates and

back alleys, etc., so as to reduce the risk of spreading diseases; if they have, of the relevant plans; if not, the reasons for that; and

- (e) whether the authorities have conducted studies on holding a “territory-wide hygiene black spot reporting campaign” to require the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (“FEHD”) to formulate a performance pledge stipulating that FEHD must handle the reported cases properly within a specified period of time upon receipt of hygiene black spot reports made by the public; if they have, of the relevant plans; if not, the reasons for that?

安全飲用水的供應

(13) 王國興議員 (書面答覆)

據報，近年內地的一些河流、湖泊、近海水域，以至野生動物和人類的體內，檢測出多種有害的化學物質，亦有多個地方的飲用水受到污染。報道又指出，國家環境保護部近日首次承認，內地有數以百計的癌症村，而廣東省內有25個，其中兩個更位於本港主要水源東江沿岸的惠州。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 鑒於香港採用世界衛生組織所訂定的《飲用水水質準則》作為經處理的飲用水水質標準，該準則近年有否因應全球不斷出現環境污染問題而更新；當局有否就水質監測制訂新的應對策略；
- (二) 過去3年，每年的輸港東江水原水水質檢測結果當中，哪些項目不符合有關的水質標準，以及飲用該等不符合標準的飲用水會否損害人體健康；若會，詳情為何；
- (三) 鑒於近年內地的環境污染問題日趨嚴重，當局有否與廣東省的有關當局磋商推行措施，進一步改善東江水原水水質，包括減少對東江水源頭的污染，以期減少使用化學物質來淨化飲用水；若有，詳情為何，若否，原因為何；及
- (四) 鑒於內地近年經常出現乾旱，而且不時有污染問題被揭露出來，當局有否制訂應變措施，應付東江水因突發事件而無法輸港或不適宜飲用的情況，以確保本港有安全及穩定的飲用水供應；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何，以及當局會否認真考慮制訂該等應變措施？

Supply of safe drinking water

(13) Hon WONG Kwok-hing (Written reply)

It has been reported that on the Mainland in recent years, various types of hazardous chemical substances have been found in some rivers, lakes, coastal waters and even in the bodies of wild animals and human beings, and the drinking water in many places has been contaminated. It has also been reported that the Ministry of Environmental Protection has recently acknowledged for the first time the existence of hundreds of cancer villages on the Mainland. There are 25 such villages in Guangdong Province, and two of them are even in Huizhou, which is situated along the riverbank of Dongjiang - the main source of water supply for Hong Kong. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) as Hong Kong has adopted the Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality (“the Guidelines”) published by the World Health Organization as the water-quality standard for treated drinking water, whether the Guidelines have been updated in recent years in response to the environmental pollution problems which have emerged worldwide one after another; and whether the authorities have devised any new and corresponding strategies for monitoring water quality;
- (b) of the items which failed to meet the relevant water quality standards in the outcome of tests of the quality of Dongjiang raw water supplied to Hong Kong in each of the past three years; and whether drinking such substandard water is harmful to health; if it is, of the details;
- (c) given the worsening environmental pollution problems on the Mainland in recent years, whether the authorities have discussed with the relevant Guangdong Provincial authorities the implementation of measures to further improve the quality of Dongjiang raw water, including reducing the pollution to the source of Dongjiang water, with a view to reducing the use of chemicals for purifying drinking water; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

- (d) given the frequent droughts and revelation of pollution problems on the Mainland in recent years, whether the authorities have formulated any contingency measures to deal with the situations in which Dongjiang water cannot be supplied to Hong Kong or is unsafe to drink due to unexpected incidents, so as to ensure a steady supply of safe drinking water to Hong Kong; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that, and whether the authorities will consider seriously formulating such contingency measures?

