

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(3) 402/14-15

**Paper for the House Committee meeting
of 30 January 2015**

**Questions scheduled for the
Legislative Council meeting of 4 February 2015**

Questions by:

- | | | |
|------|--|-------------------------------|
| (1) | Dr Hon Helena WONG | (Oral reply) |
| (2) | Hon TAM Yiu-chung | (Oral reply) |
| (3) | Hon Gary FAN | (Oral reply) |
| (4) | Hon IP Kin-yuen | (Oral reply) |
| (5) | Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT | (Oral reply) |
| (6) | Hon Paul TSE | (Oral reply) (New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (7) | Hon Starry LEE | (Written reply) |
| (8) | Hon LEE Cheuk-yan | (Written reply) |
| (9) | Hon Jeffrey LAM | (Written reply) |
| (10) | Hon YIU Si-wing | (Written reply) |
| (11) | Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG | (Written reply) |
| (12) | Hon Dennis KWOK | (Written reply) |
| (13) | Hon CHAN Chi-chuen | (Written reply) |
| (14) | Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN | (Written reply) |
| (15) | Hon Albert HO | (Written reply) |
| (16) | Hon CHAN Kin-por | (Written reply) |
| (17) | Hon CHAN Han-pan | (Written reply) |
| (18) | Hon Frederick FUNG | (Written reply) |
| (19) | Hon WONG Kwok-hing | (Written reply) |
| (20) | Hon Emily LAU | (Written reply) |
| (21) | Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai | (Written reply)(New question) |
| | <i>(Replacing his previous question)</i> | |
| (22) | Hon TANG Ka-piu | (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

Measures to increase the income generated by
the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal

(6) Hon Paul TSE (Oral Reply)

There are comments that as the gross receipt of the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (“KTCT”) in 2014 was only \$30 million, the Government could only share \$2.19 million at the most. If KTCT’s operation fails to make a “great leap forward” in the years to come, it may take as long as 23 years, i.e. in year 2037 or 2038, to fully recover the \$8.2 billion investment of public funds. In this connection, the tourism sector and some marketing academics have attributed KTCT’s operational failure to erroneous positioning, its supporting facilities being “a fiasco”, lack of any long-term planning for tourism policy, inability to compete with the neighboring regions, and reducing Hong Kong to a shopping spot for mainland tourists. They therefore have described KTCT as “expensive chicken ribs”, which means that it is of dubious worth but too costly to give up. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (1) whether it has, based on the current business situation of KTCT and the terms in KTCT’s tenancy for operation and management, made projections as to when the Government can recover the aforesaid \$8.2 billion investment of public funds; if it has, of the details; if not, whether it can make projections immediately and give an account of its projections to the public as early as possible;
- (2) as the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (“LCSD”) is currently occupying one of the units in KTCT’s roof garden that enjoys a 360-degree panoramic sea view, of the total floor area of the unit, the purpose for which the unit is used by LCSD, the number of staff members using the unit and their scope of work; whether it has assessed the rental income that may be brought to KTCT each year if the unit is leased to a private organization; and
- (3) whether it will, in response to the aforesaid comments made by the tourism sector and marketing academics, review the positioning and mode of operation of KTCT and, by making reference to the success of the Wine and Dine Festival held at KTCT, implement the proposal of establishing “a bar street” in the roof garden, increase the number of occasions on leasing KTCT facilities for holding concerts or other performances, or explore other means to create new sources of income, so as to boost KTCT’s income and shorten the cost recovery period?

