

# 立法會 *Legislative Council*

立法會 CB(3)216/03-04 號文件

2003 年 12 月 5 日內務委員會會議文件

定於 2003 年 12 月 10 日立法會會議上提出的質詢

提問者：

- |      |                      |                 |
|------|----------------------|-----------------|
| (1)  | 劉江華議員                | (口頭答覆)          |
| (2)  | 劉慧卿議員                | (口頭答覆)(原先編號：20) |
|      | (此項質詢原本編定為要求書面答覆的質詢) |                 |
| (3)  | 吳靄儀議員                | (口頭答覆)          |
| (4)  | 鄭家富議員                | (口頭答覆)          |
| (5)  | 吳亮星議員                | (口頭答覆)          |
| (6)  | 張宇人議員                | (口頭答覆)(新的質詢)    |
|      | (取代原先列入此編號的質詢)       |                 |
| (7)  | 陳婉嫻議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (8)  | 李鳳英議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (9)  | 張文光議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (10) | 梁富華議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (11) | 羅致光議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (12) | 丁午壽議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (13) | 單仲偕議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (14) | 何鍾泰議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (15) | 石禮謙議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (16) | 劉江華議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (17) | 鄭家富議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (18) | 鄧兆棠議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (19) | 何鍾泰議員                | (書面答覆)          |
| (20) | 劉慧卿議員                | (書面答覆)(新的質詢)    |
|      | (取代其原先提出的質詢)         |                 |

註 :

NOTE :

# 議員將採用這種語言提出質詢

# Member will ask the question in this language

# (2) 劉慧卿議員 (口頭答覆)

據報，青洲英泥有限公司自 1992 年起未經許可佔用了一幅位於紅磡的政府土地。就此，行政機關可否告知本會：

(一) 該宗事件的詳情，以及為何該公司可未經許可佔用政府土地長達 11 年之久；及

(二) 當局曾採取及將採取的跟進行動？

(2) Hon Emily LAU (Oral Reply)

It has been reported that the Green Island Cement Company Limited has been occupying without authorization a piece of government land in Hung Hom since 1992. In this connection, will the Executive Authorities inform this Council of:

(a) the details of the case and why the company could have occupied government land without authorization for as long as 11 years; and

(b) the follow-up actions taken and to be taken by the authorities?

#(6) 張宇人議員 (口頭答覆)

為實施公共服務電子化計劃，政府委聘了一家私營公司建立及營辦“生活易網站”。政府透過該網站以電子方式向市民提供公共服務，而營辦商則可利用該網站進行電子商貿活動。但本人留意到該網站內介紹“家居及飲食”的網頁載有30多家屬“私房菜”類別的食肆的資料，本人獲悉當中不少食肆並未領有食物業牌照。就此，政府可否告知本會：

- (一) 有關的營辦合約有否規定該網站不可宣傳非法活動；若有，規定的詳情；若沒有，原因是甚麼；
- (二) 該網站有否載列無牌食肆的資料；若有，當局會否要求網站營辦商刪除無牌食肆的資料，以保障消費者及持牌食肆的權益；及
- (三) 會否按照該網站所載的資料，採取執法行動取締有關的無牌食肆？

(6) Hon Tommy CHEUNG (Oral Reply)

To implement the Electronic Service Delivery ("ESD") Scheme, the Government has commissioned a private company to develop and operate the "ESD life web-site". The Government provides online public services through the web-site, while the contractor is allowed to use the web-site for conducting e-commerce activities. However, I notice that the "Household" page of the web-site contains information on some 30 restaurants which fall into the "private kitchen" category, and I have learnt that quite a number of such restaurants have not obtained any food business licences. In this connection, will the Government inform this Council whether:

- (a) the relevant operating contract has stipulated that no illegal activities should be promoted on the web-site; if so, of the details of the stipulations; if not, the reasons for that;
- (b) the web-site contains information on unlicensed restaurants; if so, whether the authorities will ask the web-site operator to remove the information on the unlicensed restaurants, so as to safeguard the rights and interests of consumers as well as licensed restaurants;

and

- (c) it will, based on the web-site's information, take enforcement actions against the unlicensed restaurants concerned?

# (20) 劉慧卿議員 (書面答覆)

《淫褻及不雅物品管制條例》(第 390 章)禁止向青少年(即未滿 18 歲的人)發布不雅物品，而《電影檢查條例》(第 392 章)則禁止對青少年上映被檢查員分級為“只核准對年滿 18 歲的人上映”的影片。就此，行政機關可否告知本會：

- (一) 過去 3 年，有關當局共接獲多少宗關於商鋪向青少年發布不雅物品的投訴，以及分別有多少名商鋪負責人因而被檢控及定罪；
- (二) 有否計劃教育家長及鼓勵市民向當局舉報向青少年發布不雅物品的商鋪；若有，計劃的細節；若否，原因為何；及
- (三) 有否計劃要求進口商在出售未經分級的電影光碟前把它們送交電影檢查監督評級；若有，計劃的細節；若否，原因為何？

(20) Hon Emily LAU (Written Reply)

The Control of Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance (Cap. 390) prohibits the publication of indecent articles to juveniles (i.e. persons under the age of 18 years), whereas the Film Censorship Ordinance (Cap. 392) prohibits the exhibition to juveniles films classified by censors as "APPROVED FOR EXHIBITION ONLY TO PERSONS WHO HAVE ATTAINED THE AGE OF 18 YEARS". In this connection, will the Executive Authorities inform this Council:

- (a) of the number of complaints received by the relevant authorities about shops publishing indecent articles to juveniles in the past three years, and the respective number of persons in charge of such shops prosecuted and convicted for such offence;
- (b) whether they have any plan to educate parents and encourage members of the public to report to the authorities the shops which publish indecent articles to juveniles; if so, of the details of the plan; if not, the reasons for that; and
- (c) whether they have any plan to require importers of optical discs of films to submit those discs yet to be classified to the Film Censorship Authority for classification before selling them; if so, of the details of the plan; if not, the reasons for that?

