

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(1)1505/13-14  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/HG/1

**Panel on Housing**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 3 March 2014, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH (Chairman)  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP  
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon WONG Yuk-man  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

**Members absent** : Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP

**Public Officers attending** : **For item III**

Professor Anthony CHEUNG, GBS, JP  
Secretary for Transport and Housing

Mr D W PESCOD, JP  
Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing)

Miss Agnes WONG, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing)

Mr Anson LAI  
Assistant Director (Strategic Planning)  
Housing Department

**For item IV**

Mr D W PESCOD, JP  
Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing)

Mr CHAN Siu-tack  
Acting Deputy Director (Estate Management)  
Housing Department

Mr LEUNG Sai-chi  
Assistant Director (Estate Management) 1  
Housing Department

**Clerk in attendance** : Mr Derek LO  
Chief Council Secretary (1)5

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Ken WOO  
Senior Council Secretary (1)5

Ms Mandy LI  
Council Secretary (1)1

Miss Mandy POON  
Legislative Assistant (1)1

---

Action

**I. Information papers issued since last meeting**

1. Members noted that no information paper had been issued since last meeting.

**II. Items for discussion at the next meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)984/13-14(01) — List of follow-up actions

LC Paper No. CB(1)984/13-14(02) — List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(1)984/13-14(03) — Letter dated 25 February 2014 from Hon WONG Kwok-hing, Chairman (Chinese version only)

LC Paper No. CB(1)1015/13-14(01) — Letter dated 25 February 2014 from Hon WONG Kwok-hing, Chairman, on his request for the Research Office of the Legislative Council Secretariat to conduct research studies on rent control (Chinese version only))

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 7 April 2014, at 2:30 pm –

- (a) Head 711 Item — PWP No. B197SC Reprovisioning of Pak Tin community hall and special child care centre-cum-early education and training centre in Pak Tin Estate redevelopment site, and construction of footbridge link at Nam Cheong Street, Sham Shui Po;

Action

- (b) Progress Report on Addition of Lifts to Existing Public Rental Housing Estates; and
- (c) Rent payment for public housing tenants.

3. The Chairman advised that in response to his letter dated 25 February 2014 (circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1)984/13-14(03) on 26 February 2014), the Administration had agreed to advance discussion of the item "Interim measures to tackle under-occupation in public rental housing estates" from the third quarter of 2014 to the meeting on 5 May 2014.

4. The Chairman also advised that he had received a submission from a group of residents of Kwun Lung Lau who expressed concern on rental increase to be implemented by the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HS") in 2014. At the request of the Chairman, the Secretary for Transport and Housing ("STH") undertook to liaise with HS on the date for discussion of the matter.

*(Post-meeting note: The above submission was tabled at the meeting and subsequently circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1032/13-14(01) on 4 March 2014. The Administration had replied that HS would be able to attend the Panel meeting on 5 May 2014 to discuss the matter.)*

5. Members agreed to the Chairman's request in his letter dated 25 February 2014 (circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1015/13-14(01) on 28 February 2014) for the Research Office of the Legislative Council Secretariat to conduct a comparative study on rent control policies in Hong Kong and overseas countries.

*(Post-meeting note: With the concurrence of the Chairman, the above research report would be discussed at the Panel meeting on 7 July 2014. The Administration had been invited to attend the meeting.)*

### **III. Review of Waiting List Income and Asset Limits for 2014/15**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)984/13-14(04) — Administration's paper on "Review of Waiting List Income and Asset Limits for 2014/15"

LC Paper No. CB(1)984/13-14(05) — Updated background brief on "Waiting List Income and Asset Limits" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat)

Action

6. STH briefed members on the outcome of the review of the Waiting List ("WL") income and asset limits for 2014/15 by highlighting the salient points of the Memorandum for the Subsidized Housing Committee ("SHC") of the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") which was attached to the Administration's paper. He advised that the proposed income and asset limits for 2014/15 would increase by an average of 8.4% and 4.4% respectively over those for 2013/14 and that the outcome of the review would be considered by SHC on 24 March 2014. The Assistant Director of Housing (Strategic Planning) ("ADH(SP)") then gave a power-point presentation to outline the outcome of the review of the WL income and asset limits for 2014/15.