“\$6,000計劃”的受惠資格

(14) 黃毓民議員 (書面答覆)

據悉，有部分在港定居的人士因未擁有香港永久性居民身份而不合資格登記“\$6,000計劃”以領取6,000元，又因在香港居住已滿7年而不合資格向“關愛基金新來港人士津貼計劃”申領6,000元津貼。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 有否統計目前香港有多少名上述類別的市民；如有，數目為何；如否，原因為何；
- (二) 有否為該類別的市民作出特別安排，讓他們可以領取6,000元；及
- (三) 政府在制訂上述計劃的資格準則時，有否考慮會否造成對某類市民不公平或歧視的情況，及避免該情況的出現？

The eligibility criteria for “Scheme \$6,000”

(14) Hon WONG Yuk-man (Written reply)

It is learnt that some people who have settled in Hong Kong are ineligible to register for “Scheme \$6,000” so as to receive \$6,000 as they have not attained the Hong Kong permanent resident status, and they are also ineligible to apply for an allowance of \$6,000 under the “Allowance for New Arrivals Programme of the Community Care Fund” as they have lived in Hong Kong for seven years. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it has compiled statistics on the number of the aforesaid group of residents in Hong Kong at present; if it has, of the number of such residents; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) whether it has made any special arrangement to enable the aforesaid group of residents to receive \$6,000; and
- (c) whether the Government has, in setting the eligibility criteria for the aforesaid scheme, considered if such criteria will give rise to a situation being unfair to or discriminating against a certain group of residents, and avoided such a situation?

長者基礎牙科外展服務先導計劃

(15) 麥美娟議員 (書面答覆)

政府於2011年4月推出為期3年的長者基礎牙科外展服務先導計劃(“先導計劃”), 透過非政府機構為居於院舍及使用長者日間護理中心的有需要長者提供免費的基礎牙科及口腔護理外展服務。當局預計該計劃的服務人次為10萬, 並承諾於計劃實施兩年後進行中期檢討。就此, 當局可否告知本會:

- (一) 截至目前為止, 使用上述服務的長者人次為何, 並按服務項目(例如牙齒檢查、洗牙、止痛和緊急牙科治療)列出分項數字;
- (二) 截至目前為止, 先導計劃的開支為何; 鑒於不少長者的大部分牙齒已脫落而要使用假牙, 當局會否重新考慮將鑲牙及補牙納入先導計劃的服務範圍; 如會, 詳情為何, 包括預計每年將增加多少額外開支; 如否, 原因為何;
- (三) 當局會否考慮將先導計劃的服務對象擴展至全港的長者; 如會, 詳情為何; 如否, 原因為何; 及
- (四) 當局將於何時公布先導計劃的中期檢討結果; 當局根據甚麼準則評估先導計劃的成效, 以及有否為該計劃制訂指標; 如有, 詳情為何; 如否, 原因為何?

Pilot project on outreach primary dental care services for the elderly

(15) Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen (Written reply)

The Government launched a three-year pilot project on outreach primary dental care services for the elderly (“the pilot project”) in April 2011 to provide free outreach primary dental care and oral health care services to the elderly in need in residential care homes or day care centres through non-governmental organizations. The authorities estimated that services would be provided for 100 000 persons (in terms of head counts) under the pilot project, and they undertook to conduct an interim review two years after its implementation. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of attendances of the elderly receiving the aforesaid services hitherto, with a breakdown by type of service (e.g. dental examination, scaling and polishing, pain relief and emergency dental treatment);
- (b) of the expenditure incurred by the pilot project hitherto; given that quite a number of elderly people have lost most of their teeth and therefore need to wear dentures, whether the authorities will consider afresh extending the scope of the services provided under the pilot project to cover crowning and tooth-filling; if they will, of the details, including the estimated additional expenditure to be incurred annually; if not, the reasons for that;
- (c) whether the authorities will consider expanding the service targets of the pilot project to cover all elderly people in Hong Kong; if they will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (d) when the authorities will announce the results of the interim review of the pilot project; of the criteria based on which the authorities assess the effectiveness of the pilot project, and whether they have set targets for the project; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

第二按揭計劃

(16) 吳亮星議員 (書面答覆)

據報，香港金融管理局自2009年以來多次收緊住宅按揭貸款的最高按揭成數，而涉及第二按揭計劃的貸款額及其佔新批出按揭貸款的百分比則由2010年的14.79億元和0.45%上升到2012年的38.59億元和2.01%。就此，政府可否告知本會，自2009年至今：

- (一) 每年涉及第二按揭計劃的貸款總額及其佔年內新批出按揭貸款的百分比為何；及
- (二) 上述百分比有否呈上升趨勢；若有，有否評估此趨勢對本港金融系統的穩定帶來甚麼風險；若有評估，詳情為何；若沒有評估，會否進行評估？

Co-financing schemes

(16) Hon NG Leung-sing (Written reply)

