

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(3) 249/13-14

Paper for the House Committee meeting of 13 December 2013

Questions scheduled for the Legislative Council meeting of 18 December 2013

Questions by:

- | | | |
|------|--|--------------------------------|
| (1) | Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok | (Oral reply) |
| (2) | Hon NG Leung-sing | (Oral reply) |
| (3) | Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan | (Oral reply) |
| (4) | Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (5) | Hon CHAN Han-pan | (Oral reply) |
| (6) | Hon Kenneth LEUNG | (Oral reply) |
| (7) | Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan | (Written reply) |
| (8) | Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau | (Written reply) |
| (9) | Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming | (Written reply) |
| (10) | Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen | (Written reply) |
| (11) | Hon James TO Kun-sun | (Written reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (12) | Hon CHAN Kin-por | (Written reply) |
| (13) | Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung | (Written reply) |
| (14) | Hon CHAN Chi-chuen | (Written reply) |
| (15) | Hon Claudia MO | (Written reply) |
| (16) | Hon TANG Ka-piu | (Written reply) |
| (17) | Hon James TIEN Pei-chun | (Written reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (18) | Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit | (Written reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (19) | Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung | (Written reply) |
| (20) | Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan | (Written reply) |
| (21) | Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun | (Written reply) |
| (22) | Hon WU Chi-wai | (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

Conduct of health screening on travellers at immigration control points

(4) Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai (Oral reply)

The Department of Health (“DH”) is gradually outsourcing the health screening service (“screening service”) provided at immigration control points (“control points”). Some health surveillance assistants (“HSAs”) have indicated that they are worried about losing their jobs. They even query that DH has adopted harsh management measures and increased their work pressure recently, in an attempt to force them to resign so as to implement outsourcing of screening service. For example, some of the staff members who reside on Cheung Chau and had all along worked at the control point in Hong Kong-Macao Ferry Terminal have been deployed to work at the control point in Lok Ma Chau, and when they fail to spot mainland women who are pregnant for 28 weeks or more among the travellers arriving at Hong Kong, they will be required to write a report to give explanations. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) given the two recent cases of human infection of H7N9 avian influenza which were suspected to be imported from a place outside the territory, whether the authorities have assessed if the screening service contractors have sufficient manpower to cope with the demand for screening service in case of a major epidemic; if they have, of the details of the assessment; and how the authorities monitor the quality of the service provided by the additional staff members employed by the contractors;
- (b) of the number of non-local pregnant women spotted by HSAs through visual inspection at the control points in the past five years, and how the authorities assess the effectiveness of their work; and
- (c) given that some HSAs have pointed out that the number of mainland travellers visiting Hong Kong under the Individual Visit Scheme has continuously increased in recent years, and that due to the Immigration Department’s gradual replacement of traditional counters with Automated Passenger Clearance System (“e-Channels”) for immigration clearance for travellers holding electronic Exit-Entry Permits for Travelling to and from Hong Kong and Macao, the time for immigration clearance will be shortened, making it increasingly difficult for them to carry out the work of spotting non-local pregnant women through visual inspection, whether the authorities have reviewed the manpower of HSAs and the deployment of them to various posts, so as to alleviate the work pressure on these staff members?

Steering Committee on Land supply

(11) Hon James TO Kun-sun (Written reply)

The Chief Executive indicated in the 2013 Policy Address that the Steering Committee on Housing Land Supply chaired by the Financial Secretary would be re-organized as the Steering Committee on Land Supply (“the Committee”), which would coordinate the overall plans for development and supply of land in Hong Kong for various uses, and adjust supply in response to changes in demand. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the composition of the Committee and the number of meetings held last year;
- (b) whether the Committee last year proposed any specific measure to increase residential land supply in the short to medium terms and recommended any individual sites for such use; if it did, of the number of sites that will be available for residential use and the respective numbers of residential flats that can be built in each of the next five years;
- (c) whether the Committee has made any recommendation on the Land Sale Programme (“LSP”) in the fourth quarter of this year; if it has, of the details; whether the Committee has assessed the numbers of residential flats that can be supplied this year by the major sources of residential land supply (including Government’s LSP, railway property development projects, projects of the Urban Renewal Authority, and lease modifications/land exchanges or other private developments), and how such figures compare with the target set by the Government early this year that the land supply in this year will be capable of producing 25 800 private residential flats, and whether it has assessed the supply of residential sites and flats next year;
- (d) given that the Government has estimated that 24 000 first-hand units can be offered for sale in 2013 (including 12 000 uncompleted units for which the Government would expedite the processing of their pre-sale consent applications, 8 000 uncompleted units ready for pre-sale and 4 000 unsold units in completed projects), whether the Committee has assessed if all of the aforesaid 24 000 first-hand units can be offered for sale at present, and the number of units sold among them; if the assessment result is that only some of such units can be offered for sale, of the reasons for that;