*(Post-meeting note: A set of the power-point presentation materials was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1031/13-14(01) on 4 March 2014.)*

Request for raising Waiting List income limits for 1- and 2-person households

7. Miss Alice MAK highlighted the pressing need to provide public rental housing ("PRH") to those who could not afford high rentals of private housing and thus had to reside in cubicles or subdivided units ("SDUs"). As housing costs, being a component of the review mechanism, were derived from the costs of renting a private flat comparable to PRH, she was concerned that such costs might not have taken into account the high unit rents for cubicles and SDUs and she hoped that separate surveys would be conducted. Pointing out that some occupations, such as security guards whose working hours were commonly 12 daily, she was concerned about the fact that the household income of 2-person households with two income earners each earning statutory minimum wage ("SMW") and worked for 12 hours daily would have exceeded the proposed WL income limits. This would have penalized 2-person households with two income earners and discouraged them from joining the workforce. She therefore requested that the mechanism for reviewing the WL income and asset limits be reviewed and that special consideration be given to households whose income was marginally above the proposed limits. STH responded that it was impractical to factor in the number of working hours in setting the WL income limits as different households would have different working arrangements. The nominal wage index introduced to the mechanism would reflect the changes in income levels brought about by the implementation of SMW. The total household expenditure of all household sizes, averaging at 8.4% under the review, was in fact higher than the increase in household income brought about by SMW.

8. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung suggested adding weighting to the WL income limits of both 1- and 2-person households in view of the relatively higher expenditure of 1-person households compared with those of more persons, and

Action

that there would only be around \$8,000 left per month for 2-person households upon deduction of rentals. Mr Christopher CHUNG considered the proposed WL income limit for 2-person households at \$14,970 contrary to the policy of encouraging births, as the household income of a 2-person household with two income earners would easily exceed that limit. He urged HA to raise the WL income limit for 2-person households.

9. STH responded that the proposed WL income limit for 1-person households had in fact been increased by a higher percentage when compared with households with more persons. It should also be noted that an increase in the number of households eligible for PRH in response to a rise in the WL income limits would bring about a reduced chance for PRH for low-income families. In reply to Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, STH advised that the household income of 2-person households with two income earners each earning SMW and worked for nine hours per day and 26 days per month would still be within the WL income limits. The existing review mechanism had struck a balance between the working hours of different occupations. He took note of members' concerns and undertook to convey them to SHC for consideration.

10. Dr KWOK Ka-ki described the proposed WL income limit for 2-person households as inhumane, as it would mean that each person of the household would only have some \$4,000 to meet daily expenses per month upon deducting rental payment, thus making it impossible at all for these households to give birth to babies and support the living of dependent parents. Pointing out that the Singapore Government had provided non-means tested public housing for about 85% of its population and that the income limit for public housing was set at \$12,000 Singapore Dollar (i.e. around \$70,000 Hong Kong Dollar), he suggested that the Administration could make reference to the experience of Singapore in providing public housing. STH replied that the experience of Singapore might not be applicable to Hong Kong given the differences in the historical development of housing and the target populations of the two places. Other factors such as a consensus of the community in the provision of PRH and the costs involved should also be considered. Mr WONG Yuk-man criticized the Administration for giving only a perfunctory response to Dr KWOK's suggestion.

11. Pointing out that rentals for 1-person private units and SDUs had now soared to some \$5,000 per month, Mr Albert CHAN commented that the logic in which households with income and assets above the prescribed WL income and asset limits were able to afford private accommodation was outdated. STH responded that under the mechanism on WL income and asset limits, housing costs were obtained by multiplying the average space allocated to WL applicants in the past three years by a unit rent derived from a sample survey of private dwellings conducted by the Census and Statistics Department.