It has been reported that the Hong Kong Monetary Authority has tightened the maximum loan-to-value ratio for residential mortgage loans for a number of times since 2009, and the amount of loans involving co-financing schemes and the percentage of such loans in the new mortgage loans approved increased from \$1.479 billion and 0.45% in 2010 to \$3.859 billion and 2.01% in 2012 respectively. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the total amount of loans involving co-financing schemes and the percentage of such loans in the new mortgage loans approved in each year since 2009; and
- (b) whether the aforesaid percentages have shown a rising trend since 2009; if so, whether it has assessed what risks such a trend has posed to the stability of Hong Kong's financial system; if it has made such an assessment, of the details; if not, whether it will do so?

申請樓宇按揭貸款的入息證明

(17) 梁耀忠議員 (書面答覆)

最近，本人接獲一些受聘於內地工作並透過內地銀行帳戶支取薪金的香港永久性居民的投訴，聲稱有本港銀行不接納內地銀行的帳戶紀錄作為入息證明，並拒絕其樓宇按揭貸款申請，令他們無法置業。該等市民被逼長期租住私人住宅，高昂的租金開支使他們的生活負擔沉重。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 是否知悉，現時哪些本港銀行在處理香港永久性居民的樓宇按揭貸款申請時，不接納非本港銀行的帳戶紀錄作為入息證明，該等銀行採取此做法的原因為何，以及該等銀行會否接納其他的入息證明；若不接納，原因為何；及
- (二) 政府會否協助上述組別的人士解決他們在申請樓宇按揭貸款時遇到的困難；若會，詳情為何；若否，原因為何？

Income proofs for home mortgage loan applications

(17) Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung (Written reply)

Recently, I have received complaints from Hong Kong permanent residents who are employed to work on the Mainland and receive salaries through mainland bank accounts. They claimed that some banks in Hong Kong did not accept the account records of mainland banks as income proofs, and rejected their applications for home mortgage loans, rendering them unable to purchase homes. These members of the public have been forced to rent and reside in private residential flats on a long-term basis, and the high rental expenses have imposed a heavy burden on their livelihood. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it knows which banks in Hong Kong currently do not accept account records of non-Hong Kong banks as income proofs when dealing with home mortgage loan applications of Hong Kong permanent residents, the reasons why such banks have adopted such a practice, and if such banks accept other income proofs; if they do not, the reasons for that; and
- (b) whether the Government will assist the aforesaid group of people in resolving the difficulties they encounter in applying for home mortgage loans; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

防止殘酷對待動物

(18) 黃碧雲議員 (書面答覆)

香港警務處(“警務處”)聯同漁農自然護理署、香港愛護動物協會、獸醫組織及關注動物組織於2011年推出動物守護計劃，從教育、宣傳、情報收集及調查四方面全方位打擊殘酷對待動物的行為，包括把此類案件交由警務處轄下專業的刑事調查隊調查。另一方面，警務處較早前表示，已將關注動物權益的組織及人士提出成立“動物警察”的要求轉達負責整體動物福利事宜的食物及衛生局處理。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去5年，當局每年接獲懷疑殘酷對待動物的舉報數目為何，當中所涉傷亡的動物及施虐人士數目為何；並按動物受傷害情況、施虐人數及區議會分區列出舉報數目的分項數字；
- (二) 過去5年，每年此類案件的破案率、被捕人士數目，以及被定罪人士數目和法庭向他們施加的最高及最低判罰分別為何；
- (三) 由2011年至今，當局在教育、宣傳、情報收集及調查四方面打擊殘酷對待動物的行為所投放的資源分別為何(按月份列出)；
- (四) 有否檢討動物守護計劃的整體及上述四方面的成效；若有，檢討的準則為何，以及宣傳及教育的工作詳情、該計劃推出至今所收集的情報數量及進行調查的個案宗數分別為何；若否，原因為何；
- (五) 由2011年至今，每月刑事調查隊所處理的殘酷對待動物的案件數目為何；隊員有否接受與動物權益和福利相關的專業訓練；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因

為何，以及如何確定隊員有足夠的專業知識處理殘酷對待動物案件；及

- (六) 過去5年，警務處、食物及衛生局和保安局有否就成立動物警察事宜舉行跨部門會議；若有，按年列出會議的詳情(包括日期、時間、地點及結論等)；有否考慮向各警區或個別警區的刑事調查隊成員或其他警員提供相關的專業知識和培訓，並指派該等警員專責處理與動物有關的案件；若有，詳情為何；若否，原因為何？

