



# 340 億「派糖」物有所值

中英社評

昨日是農曆正月初七，俗稱「人日」，財政司司長曾俊華選擇在昨天公布新一份財政預算案，上年度庫房收入盈餘高達六百三十多億，令到政府有能力推出總數高達三百四十多億的「派糖」紓困措施，人人「生日」，皆大歡喜。

從各項紓困措施而言，可說各階層「雨露均沾」，其中又以中產受惠程度最為顯著，一改過去多年紓困措施向基層傾斜的慣例。這一改變，相信與兩點因素有關，一是中產長期已有「交稅多、福利少」的怨言，二是過去一年的政治事件及眼前的政改宏圖，均突顯了中產階層中流砥柱、穩定大局的作用，政府在施政上要多傾聽中產聲音、多照顧中產的需要，已是不言而喻。

從政府理財角度而言，「派糖」成了每年預算案的「指定動作」，不「派」市民就「不收貨」，到底是一件好事還是壞事，以及其間的依據和理念何在，也有進一步予以廓清的必要。對此，曾俊華在新一份預算案中提出：政府考慮到市民面對充滿挑戰的國際宏觀環境和不穩定的經濟因素，以及提振本地短期經濟的需要，加上政府在短中期內較為穩健的財政狀況，因而在「應使則使」的原則下，推出一系列一次性的紓緩措施。

從近年「派糖」受歡迎和受關注的程度看來，也說明相關措施並非無的放矢、「亂派一通」，而是確有其實際需要，不少市民和家庭在收到「糖」後確實可以有較寬裕的條件去做一些平日想做而不能做的事，如為子女改善家中學習設施、進行更多的家庭親子共融活動等，在消費、經濟之外更可達到促進家



▲曾俊華（左二）於正月初七日公布新一份財政預算案，多項「派糖」紓困措施，真正人人「生日」，皆大歡喜 資料圖片

庭和睦與社會和諧的目的。看來這顆「糖」是派得物有所值的。

但另一方面，年年「派糖」可能有一個副作用以至反效果，就是容易以為政府每年用於民生百姓身上的開支就是這些「糖」，派多了就高興、派少了就罵街，傳媒也把報道焦點全集中到「派糖」上，反而把基本的公共開支和社會建設給淡化、淡忘了。

事實是，就以下一個財政年度而言，政府用於各項基本公共建設的經常性開支就高達四千四百多億元，其中「三大柱」：教育七百九十三億、醫療衛生七百零六億、社會福利六百七十七億，還有基建七百六十一億、社區及對外事務六百四十七億、保安四百一十六億等，不但數字非常龐大，幅度也是有增無已的，與上一財政年度比較，下年度經常性開支又要增加百分之六。而未來隨着人口不斷老化，醫療、福利方面的開支更會以驚人的幅度增長。這是在

希望年年有「糖」派、愈派愈「大粒」的同時不能不注意到的。

更重要的是，不論是一次性的「派糖」還是恆常性的經常開支，都需要以經濟保持穩定發展和有所增長作為大前提及支撐，否則，曾俊華難道真是手捧金元寶從天而降的「財神」？但就在這新一份財政預算案中，曾俊華在「引言」和「結語」部分都表達了對過去一年以及眼前港人社會政治爭拗頻繁、非法佔領損害經濟民生以及立法會「拉布」不斷的憂慮，擔心長此下去，已有的制度和共同價值觀不斷受到衝擊，光陰虛耗，香港經濟發展將會陷入泥沼而無法向前。看來，「財爺」在預算案中除了「經濟糖」外，還向市民送上了要保持理性和諧、包容務實的「人心糖」，希望市民也能「分甘同味」，感受其中的美意。

2015-02-26

## It's worth it to give away \$34 billion-worth "sweets"

Yesterday was the 7th day of the first month on the Lunar Calendar, known as the Human Day. Financial Secretary John Tsang Chun-wah **picked out** that day to unveil a new draft Budget. Last financial year's fiscal surplus has reached more than \$63 billion, which makes it possible for the government to "give away sweets", i.e. launch relief measures worth over \$34 billion. Everyone felt happy on that universal "birthday".

The relief measures could be said to benefit all sectors, but the middle class may benefit the most. This has changed the adopted practice in past years that relief measures **were inclined to help the grass-roots**. It is believed that such a change is made because of two factors. One is that the middle class has long been complaining that they have paid more taxes but enjoyed less welfare. The second is that last year's political incident and the current pursuit of the political reform both highlight the role of the middle class as the **mainstay** in stabilizing the overall situation. So it becomes self-evident that the government has to listen more closely to the voice of the middle class, and to better take care of their needs.

In view of the government's financial management, "giving away sweets" seems to have become a "must" in every year's budget. And people won't accept it if there is no "sweets" offered. Is this on earth a good thing or a bad thing? And on what a ground or ideal is this based? This needs to be further clarified. On this, John Tsang mentions in this latest Budget: In view of the challenging international macroeconomic environment, the unstable economic factors, the need to boost the local economy in the short term, and the government's relatively sound fiscal position in the short to medium term, a series of one-off relief measures are launched according to the principle of committing resources as and when justified and needed.

The move to "give away sweets" in recent years has been popularly welcomed and attracted wide attention. This shows it is not a pointless move to arbitrarily "give away sweets", but to meet real needs. Many citizens and families indeed could have some extra money, after receiving the "sweets", to do some things they wanted to do but were unable to do, such as improving conditions for their children to study at home or participating in more parent-child activities. As such, this could help promote family harmony and social harmony in addition to boosting consumption and the economy. Hence it's certainly **worth it** to give away such "sweets".

