

社評

對抗無益「錦綉之爭」應依法解決

元朗錦綉花園大道昨再發生爭路、堵路事件，管理公司放下欄杆禁止貨櫃車駛入，櫃車司機索性以車堵路，加上居民及村民數百人對峙，場面一度混亂不堪。事件雖為私人、局部性質，但因行動越趨激烈、升級，已引起社會廣泛關注。

事件起因，緣於七十年代末期發展商收購農地興建本港首個單幢式的大型私人屋邨錦綉花園，當時發展商曾承諾大生圍村民有權「世世代代」使用錦綉大道；早年彼此相安無事，其後，隨著香港與內地物流業蓬勃發展，有村民將土地出租作貨櫃場，重型貨櫃車使用錦綉大道的數目陡增，每日以數百架次計，從而滋生擠塞、噪音、維修保養及道路安全等問題，前年一名學童騎單車被貨櫃車撞死，更使問題激化。近日，錦綉花園業主及管理公司在大道路口裝設欄杆、增派保安，禁止貨櫃車駛入，居民與村民、司機之間一再發生齟齬，昨日對抗更見激烈。

衝突的發生，是令人遺憾及不安的。如此文明、法治的現代社會，竟會出現如同一百幾十年前兩條村民爭用水井大打出手群毆的事件，雙方甚至出動「老人陣」、「梳仔黨」對壘，實在貽笑大方，而堵塞交通、妨礙救護車執行任務，更是法治社會所不能容忍。

因此，現階段，就錦綉大道出現的使用權紛爭，必須從兩個方面給予關注和加以解決。

首先，必須弄清楚，錦綉大道是一條位於私人業權契約範圍內的「私家路」，而當年發展商與大生圍村民之間達成的所謂「世代使用」協議，到底何所指、是否有限制，這一切，都只能、而且必須通過有關各方以對話、協商來解決，如協議不成，也大可訴諸法庭，循法律途徑尋求解決，如近日般互相阻攔、封鎖、對峙等不文明做法絕不可取，且有觸犯法例之嫌。

另一方面，運輸署等政府相關部門，在事件中應扮演何種角色、發揮什麼作用，也要積極、審慎處理。事件中，有運輸業界人士要求政府將錦綉大道收回管理，此議看似有理、實則並不可行，一來私人業權契約必須尊重，收地事涉公帑運用和公眾利益，不能因為一有紛爭或訴求，政府就要「上手」，而且，錦綉花園業主、住客所關注的噪音和安全問題，不會因為政府收回而解決，相反，錦綉大道一旦「歸公」，使用率只會更大幅提高。



元朗錦綉花園大道再次發生爭路、堵路事件，大生圍村民與錦綉花園居民對峙，場面一度混亂 (林良堅攝)

因此，從政府角度而言，需要考慮和解決的是如何更好規劃和管理該區的整體道路交通運作。事實是，為緩解錦綉大道之爭，政府早於一九九八年便曾在該區增建一條錦學路連接青山公路及新田公路，但貨櫃車業界卻以需要繞路多花汽油錢為由而不願使用，寧願吵吵嚷嚷的繼續使用錦綉大道。而鑑於錦綉事件近日越演越烈，且出於跨境交通運輸長遠發展的需要，政府昨日透露正積極籌劃斥資億元在大生圍興建一條新的公路，可望二〇一二年竣工使用，並考慮以區議會地區小型工程模式，撥款一百五十萬資助錦綉大道進行一次路面維修。此「一長一短」兩議，應從根本及眼前緩解這一場「錦綉之爭」，亦符合政府角色職能和善用公帑之責。

2009/03/17 大公报社評

中文基本功

桿菌的桿多了三個錯音

桿字兩音，槓桿讀干，桿菌讀幹，這是粵語長久以來的讀法，由戰前到戰後，凡數十年，一直如此，並無其他雜音。換言之，這兩個讀音，是桿字在粵語的實際讀音。到二十年前，桿字在香港多了一個音，讀成追趕的趕，亦即不桿的桿，用於桿菌。與此同時，「正音」人士認為，既然槓桿讀干，桿菌也要讀干，以資「統一」。

我問過人：何以桿菌的桿，要改讀追趕的趕？有人答稱：普通話桿字讀第三聲，等於粵語的上聲，所以桿菌就要改讀趕菌。記得這種讀法，最初在無線電視新聞報道開始使用；由於沒有什麼人響應，改讀了一個時期就「無疾而終」了。

由於「正音」人士搞讀音「統一

容若

五星級英文



教成人要先立威信

黑楊 (yeung@harkyeung.com)

