

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(3) 708/15-16

**Paper for the House Committee meeting  
of 24 June 2016**

**Questions scheduled for the  
Legislative Council meeting of 29 June 2016**

Questions by:

- |      |   |                               |
|------|---|-------------------------------|
| (1)  | Hon Claudia MO  | (Oral reply)                  |
| (2)  | Hon CHAN Hak-kan  | (Oral reply)                  |
| (3)  | Hon Frankie YICK  | (Oral reply)                  |
| (4)  | Hon Mrs Regina IP<br><i>(Dr Hon Helena WONG<br/>has given up the question slot)</i> | (Oral reply)(New question)    |
| (5)  | Hon Cyd HO  | (Oral reply)                  |
| (6)  | Hon IP Kin-yuen   | (Oral reply)                  |
| (7)  | Hon Alvin YEUNG   | (Written reply)               |
| (8)  | Hon Michael TIEN  | (Written reply)               |
| (9)  | Hon CHAN Yuen-han   | (Written reply)               |
| (10) | Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung   | (Written reply)               |
| (11) | Hon Albert HO   | (Written reply)               |
| (12) | Hon NG Leung-sing   | (Written reply)               |
| (13) | Hon MA Fung-kwok  | (Written reply)               |
| (14) | Hon James TIEN  | (Written reply)               |
| (15) | Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai<br><i>(Replacing his previous question)</i>                      | (Written reply)(New question) |
| (16) | Hon CHAN Kin-por  | (Written reply)               |
| (17) | Hon IP Kwok-him   | (Written reply)               |
| (18) | Hon KWOK Wai-keung  | (Written reply)               |
| (19) | Hon Paul TSE<br><i>(Replacing his previous question)</i>                            | (Written reply)(New question) |
| (20) | Hon Emily LAU   | (Written reply)               |
| (21) | Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT   | (Written reply)               |
| (22) | Hon Charles Peter MOK   | (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

## Mainland single mothers with minor children residing in Hong Kong

(4) Hon Mrs Regina IP (Oral reply)

Quite a number of Mainland women have sought my assistance regarding the problem of single-parent families being separated by the Mainland-Hong Kong boundary. They married or cohabited with Hong Kong residents and have given birth to children, but subsequently they divorced their husbands or were deserted by their partners. As a result, they are ineligible for applying for Permits for Proceeding to Hong Kong and Macao (commonly known as One-way Permits (“OWPs”)) to settle in Hong Kong, and may only apply for Exit-entry Permits for Travelling to and from Hong Kong and Macao (commonly known as “Two-way Exit Permits”) so that they can have a brief stay in Hong Kong to take care of their minor children. As they may neither take up employment in Hong Kong nor apply for Comprehensive Social Security Assistance, they are in financial straits. Their children, despite having the status of Hong Kong residents, lack the love and care of a healthy family, and have to lodge under other people’s roof which may make them feel discriminated. As a result, these children encounter a lot of difficulties when growing up. Some of them may develop hatred of society due to their long accumulated dissatisfaction, which may lead to a potential youth problem. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (1) of the current statistics or estimated figures on Mainland single mothers who are ineligible for applying for OWPs due to the aforesaid situations, and on their minor children residing in Hong Kong;
- (2) as the aforesaid single-mother assistance seekers are ineligible for applying for OWPs and some of the assistance seekers have chronic diseases, whether the Director of Immigration will consider granting, on compassionate grounds, permission for those assistance seekers who are under such special circumstances to stay in Hong Kong, so that they can take care of their minor children; and
- (3) how the authorities currently provide appropriate support for the aforesaid single mothers and their minor children in order to help these children grow up healthily, and of the relevant details?

## “Belt and Road” Scholarship Scheme

(15) Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai (Written reply)

To encourage more outstanding students from economies along the “Belt and Road” region (“B&R economies”) to pursue studies in Hong Kong, the Chief Executive (“CE”) proposed in the 2016 Policy Address to inject \$1 billion into the HKSAR Government Scholarship Fund and use the investment income thus generated to increase the number of scholarships offered to outstanding students from B&R economies to about 100 by phases (“the scholarship scheme”). Having regard to public views, the Government subsequently modified the scholarship scheme to make it a two-way initiative, i.e. apart from scholarships to be offered to attract outstanding students from B&R economies to pursue undergraduate studies in Hong Kong (“the inbound scholarship”), an “Outbound B&R Scholarship” (“the outbound scholarship”) will be provided at the same time for Hong Kong students to pursue undergraduate studies in B&R economies. Members of this Council have expressed diverse views on the scholarship scheme, including (a) while the spirit of the scholarship scheme deserves recognition, it should be taken forward on the premise that the admission of local students to funded undergraduate programmes in the territory will not be affected, (b) as Hong Kong students know nothing about the education situations in B&R economies, it is doubtful how many Hong Kong students will pursue university studies in these regions, and (c) CE’s taking forward the scholarship scheme in fact aims to flatter and toady to the Central Authorities for political advantages. Besides, it has been reported that the Government intends to submit the funding proposal for the scholarship scheme to the Finance Committee (“FC”) before the prorogation of the current term of the Legislative Council (“LegCo”). In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (1) given that it is now only about two weeks away from the prorogation of the current term of LegCo and that there are a number of funding proposals pending processing by FC, whether the Government has assessed if it is justifiable to submit the funding proposal for the controversial scholarship scheme to FC for scrutiny and whether there is urgency in doing so; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (2) whether it has assessed the likelihood of the funding proposal for the scholarship scheme getting FC’s approval before the prorogation of the current term of LegCo; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (3) whether it has estimated the respective numbers of applications for inbound scholarship and outbound scholarship in each of the first five years following the implementation of the scholarship scheme; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (4) whether it will set a relative ratio of approved inbound scholarship cases to approved outbound scholarship cases; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;