Action

HA's SHC would also take into account this comment in reviewing WL income and asset limits.

12. Noting that the average reference flat size was a component of the housing costs, Mr WU Chi-wai sought explanation for setting the reference flat size for 3-person households at 29.9 square meters as opposed to the established value at about 31 to 32 square meters. ADH(SP) advised that since 3-person households might be allocated 2- to 3-person flats or one-bedroom flats, the housing expenditure of a household would be calculated based on the actual size of the flat allocated.

Request for raising Waiting List income limits for applicants opting for flats in the urban district and for applicants with disabilities

13. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung opined that households who met the WL income and asset limits were in fact living close to the poverty line. In view of the limited housing supply accompanied by soaring rentals, he called for HA to review the mechanism for reviewing the WL income and asset limits, and consider setting a higher income limit for households opting for PRH in the urban district in view of the relatively higher housing costs envisaged. STH replied that all along, the WL income and asset limits were reviewed by using an expenditure-led review mechanism which provided an objective basis to assess the affordability of households applying for PRH.

14. In considering housing costs, Mr Frederick FUNG opined that the differential unit rents of private flats for 1-person households at \$272 under the latest review was on the low side compared with those of SDUs. He also found the reference flat sizes for 1- and 2-person households at 15.3 and 22.4 square metres respectively unrealistic, and the unit rent for 2-person households around \$10 under the latest review impossible. On Mr FUNG's request to set out separate housing costs according to districts because such costs were relatively higher in the urban district, STH explained that the mechanism of the annual review would be made very complex if the relevant parameters were to be subdivided on a district basis. He however said that HA's SHC would consider Mr FUNG's view in the review of WL income and asset limits. Mr FUNG was disappointed that the Administration had made no concrete response to his request, which had been made for years.

15. Dr Fernando CHEUNG highlighted the financial burden shouldered by persons with disabilities or chronic illnesses on residence, medication and consumables, and called on HA to consider factoring in such medical-related expenditures in setting separate WL income limits for these applicants. Mr WU Chi-wai echoed Dr CHEUNG's views, and urged HA to put in place a mechanism under which applicants whose income limits were marginally above

Action

the prescribed limits would be given consideration on compassionate ground. Expressing a similar concern, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung suggested adding weighting to the WL income limits of these applicants direct without amending and thus complicating the existing formula.

16. The Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing) ("PSTH(H)") responded that mechanism had already been in place for applicants whose cases warranted special attention to apply for Compassionate Rehousing through the Social Welfare Department ("SWD"), so that HA could provide housing on compassionate ground. STH also undertook that HA's SHC would consider members' views and suggestions.

Request for raising Waiting List asset limits

17. Mr Frederick FUNG held the view that the WL asset limits should be adjusted with reference to other more relevant indicator(s) other than the Consumer Price Index (A) ("CPI(A)"), such as an index on asset growth of low-income families. Mr Christopher CHUNG considered the CPI(A) too broad an indicator to accurately reflect the financial position of the sector of the population eligible for PRH. Instead of relying on a set of indicators, he supported that a more people-oriented approach be adopted in the review of WL income and asset limits. In reply, STH advised that CPI(A) was widely accepted as an index that reflected price changes of consumer products in response to factors like inflation.

18. The Chairman sought explanation on the difference between the proposed income and asset limits for 2014/15 which would increase by an average of 8.4% and 4.4% respectively over those for 2013/14. He also considered the proposed WL asset limit for 1-person households at \$221,000 way too low as such a low level would effectively deter WL applicants from making savings and improving their financial position, thus went against the wider policy objective of promoting savings and acquiring wealth. Elderly applicants, who had made savings from years of work, would also fall into the category of well-off tenants easily. He urged HA to conduct a comprehensive review into the existing mechanism on reviewing the WL income and asset limits which in his view was very outdated. STH responded that the WL asset limits for elderly households were already set at two times the limits for non-elderly applicants under the existing mechanism. HA would conduct a review into the Well-off Tenants Policy having regard to the views expressed recently by the Public Accounts Committee ("PAC") and the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee ("the Steering Committee").