Second round of public consultation on constitutional development

(21) Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai (Written Reply)

On the 7th of last month, the Government published the Consultation Document on the Method for Selecting the Chief Executive by Universal Suffrage to commence a two-month second round public consultation on the method for selecting the Chief Executive (“CE”) by universal suffrage in 2017. CE reiterated in the 2015 Policy Address that the substantive power to decide on constitutional development rested with the Central Authorities and the decision of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress on issues relating to the selection of CE by universal suffrage and on the method for forming the Legislative Council (“LegCo”) in the year 2016 had irrefutable legal status and was legally valid, and that the slogan of “Hong Kong shall resolve Hong Kong’s problems” did not conform with our constitutional arrangements. CE also named in his criticism some featured articles of Undergrad, a magazine of the Hong Kong University Students’ Union, and a book named Hong Kong Nationalism published by it, which advocated the proposition that Hong Kong should “find a way to self-reliance and self-determination”. CE considered that the society must stay alert to such a proposition, but such remarks had aroused some controversies in society. On the other hand, an opinion poll conducted by a university has indicated that the instant satisfaction rate of the public with this year’s Policy Address is the second lowest among the policy addresses delivered since the reunification of Hong Kong. Moreover, the Chief Secretary for Administration, who is the main promoter of the constitutional reform, has described that there is a slim chance for the constitutional reform package to be passed by LegCo, but she would not miss any opportunity to approach the pan-democrats. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (1) of the members of political parties, political groups and organizations as well as LegCo Members met separately by the government officials responsible for the constitutional reform since the launch of the second round of public consultation; the respective numbers and dates of the meetings held, the number of persons met and the contents of the meetings;
- (2) of the number of relevant open forums, briefing sessions and consultation activities attended by the government officials responsible for the constitutional reform since the launch of the second round of public consultation; the respective dates, contents and organizers of such activities; whether the government officials have plans to attend similar activities in the remaining consultation period; if they have plans, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (3) of the number of submissions received by the Government from members of the public by email, fax, mail and phone since the launch of

the second round of public consultation; and the contents of such submissions;

- (4) whether the government officials responsible for the constitutional reform will make arrangements to meet the 27 pan-democratic LegCo Members one by one; if they will, of the Members whom they have arranged to meet; if not, the reasons for that; whether they have plans to meet the rest of LegCo Members as well as various political parties, political groups and organizations in the remaining consultation period to lobby them to support the passage of the constitutional reform package by LegCo; if they have plans, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (5) whether the government officials responsible for the constitutional reform have plans to meet the representatives of the Hong Kong Federation of Students and Scholarism in the remaining consultation period; if they have plans, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (6) how the Government determined the weighting to be accorded to the public opinions in formulating the proposals for selecting CE by universal suffrage in 2017, and of the details of such consideration;
- (7) whether it has assessed if the relatively low instant satisfaction rate of members of the public with this year's Policy Address will affect their support for the passage of the constitutional reform package by LegCo; if it has assessed, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (8) given the comments that the Occupy Central movement has greatly aroused the interest of young people and students in the constitutional reform, whether the Secretary for Education will have a direct dialogue with them on issues relating to the constitutional reform;
- (9) whether it has assessed if there will be a greater chance for the constitutional reform package to be passed by LegCo should CE meet and lobby pan-democratic LegCo Members in person; if it has assessed, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (10) whether it has assessed if CE's criticism of Undergrad will undermine the post-secondary students' support for the passage of the constitutional reform package by LegCo, or even result in their boycott of the second round of public consultation; if it has assessed, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (11) whether it will consider expanding the membership of the Task Force on Constitutional Development by recruiting more government officials to participate in the consultation and lobbying work; if it will consider, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (12) given the CE's remarks that there are external forces intervening in the political affairs of Hong Kong, whether it has assessed if there are external forces exerting influence on or intervening in the constitutional reform and the second round of public consultation; if it has assessed, of

the details; if not, the reasons for that; whether it has assessed when it will be the appropriate time for making public information on the intervention of external forces in the political affairs of Hong Kong;

- (13) whether it has taken the initiative to invite officials of the Central Authorities to have a direct dialogue with pan-democratic LegCo Members on the constitutional reform; if it has, of the details, if not, the reasons for that;
- (14) whether it has assessed if the expressed support by pan-democratic LegCo Members for the so-called “referendum” to be triggered by the resignation of a LegCo Member will affect the chance for the constitutional reform package to be passed by LegCo; if it has assessed, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (15) of the expected time for publishing the report on the second round of public consultation and for submitting the constitutional reform package to LegCo?