- (e) whether the Committee last year proposed any specific measure to increase the land supply for public housing in the medium to long term and recommended any individual site for such use; if it did, of the respective numbers of public rental housing flats and Home Ownership Scheme flats expected to be built in each of the five years starting from 2017-2018, and
- (f) whether the Committee has assessed the supply of commercial sites in LSP for this year; whether the Committee knows the progress of the relocation of the existing government facilities in the two action areas of Kowloon East and the development of the North Commercial District on Airport Island; whether the Committee has assessed the time when government departments located in Central, Mong Kok and Wan Chai can be relocated to other districts, with a view to increasing the supply of office sites in these districts?

Rational allocation of public rental housing resources

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

There are comments that the current number of applications on the Waiting List for public rental housing (“PRH”) has already exceeded 230 000 but the Housing Subsidy Policy and the Policy on Safeguarding Rational Allocation of Public Housing Resources (commonly known as “Well-off Tenants Policies”) have failed to achieve the objective of ensuring rational allocation of the limited public rental housing resources by encouraging well-off tenants to vacate their PRH flats. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the detailed justifications for each of the following requirements of the Well-off Tenants Policies:
 - (i) that the minimum length of residence for declaration of household income and/or assets be set at 10 years, and not a shorter period;
 - (ii) that the thresholds of household income for payment of 1.5 times and double net rent plus rates be set at two and three times of Waiting List Income Limits (“WLILs”) respectively; and
 - (iii) that the threshold of net household asset value for vacation of PRH flats be set at 84 times of WLILs;
- (b) of the number of well-off tenants and the percentage of such number in the total number of PRH households in each of the past five years, with a breakdown by the level of the rents paid by such well-off tenants (i.e. 1.5 times rents, double rents or market rents);
- (c) of the number of well-off tenants who vacated their PRH flats in each of the past five years and, among such tenants, the number of those who vacated their flats upon purchase of Home Ownership Scheme flats;
- (d) whether it has studied the feasibility of the following suggestion which aims at boosting the turnover of PRH flats: where for three consecutive years the total monthly household income of a household has reached the level at which the household is required to pay double rent, such household is required to vacate its PRH flat within the three years immediately following, and upon vacation, the household will be refunded half of the total amount of double rent paid as subvention and be exempted from the requirement of restoring the rescinded PRH flat to its original form; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and

- (e) whether it has considered converting the current tenancies of PRH flats, which bear no time limit, into fixed-term tenancies to ensure that precious public rental housing resources are allocated to needier people; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

Protection of welfare of animals

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

Last year, the Government conducted public consultation on proposed measures to better regulate pet trading. When reporting the outcome of the public consultation to a panel of the Legislative Council (“LegCo”) on 16 April this year, the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (“AFCD”) indicated that it aimed to propose legislative amendments to the Public Health (Animals and Birds) (Animal Traders) Regulations (Cap.139, sub leg B) within this year, but such legislative proposal has not yet been introduced into LegCo so far. Moreover, some concern groups on animal interests consider that as only the breeding and selling of dogs will be regulated, the proposed amendments fail to regulate private breeding centres comprehensively. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (a) of the respective numbers of reports on animal abuse received and prosecutions instituted by AFCD and the Police in each of the past three years, with a breakdown by the type of animals abused;
- (b) of the sales volume of pets in each of the past three years, with a breakdown by the type of animals;
- (c) why it has not yet introduced the aforesaid legislative amendments into LegCo and when it will do so;
- (d) as some concern groups on animal interests are worried that under the proposed amendments, operation of private animal breeding centres in private residential premises is not prohibited, which makes it difficult for the authorities to conduct surprise inspections on such breeding centres, that application for licence to breed and trade animals may be made in the name of a person, and that no ceiling has been set on the number of such licences to be issued within the territory, whether the authorities have assessed if such situations would constitute loopholes of regulation, thus making it difficult for the authorities to control private pet-breeding activities effectively; if they have, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (e) whether AFCD has assessed if there are fewer cases of animal abuse and abandonment in countries or regions where private breeding of pets for commercial purposes is totally prohibited; if the assessment result is in the affirmative, of the details, and whether AFCD will consider adopting such a practice; if it has not conducted such assessment, of the reasons?