2008年與我合作辦英文寫作班的學習中心曾建議我考慮為家長開班，教家長怎樣去教孩子英文寫作，因為在該中心就讀的學生多來自中產家庭，家長受過高等教育，只是不懂若干寫作技巧，無法教孩子寫作。我一聽，反應是：恐怕比較年輕人難得多，之後就沒有再跟進。

英文教學非愚公移山

這可說是經驗之談，因為曾開過成人班，參與的不是家長，是中學教師。未開班前，該學校的英文老師在主任率領下說學生沒有學習意欲，暑假要學生上英文班，大概準備愈上愈少。平心而論，這班英文老師並非特別消極，遇上的老師甚至校長幾乎都是同一口腔。在港教中學的外籍老師，也認為在港教英文幾乎是愚公移山。

結果英文班非常成功，學生寫評語說是神奇魔術課程，使他們大有進步。校長安排老師分享經驗，老師們

積極得多了，不是討論怎樣教學生，而是質疑我用什麼魔法，令學生寫出正面評語。幸好有位老師一直旁聽我的課，透明度甚高的授課方式使我不至於不能自辯。人到了幾十歲，有了人生經驗，總以為自己辦不到的，別人也做不到。

現在實驗教英文寫作多了一年，想法有點改變，認為開家長班並非白費心機，但不能不先為家長做心理準備。什麼心理準備？就是先要他們的孩子上一年半載，成績大有進步，學習態度固然要好，分數一定要高，建立了威信，家長的態度就會比較開放了。有這個結論，是因為主動找我的家長，都是見孩子「脫胎換骨」（這是他們用的字眼），抱著好奇心來看老師到底是什麼怪模樣。

學生初上課，未大有進步呢？最好不要與家長談。因為他們每每有很多意見，例如：為什麼不給學生多些練習？多些功課？背多些生字？

(與父母對話，四)

社經「數」描

宜疏導15萬考生出路

2009年約有12萬名學校考生準備參加高考及會考公開試，加上自修生，考生接近15萬名。2008年報會考的總人數為109,574，學校考生為84,565；08年報高考總人數為38,263，學校考生為30,802。

七成中學生走向社會

換句話說，2008年會考後能進入中六預科的學校學生只有36%，倘加上自修生的競爭，入中六百分率只為28%。

這批有幸升上中六的學生，兩年後能考入大學的百分率為40%，以2009年中五學校學生8萬餘，兩年後能透過聯招升上大學的百分率為18%，其中13%能入讀本科課程，其餘5%只能入讀資助的副學位課程。其餘78%的學生到底何去何從？金融海嘯後，中學離校生在就業市場相對處於弱勢，選擇進修似是唯一途徑，估計今年高考及會考後，12萬名學校考生中，扣除35%上大學及入中六，15%加入就業市場或做「雙待」青年，將有6萬名學生選擇接受大專、專業教育及職業培訓，令到整個教育市場轉趨活躍。

社會各行各業人才需要平衡，倘教育機構以自由經濟概念一窩蜂去辦熱門科目如商業會計、酒店、旅遊等；當十大基建上馬之時，還有人力資源可用嗎？猶記得2000年科網爆破，之前一窩蜂修讀IT課程的IT人猶有餘糧；今日，IT人力資源竟又喊不夠，香港的人力資源規劃之差可見一斑。

政府是有責任令到今年的6萬名中五、中七離校生修讀各類課程，力取平衡，以便配合香港未來發展。

專業教育培訓顧問 呂康

Editorial

Fairview road row must be settled through law

A row broke out again yesterday over the use of the Fairview Park Boulevard in Yuen Long. The Park management erected bars to ban container trucks from using the Boulevard, prompting truckers to block off part of the road. The row boiled over into angry scenes as scuffles broke out between dozens of residents of Fairview Park and elderly villagers from Tai Sang Wai. Although the incident is private and local in nature, the row, which tended to escalate and become violent, has aroused wide attention in society.

The root cause of the long-running row can be traced back to late 1970s when the developer acquired farmland to build Hong Kong's first large private villa estate with an agreement to allow Tai Sang Wai villagers to use the Fairview Park Boulevard "generation after generation". In the early days, the two sides had got along well enough without any trouble. But later on, when logistics industry began to flourish in Hong Kong and on the Mainland, some villagers leased out their farmland lots as container yards. As a result, the number of heavy container trucks using Fairview Park Boulevard has skyrocketed to several hundred a day, causing problems such as traffic jam, noise, road maintenance and traffic safety. Two years ago, a boy on a bicycle was killed by a truck using the road, further intensifying the row. Several days ago, owners and management company of the Fairview Park began to erect bar on the entrance of the road and heighten security to block the entry of container trucks. Since then quarrels have often been fought out between park residents and villagers and truckers, with the confrontation yesterday turning out to be the most dramatic.