Prevention of cruelty to animals

(18) Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan (Written reply)

The Hong Kong Police Force (“HKPF”), in collaboration with the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Hong Kong), veterinary associations and animal concern groups, introduced the Animal Watch Scheme in 2011 to fight against cruelty to animals through a four-pronged approach of education, publicity, intelligence gathering and investigation, including referring such cases to the professional crime investigation teams under HKPF for investigation. Meanwhile, HKPF indicated earlier that it had forwarded the requests of animal welfare concern groups and individuals for the establishment of “animal police” to the Food and Health Bureau (“FHB”), which is responsible for overall animal welfare matters. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of reports received by the authorities in each of the past five years on suspected cases of cruelty to animals; the number of animals which were injured or killed and abusers in such cases; a breakdown on the number of reports by the type of harm done to the animals, the number of abusers and District Council district;
- (b) of the detection rates of such cases, the number of persons arrested as well as the number of persons convicted and the respective maximum and minimum penalties imposed on them by the court, in each of the past five years;
- (c) of the respective resources deployed by the authorities since 2011 (broken down by month) to fight against cruelty to animals in respect of education, publicity, intelligence gathering and investigation;
- (d) whether it has assessed the effectiveness of the Animal Watch Scheme on the whole and in respect of the aforesaid four aspects; if it has, of the assessment criteria, as well as details of publicity and education activities, the amount of intelligence gathered and the

number of cases investigated since the introduction of the Scheme; if not, the reasons for that;

- (e) of the number of cases of cruelty to animals handled by the crime investigation teams each month since 2011; whether the team members have received professional training relevant to animal rights and welfare; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that, and how it ensures that the team members have adequate professional knowledge in handling cases of cruelty to animals; and
- (f) whether HKPF, FHB and the Security Bureau had conducted inter-departmental meetings on the establishment of “animal police” in the past five years; if they had, of the details (including the dates, time, venues and conclusions, etc.) of such meetings each year; whether they have considered providing the crime investigation team members in various police districts or individual police districts or other members of HKPF with relevant professional knowledge and training, and designating such members of HKPF to handle animal-related cases specifically; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

水痘疫苗的供應

(19) 梁家傑議員 (書面答覆)

據報，自從去年8月內地揭發有醫院為兒童接種假冒的水痘疫苗，以及去年11月本港有一名男童因染上水痘而不治後，在本港接種水痘疫苗的兒童人數急增，導致水痘疫苗由去年年底開始斷貨。3間向本港供應水痘疫苗的供應商均表示，未知何時可恢復穩定供應。此外，政府已計劃在2014年將水痘疫苗納入“香港兒童免疫接種計劃”(“接種計劃”)。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 衛生署有否統計，過去3年，每年接種水痘疫苗的人數為何；如否，原因為何；如有，有關的統計數字有否區分香港永久性居民的婦女所生的兒童、配偶為香港永久性居民的內地婦女在港所生的兒童、配偶為非香港永久性居民的內地婦女在港所生的兒童，以及內地兒童；
- (二) 衛生署有否統計今年首季有多少名兒童接種水痘疫苗；
- (三) 衛生署有否評估目前水痘疫苗缺貨的情況；如有，評估的結果為何；如否，原因為何；
- (四) 根據衛生署與水痘疫苗供應商聯繫所得，是次疫苗缺貨的原因為何，以及何時可恢復穩定供應；
- (五) 政府會否考慮在短期內引入其他的水痘疫苗供應商，以應付急切的需求；
- (六) 衛生署預計接種計劃每年會為多少名兒童接種水痘疫苗；

- (七) 衛生署有否評估在水痘疫苗納入接種計劃後，現時的供應商能否供應足夠的疫苗；及
- (八) 衛生署有否因應是次水痘疫苗短缺事件，主動監察其他類別的疫苗會否出現缺貨情況？

Supply of varicella vaccines

(19) Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit (Written reply)

