

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 753/12-13

**Paper for the House Committee meeting
of 5 July 2013**

**Questions scheduled for the
Legislative Council meeting of 10 July 2013**

Questions by:

- | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------------|
| (1) | Hon Steven HO Chun-yin | (Oral reply) |
| (2) | Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (3) | Hon CHAN Han-pan | (Oral reply) |
| (4) | Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun | (Oral reply) |
| (5) | Hon LEUNG Che-cheung | (Oral reply) |
| (6) | Hon James TO Kun-sun | (Oral reply) |
| (7) | Hon YIU Si-wing | (Written reply) |
| (8) | Hon WONG Kwok-kin | (Written reply) |
| (9) | Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung | (Written reply) |
| (10) | Hon Starry LEE Wai-king | (Written reply) |
| (11) | Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun | (Written reply) |
| (12) | Hon WONG Kwok-hing | (Written reply) |
| (13) | Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai | (Written reply) |
| (14) | Hon CHAN Hak-kan | (Written reply) |
| (15) | Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan | (Written reply) |
| (16) | Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen | (Written reply) |
| (17) | Hon Claudia MO | (Written reply) |
| (18) | Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him | (Written reply) |
| (19) | Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit | (Written reply) |
| (20) | Hon James TIEN Pei-chun | (Written reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (21) | Hon Dennis KWOK | (Written reply) |
| (22) | Hon KWOK Wai-keung | (Written reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye has given
up the question slot allocated to her)</i> | |

註 :

NOTE :

議員將採用這種語言提出質詢

Member will ask the question in this language

Resolving the long-standing problems faced by
the education sector

(2) Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai (Oral reply)

The Chief Executive indicated in the 2013 Policy Address that “it is time to consolidate our education policies, and avoid drastic changes to give stakeholders some respite. Our future priority will be to ensure the quality of our education by further improving relevant measures in accordance with existing policies.” However, quite a number of people from the education sector have pointed out to me that the education sector is facing many long-standing challenges and problems, including the declining population of secondary students, insufficient subsidized tertiary education places, the difficulties encountered by Direct Subsidy Scheme (“DSS”) schools in teacher recruitment, etc., but the Government’s existing policies have not been able to resolve these long-standing problems. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether it will draw up specific policies and a relevant timetable to resolve the problem of insufficient tertiary education places; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) whether it will set up a dedicated committee to review the class-teacher ratios of secondary and primary schools; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) whether it will set up a dedicated committee to review the functions and roles of DSS schools; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

Surrender by the Hong Kong Mercantile Exchange Limited of its authorization to provide automated trading services

(20) Hon James TIEN Pei-chun (Written reply)

On 17 May this year, the Hong Kong Mercantile Exchange Limited (“HKMEx”) decided to surrender its authorization to provide automated trading services because its revenues had fallen short of expenditure (“the HKMEx incident”). The incident has aroused grave public concern. However, representatives from the Government and the Securities and Futures Commission (“SFC”) refused, on the ground that the incident was under investigation, to explain the details of the incident in reply to Members’ questions raised at the meeting of the Panel on Financial Affairs of this Council held on 3 June. Subsequently, I proposed at the meeting of the House Committee (“HC”) of this Council on 7 June that a select committee be formed and authorized by this Council to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance (Cap. 382) (“the P&P Ordinance”) to inquire into issues relating to the incident. At its meeting of 26 June this year, this Council also debated and voted on the resolution to set up a select committee on this matter. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) given that the senior officers of the Government and SFC had, prior to the aforesaid HC meeting, held a closed meeting with some Members of this Council from certain political groups, and such Members indicated after the closed meeting that as the authorities had addressed their prime concerns, they decided to object to the setting up of the select committee, whether the authorities can explain why they were willing to explain the details to some Members of this Council at that closed meeting only, and whether they can state openly to members of the public and this Council the justifications presented at the closed meeting; if not, of the reasons for that;

- (b) given that, in response to the criticisms that there have been inconsistency and unfairness in SFC's regulation of HKMEx and securities brokers and that SFC is alleged to have given preferential treatment to the former, the Government has explained that the two differed remarkably in terms of functions, business operation and the level of regulation that they were subject to and the two therefore could not be compared, whether the authorities know if other international financial centres have adopted more lenient standards in regulating institutions akin to HKMEx; if they know; of the details; if not, the reasons for not conducting a study on it;
- (c) whether it has assessed the impact of the HKMEx incident on the credibility of SFC and the reputation of Hong Kong as an international financial centre; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (d) given that the Government has repeatedly stated that if this Council invokes the P&P Ordinance to inquire into the HKMEx incident, the investigations currently being carried out by the law enforcement agencies and the legal proceedings which may be initiated in the future will be affected, of the concrete examples to support such statement; and
- (e) whether it has assessed if the investigation initiated by SFC on the HKMEx incident will give the public the impression of "the industry investigating its own members", hence undermining the credibility of the investigation results; if the assessment result is in the affirmative, of the reasons for continuing with such investigation?

Implementation of the Qualifications Framework

(22) Hon KWOK Wai-keung (Written Reply)

The Government launched the Qualifications Framework (“QF”) in 2008, under which a “Recognition of Prior Learning” (“RPL”) mechanism was set up. Under RPL mechanism, there is a five-year transitional period for each participating industry during which applicants may apply for recognition of qualifications at QF Levels 1 to 3 by producing documentary proofs of their years of relevant working experience, without the need to take any formal assessment tests. On 14 March this year, together with the trade union representatives of various Industry Training Advisory Committees (“ITACs”) under QF, I had a meeting with the Deputy Secretary for Education to reflect the views of the trade unions on QF and to strive for the extension of the transitional period by five years. Recently, the Education Bureau has decided to extend the transitional period for three industries, namely Printing & Publishing, Watch & Clock and Hairdressing, by two years. Quite a number of trade unions have relayed their concerns to me that there is not enough time for them to motivate employees to apply for RPL within a short span of two years. The trade unions have also pointed out that in recent years, some training providers have launched QF-related training courses when ITACs have yet to be established, Specifications of Competency Standards drawn up and RPL mechanisms implemented for the industries concerned. They are concerned that taking such courses will turn out to be the only channel through which employees can acquire recognition of qualifications for certain specific industries or posts, thereby posing serious threats to the job security and livelihood protection of serving employees. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) whether the Education Bureau has new measures to motivate employees of the Printing & Publishing, Watch & Clock and Hairdressing industries to actively apply for RPL, in

particular how it will enhance its cooperation with both the employers and the employees;

- (b) of the current number of QF-related training courses which have been launched when ITACs have yet to be established, Specifications of Competency Standards drawn up and RPL mechanisms implemented for the industries concerned; the industries and posts associated with such courses respectively; how the Education Bureau ensures that such courses can satisfy the needs of the industries; the channels through which employees can attain the same level of recognized qualifications apart from taking the relevant courses; and
- (c) whether the Education Bureau will, pursuant to the arrangement of extending the transitional period by two years, conduct a large scale interim review of QF, and comprehensively consult the public, in particular the employers and employees of the industries concerned, on the implementation of QF; if not, of the reasons for that?