The heating up of the confrontation is regrettable and unnerving. In such a civilised modern society with rule of law, it is ridiculous to have an incident similar to a brutal brawl between residents of two villages over the use of a water well that would only happen more than 100 years ago. Even aged villagers were mobilized to have a face-to-face confrontation with Park residents sitting on stools. And blocking traffic to prevent an ambulance from carrying out its mission is even more intolerable a move in a society with rule of law.

At this stage, therefore, attention must be given to two aspects of the dispute over the right to use the Fairview Park Boulevard in order to seek a solution.

In the first place, it must be clarified that the boulevard is a "private road" under a private ownership deed of contract. So what does it really mean by allowing villagers to use the road "generation after generation" in the original agreement reached by the developer and Tai Sang Wai villagers? Are there restrictions? All this can only and must be settled through dialogue and negotiations between involved parties. If they fail reach any agreement they can file a lawsuit to solve their dispute through law. It is absolutely undesirable, and likely in breach of law, to block each other's passage and stage a face-to-face confrontation.

On the other hand, the issue concerning the role the Transport Department and other relevant government agencies could play in the incident must be addressed pro-actively and carefully. In regard to the incident, some practitioners in

transport industry have asked the government to take over and put under its management the Fairview Park Boulevard. This seemingly plausible proposal in fact is not feasible. For one thing, a private ownership deed must be respected. And (government's) land acquisition involved spending of public funds and public interests, and the government should not "take over" a private road simply because there is a dispute or appeal. Moreover, problems concerned by Fairview Park owners and residents such as noise and road safety will not be solved with a government takeover. On the contrary, if the boulevard goes "public", it will only be used much more frequently.

Therefore, viewing from the government's perspective, what it should consider and solve is how to better plan and manage the overall road traffic in that area. As a matter of fact, to quell the dispute over the use of the Fairview Park Boulevard, the government as early as in 1998 already built the Kam Pok Road to link Castle Peak Road and San Tin Highway. But container truckers decline to use the bypass because the detour cost them more on fuel. Thus they still prefer to continue driving on Fairview Park Boulevard, amid great hues and cries. Seeing the recent escalation of the row over the Fairview Park Boulevard and in consideration of the need in long-term transportation development, the government yesterday revealed it was actively planning to spend some \$100 million to build a new road at Tai Sang Wai, which could be open to public service in 2012 when construction is completed. In addition, the government is also considering offering one-off maintenance work worth HK \$1.5 million on the boulevard, via the district council. These two measures, one long term and one short term, should be able to ease the confrontation over the Fairview Park Boulevard - imminently and fundamentally. They are also in line with the government's role and its responsibility to make good use of public funds.

17 March 2009

Idiom :

A hue and cry - A noise expression of public anger or disapproval. Its plural form is "hues and cries".

Examples :

- 1. There are hues and cries over pay cuts.
2. The development plan starts a hue and cry.
3. They raised a great hue and cry against the new rule.
4. There have been great hues and cries about the government's plan to close the schools.
5. If the government raises taxes too much, there will be a real hue and cry.

通識記憶體

錦綉大道之爭在路權

錦綉花園 (Fairview Park) 由加拿大海外發展有限公司在1976年開始興建，是位於新界元朗牛潭尾的大型私人住宅屋苑，總面積為116萬平方米，共有5024棟最高3層的房屋。每棟房屋有泊車位，前後均有花園。屋苑內有100條街道，總長27公里；有3間學校、60個花園、1間教堂、超級市場、消防局、醫療中心、郵政局、酒樓和櫃員機等。

錦綉花園居民與大生圍村民和附近貨櫃車司機的衝突在於道路使用權問題。事緣錦綉大道是私家路 (private road)，由私人物業擁有，而不是政府所擁有及管理的公路或街道。在保險方面，私家路使用者若發生交通意外，可能不受車輛「第三者保險」保障。

三方的衝突起於2007年1月31日一名男童在錦綉大道踩單車被貨櫃車輾斃。錦綉花園居民怒責運輸署不好使用斥資逾億元建成多年的錦學路，導致這條私家路變成交通幹線。同年2月5日，運輸署開通錦學路，仍容許逾7米長貨櫃車駛入錦綉大道；錦綉居民抗議，物業管理公司職員封閉私家路路面，阻止貨櫃車轉彎。衝突在近日白熱化，經新界鄉議局和多個政府部門斡旋，錦綉花園居民與貨櫃運輸業協議：貨櫃車在上午10時至晚上6時可使用錦綉大道，其他時段改行錦學路，進出大生圍。民政事務總署同時宣布，向區議會申請撥款150萬元維修錦綉大道。運輸署亦承諾，在錦綉大道附近的大生圍興建新路連接新田公路，可望2012年啟用。