- (5) whether it will grant scholarships for the whole duration of study to awardees in one go; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that and the academic performance criteria the Government will adopt for determining whether such awardees may continue to receive scholarships in the following year;
- (6) whether drop-out awardees are required to return their scholarships to the Government; if so, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (7) whether it will modify the scholarship scheme into one which sponsors exchange students to pursue short-term (e.g. half-year or one-year) programmes, in B&R economies; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (8) whether it understands the education situations in B&R economies, including information such as the names of the universities and their programmes available for enrolment by Hong Kong students, the admission criteria adopted by various universities, designs of the disciplines, how far the qualifications are recognized, career prospects of graduates, etc.; if it does, how the Government will make public such information;
- (9) how it will assist students who are interested in applying for scholarships in understanding the education situations in various B&R economies; whether it will provide the relevant information on government websites; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (10) whether it has examined how far the undergraduate degrees awarded by universities in B&R economies are recognized, including whether the relevant qualifications are considered equivalent to those of the undergraduate degrees awarded by various institutions in Hong Kong; if it has, of the details; if not, the reasons for that;
- (11) whether it will discuss with the education departments of B&R economies the implementation of partnership schemes for students to enrol in mutually designated universities and programmes; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (12) whether it will consider sponsoring Hong Kong teachers to pursue or further studies in, or take part in exchange activities at, the universities in B&R economies; if it will, of the details; if not, the reasons for that?

## Assisting Hong Kong people serving sentences in the Philippines

(19) Hon Paul TSE (Written reply)

I raised a question on the 8th of this month enquiring about the assistance rendered to Hong Kong people serving sentences in the Philippines, including Mr TANG Lung-wai and the late Mr CHEUNG Tai-on in the same case. The Secretary for Security (“the Secretary”) indicated in his reply that over the years, the Chinese Embassy in the Philippines (“the Embassy”) had attached great importance to the Hong Kong people serving sentences in the Philippines. Apart from deploying staff to visit them at prison, the Embassy had approached the local judicial authorities for a number of times to understand the circumstances and progress of the cases, and had urged them to hear the cases in accordance with the law and in a prompt and impartial manner. It is learnt that Mr TANG was infuriated after learning of the Secretary’s aforesaid reply and queried that the claim of the Embassy attaching great importance to those Hong Kong people serving sentences in the Philippines was not true. Mr TANG pointed out that only in 2013 and 2014 had the Embassy staff visited the seven Hong Kong people who had applied for returning to Hong Kong to serve their sentences, and there were at least eight to nine people whom the Embassy staff had never visited in the past 12 years. Apart from those seven Hong Kong people, there are currently 15 to 17 people (eight to nine of them being holders of the British National (Overseas) Passport, and the rest being holders of the Hong Kong Certificate of Identity or the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (“HKSAR”) Passport) serving long-term sentences there. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council:

- (1) whether it has looked into Mr TANG’s claim that a number of Hong Kong people serving sentences in the Philippines had not been visited by the Embassy staff; if it has and the claim is substantiated, how the authorities have come up with the statement that the Embassy had attached great importance to them; whether the authorities will discuss with the Embassy the provision of more assistance to these Hong Kong people;
- (2) as the Secretary indicated in his aforesaid reply that the authorities were handling seven applications from Hong Kong people serving sentences in the Philippines for returning to Hong Kong to serve the remainder of their sentences, and the earliest application had been referred to the HKSAR Government by the Embassy in 2002, and yet 14 years have passed but the HKSAR Government is still waiting for the Philippine authorities to provide documents pertaining to the cases concerned, with some of the assistance seekers getting very old, how the Secretary will, as stated in his reply, “continue to follow up [the cases] with the Philippine Government through various practicable channels”; and
- (3) as it is learnt that the Philippine Department of Justice has demanded Mr TANG to first pay a penalty of 500,000 pesos before his appeal will be processed, and it is estimated that if Mr TANG wishes to appeal to the

Philippine Supreme Court, he will need to pay a legal fee of about HK\$90,000, and yet Mr TANG has indicated that he cannot afford them, of the HKSAR Government's means to help him solve such imminent problem, including whether it will urge the State Ministry of Foreign Affairs to discuss with the Philippine Government waiving or lowering the penalty, or exploring other feasible options?