Action

Impact brought about by the latest review

19. Noting that some 147 100 non-owner occupied households in the private sector would be eligible for PRH if the proposed WL income limits were adopted, Mr KWOK Wai-keung asked if the housing production target for the coming 10 years would be adjusted accordingly to meet an increased demand. Mr Frederick FUNG was concerned that HA might tighten existing measures as well as introducing new ones to recover more flats to meet an increased demand for PRH. Mr WONG Yuk-man said that it was worrying that 32.3% of the total number of non-owner occupied households in the private sector would become eligible for PRH under the revised limits, as it implied that at least one-third of the households in the private sector were earning an income ineligible for PRH yet unable to acquire a property of their own.

20. STH responded that with the upward adjustment of WL income limits, the number of eligible applicants would increase. Nevertheless, eligible households might choose not to apply for PRH and some might already be on the WL. While the Steering Committee had recommended 470 000 units to be the housing supply target for the coming 10 years, the projection would be reviewed on an annual basis to take into account any changes in policy or prevailing circumstances with a view to formulating an appropriate housing supply target.

21. Mr KWOK Wai-keung pointed out that some WL applicants whose application had been rejected due to failure to meet income eligibility requirements would become eligible again if the new limits were endorsed, and they could request for reinstatement of the original application not earlier than six months and not later than two years after the first cancellation date of the application. He asked whether HA would consider advancing the timing for reinstatement applications. ADH(SP) replied that the above mechanism was reasonable and HA currently had no plan to make adjustments. In reply to Mr KWOK on the impact of the adjustment of the proposed WL income and asset limits on the number of well-off tenants, ADH(SP) advised that as PRH tenants would be required to declare household income only having resided in PRH for 10 years or above, it was difficult to estimate the change in the number of well-off tenants subsequent to the endorsement of the proposed limits.

Handling Waiting List applications with inadvertent omissions

22. Mr Albert CHAN requested HA to reconsider WL applications which had been rejected due to inadvertent omission in declaring dividend receivable from insurance policies, and those owing to averaging the household income over the number of months during which income was earned during the past six months (as opposed to averaging it over the entire six-month period) during the detailed

Action

vetting process. Mr WU Chi-wai was disapproved of HA's rejecting applications and even making prosecutions against the applicants due to inadvertent omissions although the omission would not render the income exceeding the prescribed limits. Expressing a similar concern, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung urged HA to review its current practice on handling cases of inadvertent omissions.

23. STH responded that HA would need to be vigilant in dealing with applications with omissions where discretions should be avoided. He however undertook to look at the current practice and see if the handling of such cases could be further optimized.

24. The Chairman concluded by requesting the Administration to consider members' views and concerns on the mechanism on reviewing the WL income and asset limits.

*(Post-meeting note: As advised by STH vide his letter dated 26 March 2014, members' views and concerns on the review of WL income and asset limits for 2014/15 had been relayed to the HA's SHC, and SHC endorsed on 24 March 2014 the proposed WL income and asset limits for 2014/15 which came into effect on 1 April 2014. STH's letter was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1186/13-14(01) on 31 March 2014.)*

#### **IV. Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)984/13-14(06) — Administration's paper on "Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates"

LC Paper No. CB(1)984/13-14(07) — Updated background brief on "Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat

LC Paper No. CB(1)984/13-14(08) — Submission from a member of the public (Chinese version only))

Action

25. PSTH(H) briefed members on the latest position of the Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates ("the Marking Scheme") by highlighting the salient points of the paper. The Assistant Director of Housing (Estate Management)1 ("ADH(EM)1") gave a power-point presentation on the subject.