It has been reported that following revelation in August last year that a mainland hospital had administered fake varicella (commonly known as chickenpox) vaccines to children, and the death of a boy in Hong Kong caused by varicella in November last year, the number of children receiving varicella vaccines in Hong Kong has surged, resulting in stockout of varicella vaccines since the end of last year. All three varicella vaccine suppliers for Hong Kong have indicated that they are not sure when stable supplies can be resumed. In addition, the Government has planned to incorporate varicella vaccines into the Hong Kong Childhood Immunization Programme (“CIP”) in 2014. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the Department of Health (“DH”) had compiled statistics on the respective numbers of persons receiving varicella vaccines in each of the past three years; if it had not, of the reasons for that; if it had, whether the statistics differentiated among children born to women who are Hong Kong permanent residents (“HKPRs”), children born in Hong Kong to mainland women whose spouses are HKPRs, children born in Hong Kong to mainland women whose spouses are not HKPRs, as well as children from the Mainland;
- (b) whether DH has compiled statistics on the number of children receiving varicella vaccines in the first quarter of this year;
- (c) whether DH has assessed the current situation of shortage of varicella vaccines; if it has, of the assessment outcome; if not, the reasons for that;
- (d) according to the information obtained by DH from its liaison with the varicella vaccine suppliers, of the causes of the current shortage of varicella vaccines and when stable supplies can be resumed;

- (e) whether the Government will consider introducing other suppliers of varicella vaccines in the near future in order to meet the urgent demand for the vaccines;
- (f) of the number of children receiving varicella vaccines each year under CIP as estimated by DH;
- (g) whether DH has assessed if the current suppliers will be able to supply sufficient vaccines after varicella vaccines are incorporated into CIP; and
- (h) whether, in the light of the incident of shortage of varicella vaccines, DH has taken the initiative to monitor if there will be a shortage of supply of other types of vaccines?

流動小販管理及發牌事宜

(20) 梁志祥議員 (書面答覆)

有元朗區的居民向本人反映，區內阜財街、元朗新街、又新街及康景街的行人路、鐘聲徑，以及光華廣場、同益大廈、千色廣場及天耀邨的地面走火通道對開位置，長期被流動小販的大型攤檔佔用。該等小販不斷擴展營業範圍、對行人造成阻礙，亦阻擋行人橫過馬路的視線，而他們的販賣活動亦產生噪音及垃圾問題，附近居民的生活因此受到影響。元朗區議會轄下的委員會曾在會議上要求當局加強執法，但問題至今仍未解決。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去3年，當局就上述地點的小販販賣活動接獲投訴及提出檢控的數字分別為何；
- (二) 向流動小販簽發牌照的政策(包括訂明的擺賣條件)為何；
- (三) 現時的流動小販牌照數目為何；鑒於食物環境衛生署署長可在小販牌照內訂明持牌人可販賣的範圍，現時可於元朗區內販賣的流動小販的數目為何；及
- (四) 流動小販的販賣活動的管理及執法工作的詳情為何；屢次違例的流動小販會受到甚麼懲罰，當中是否包括收回牌照？

Management and licensing of itinerant hawkers

(20) Hon LEUNG Che-cheung (Written reply)

Some residents in Yuen Long district have relayed to me that the following areas in Yuen Long have been occupied by large stalls of itinerant hawkers for a long period of time: the pavements at Fau Tsoi Street, Yuen Long New Street, Yau Sun Street and Hong King Street; Chung Sing Path; and the areas in the vicinity of the at-grade fire escapes of Kwong Wah Plaza, Tong Yick Building, Citimall and Tin Yiu Estate. Such hawkers have continuously expanded their trading areas, causing obstruction to pedestrians and blocking pedestrians' view when they cross the roads. Also, their hawking activities have caused noise and refuse problems, affecting the daily lives of the residents nearby. A committee under the Yuen Long District Council had requested the authorities at a meeting to step up law enforcement, but the problems have not yet been solved. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the respective numbers of complaints received and prosecutions instituted by the authorities against hawking activities at the aforesaid locations in the past three years;
- (b) of the policy on licensing of itinerant hawkers (including the specified hawking conditions);
- (c) of the existing number of itinerant hawker licences; given that the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene may specify in a hawker licence the trading area of the licensee, of the existing number of itinerant hawkers who are allowed to hawk in Yuen Long district; and
- (d) of the details of the management of and law enforcement actions in relation to the hawking activities of itinerant hawkers; what penalties will be imposed on itinerant hawkers who are repeated offenders, and whether the penalties include revocation of licences?