*(Post-meeting note: A set of the power-point presentation materials was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1031/13-14(02) on 4 March 2014.)*

Enforcing termination of tenancy under the Marking Scheme

*Enforcing strictly termination of tenancy*

26. Referring to the PAC Report No. 61 released in February 2014 which recorded members' great dissatisfaction over the Administration's work on tackling the abuse of PRH, Mr WONG Yuk-man did not subscribe to the Administration's indication in its paper that an increase in point allotment cases for misdeeds in relation to using leased premises for illegal purpose was attributable to the enhanced enforcement actions and extensive publicity and educational programmes undertaken by the Housing Department ("HD"). Emphasizing the importance of examining carefully decisions of tenancy termination arising from the accumulation of 16 points under the Marking Scheme and strictly enforcing termination on cases with justifiable grounds, he requested the Administration to provide detailed information on the 51 Notices-to-quit ("NTQs") issued up to December 2013 and an update of their implementation. He also sought explanation on whether an appeal mechanism was available under the Marking Scheme, and whether section 58 of the Conveyancing and Property Ordinance (Cap. 219) which provided for restrictions on and relief against forfeiture of leases and under-leases were applicable under the Marking Scheme. PSTH(H) responded that an appeal mechanism was in place and offenders could lodge an appeal to the Appeal Panel (Housing) where their cases would be heard accordingly.

Admin

27. In response to Mr Michael TIEN, ADH(EM)1 advised that to provide for possible appeal cases, a reasonable timing would be given to households which had been issued a NTQ to move out. Households served with a NTQ would be persuaded to move out, and eviction would only be implemented if necessary.

28. Pointing out that rent in arrears were mostly due to unemployment and it took time to find a job, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung asked if HA would consider including rent in arrears a misdeed under the Marking Scheme instead of evicting such households. PSTH(H) explained that it was inappropriate for the Marking Scheme to deal with rent in arrears which was a systemic problem. Domestic tenants who faced temporary financial hardship might apply for the Rent Assistance Scheme of HA which provided relief in the form of rent

Action

reductions. Mechanism was in place to refer those with a longer term financial problem to the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme. Mr LEUNG was unconvinced of the uses of the above schemes in assisting tenants in financial distress as there were still cases of eviction due to rent in arrears. He requested the Administration to elaborate on the mechanism and its effectiveness in rendering assistance to cases of rent in arrears and the number of flats so surrendered.

Admin

29. Pointing out that some households in financial distress might be reluctant to seek assistance proactively, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung called for HD to make early referral to SWD for attention and assistance.

*Holding the entire household liable for the misdeeds committed by individual family member*

30. Mr Frederick FUNG considered it unfair to hold the entire household liable for the misdeed committed by an individual family member, except in cases where the misdeed was related to using the premises for illegal purpose. He was of the view that the individual who committed the misdeed should be held liable and be punished accordingly but this should not affect the rights of other family members to continue to live in the PRH unit. ADH(EM)1 explained that the crux of the matter was that the allocation of PRH units was on a family basis and not an individual basis. Tenants were therefore required to take responsibility for their own actions and that of their family. In response to Mr FUNG's question on whether consideration would be given to removing just the individual who committed a misdeed from the tenancy, PSTH(H) responded that the purpose of the Marking Scheme was not to terminate tenancies but to change the behavior of the tenants who committed the misdeeds, and family pressure would be a more effective way to deal with the issue.

31. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung pointed out that except the Marking Scheme, he could not find any other example under the legal system of Hong Kong in which the entire household would be held liable for a misdeed committed by a family member. As the tenancy was signed with the principal tenant, he did not see the rationale for terminating the tenancy of the entire household as a result of a misdeed committed by a child of the principal tenant, even if it was related to using the premises for illegal purpose. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung expressed a similar view, and pointed out that consistent with the approach of the Marking Scheme, all housing officials should be requested to leave with principal officials appointed under the Accountability System for the planning blunders in housing. He cautioned that he might apply for a judicial review of the relevant policy.

Action

32. Miss Alice MAK highlighted that youths were more prone to committing misdeeds under the Marking Scheme. She shared the concern about the unfairness associated with holding the entire household liable for the misdeed committed by an individual family member.

33. ADH(EM)1 responded that for those cases where the number of valid points accrued to 10, a warning letter would be served to the household concerned. The warning letter would detail the points allotted and remind the tenant of the possible consequence if more points were allotted.

*Rendering assistance to households with misdeeds committed by mentally incapacitated family members*

34. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered it inappropriate to allot points to households with autistic or mentally incapacitated family members as it would not address the root cause of the misconducts. He sought elaboration on the handling of cases involving nuisances caused by these households by estate management staff, and opined that HD should engage social workers to handle the relevant cases or even refer such cases to the Integrated Family Service Centres ("IFSCs") of SWD for follow up. Mr Frederick FUNG and Miss Alice MAK echoed Dr CHEUNG's views, and opined that assistance from SWD should be sought for cases involving repeated misdeeds.

35. ADH(EM)1 replied that with the consent of the households needing special attention and assistance, HD made 24 referrals to IFSCs in 2013. PSTH(H) added that for needy households whose tenancy was terminated under the Marking Scheme, interim housing would be provided.

36. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered the number of referrals to IFSCs on the low side compared with the 1 350 households which have accrued 10 points or above as in December 2013. He requested HD to put in place clear criteria and guidelines for making referrals to IFSCs and set up a social worker team to more effectively handle cases that warranted intervention and professional assistance. PSTH(H) explained that it was inappropriate for HD to set up a dedicated social worker team of its own in view of the wide range of social welfare needs of those who committed misdeeds. HD would thus need to draw on the expertise and resources readily available from SWD. HD would raise the issue again in its regular meetings with SWD to come up better ways to render assistance to those in needs.

Admin

37. Mr KWOK Wai-keung enquired about the number and details of point-allotment cases which had been referred to SWD for follow-up. PSTH(H) undertook to provide the relevant information.

Action

Controlling dog-keeping

38. Miss Alice MAK said that she was given to understand by some psychiatrists that it was not easy to certify a patient's special needs for the companionship of a dog for mental support although the relevant exemption was in place for dog-keeping in PRH. She asked how HD would assess the needs of a tenant needing a dog for mental support. She also asked if HD would consider relaxing its restriction on pet-keeping as it was becoming more common. ADH(EM)1 responded that HD had in fact approved quite a number of applications for dog-keeping supported by the relevant medical certificate. Keeping of small household pets such as goldfishes, de-sexed cats and hamsters were allowed and did not require application to HD.

Throwing objects from a height

39. Mr KWOK Wai-keung enquired about the reason for the increase in the number of point allotment cases for throwing objects from a height. He also sought elaboration on the classification of the misdeed. ADH(EM)1 explained that tenants would be allotted different penalty points depending on the seriousness of the misdeed, with seven points for throwing objects jeopardizing environmental hygiene, such as papers and tissues, and 15 points for throwing hard objects, such as batteries, that might cause danger or personal injury. For throwing big objects that might cause serious danger or personal injury, such as televisions and refrigerators, the tenancy of the subject household would be terminated immediately.

40. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung pointed out that since a family member who caused serious personal injury or death by throwing objects from a height would certainly be imprisoned, it was grossly unfair to terminate the tenancy of the household concerned and render other innocent family members homeless.

Tackling smoking

41. Pointing out that he had received an increased number of complaints from residents of PRH regarding nuisance of cigarette smoke on the corridor caused by neighbours smoking at their house with door open wide, Mr Michael TIEN was concerned about the difficulty in taking enforcement action on account of the need to gather evidence as the smoke might have dissipated when the housing staff arrived at the scene. PSTH(H) responded that the Administration would continue to inculcate behavioral change through publicity and educational programmes, and would strictly enforce the Marking Scheme to tackle smoking nuisance.

Action

**V. Any other business**

42. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:38 pm.

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
27 May 2014