On the other hand, however, "giving away sweets" each year may have some side effect or even an adverse effect. That is, people may easily get the impression that all these "sweets" are what the government spends on people's livelihood, so that they feel happy if more "sweets" are given, and complain if less given. The media also focus on "giving away sweets" in all their reports, overlooking or ignoring the basic public expenditure and spending on social construction.

As a matter of fact, in the draft 2015/16 Budget, the government's recurrent expenditure on public construction reaches \$440 billion, of which recurrent expenditure in the three major livelihood-related policy areas are: \$79.3 billion for education, \$70.6 billion for health, and \$67.7 billion for social welfare. And \$76.1 billion will be spent for infrastructure, \$64.7 billion for community and external affairs, and \$41.6 billion for security. Not only are these figures very huge, but they also steadily increase. Compared with the last financial year, recurrent expenditure for the coming fiscal year will increase by 6 per cent. With the population aging, expenditure for health and social welfare is expected to grow more rapidly in future. We must give attention

to this when we hope there are "sweets" to be given every year and the sweets" would become bigger and bigger".

More importantly, either for one-off "sweets" or for regular recurrent expenditure, a precondition is to keep the economy grow stably. Otherwise, could it really be it that John Tsang were the "God of Fortune" coming down from Heaven? In both the Introduction and Concluding Remarks of his new draft Budget, John Tsang expresses his worries about frequent political antagonism in Hong Kong society in the past year and are present, about the damages on the economy and people's livelihood caused by the illegal Occupy movement, and about the non-stop filibustering activity at the Legislative Council (Legco). He is concerned that if things go on like this, with the established system and common values being charged again and again and time wasted, Hong Kong's economic will be **bogged down**. As such, besides giving away "economic sweets", our "God of Fortune" has also given us the "human-heart sweets" for maintaining rational, harmonious, tolerant and practical, in hopes that people could share the "tastes" and appreciate his good intention.

26 February 2015

### WORDS AND USAGE

**Pick out** (phrasal verb) – To choose; to select. (挑選，選擇)

*Examples: 1.I picked one of the new presents out for Santa Claus this year. 2.I have been picked out to represent the whole team.*

**Be inclined to do sth, be inclined to/towards sth** (phrasal verb) – Be favourably disposed towards or willing to do something. (傾向於，側重)

*Examples: 1.I would not, if I were you, be inclined to discuss private business with the landlady. 2.He was inclined to a belief in original sin.*

**Mainstay** (phrase) – The most important part of something, providing support for everything else. (支柱，中流砥柱，中堅)

*Examples: 1.Fish is a mainstay of their diet. 2. After the father's death the son became the mainstay of the family*

(It's well) **worth it** (idiom) – It is rewarding despite the difficulties involved; it is useful or important. (值得)

*Examples: 1.If you want to have a good time traveling, it's well worth it to spend time reading guidebooks before you go. 2.It was a long climb up the hill, but the view from the top was worth it.*

**Bog down** (phrasal verb) – To become stuck; to be unable to progress. (陷入困境，停頓)

*Examples: 1.Their research bogged down because they lacked the laboratory expertise. 2.The attack would bog down sooner or later.*



國情新知

## 一般人不知道的中國製造

一隻日本馬桶蓋在日本被中國遊客買斷引來熱議，帶出部分國人不無扭曲的消費心態，也帶出一個更嚴肅的課題——中國製造業實力如何？壞事變好事，正好趁機會盤點「中國製造」之路究竟已走了多遠。

介紹近期重要的兩份資料，其一是杜建國的《不懂馬桶圈，只知福島要靠中國泵車——兼論日德製造業「神話」與「中國製造」前景》，文章長七千字，資料充足，論證扎實，是上佳的教學基礎素材。其二是韓國電視台拍攝的七集紀錄片《Super China》。

片名有Super一字，卻絕非單向歌頌中國。韓國拍攝者有系統地考量中國和平崛起的威力，及對世界的助力。此片共七集，YouTube热播，七集中六集都有中文字幕版，惟第六集「中國共產黨」於撰文時卻仍沒有「全」中文字幕，只得「上」沒有「下」。筆者看了沒中文字幕的第六集（凡受訪者有英文翻譯，中國受訪者的普通話對我們不是障礙），該集客觀陳述了中國共產黨在管治上的有效性；總體調子是肯定中國共產黨的領導——是否因而至今仍沒有足本中文字幕呢？七集紀錄片值得談的地方很多，現只談其中一點。

一直以來只知道中央電視台（CCTV）有不同的外語頻道，向外國用中國觀點報道中國事物。看完《Super China》才知道，原來CCTV的成績遠不止此，近年已在世界五大洲落地。這些落地電視台聘用當地人做主播及記者，讓他們報道當地事，及用當地人角度做世界新聞；即是由他們自主做新聞，不是轉播中國中央電視台的中國新聞。以成立於2012年、現為當地最先進的非洲肯尼亞CCTV電視台為例，受訪非洲製作人說從前只有BBC、CNN落地非洲，於是在歐美角度下，非洲只得貧窮、疾病與飢餓。自從肯尼亞CCTV成立後，便有了《非洲面孔》之類用非洲人觀點看非洲生活的節目。韓國《Super China》的發現獨特，點出中國幫助資源匱乏的貧窮國家發出自己的聲音。這樣做跟中國觀點的傳播無關，卻令世界向真正多元化發展。像這些貢獻，香港的中國新聞版從未介紹。

回頭說杜建國不容錯過的長文。他在文中指出，當前部分中國傳媒及知識分子「觀念與現實脫節」，嚴重低估中國製造業的成績與實力。杜建國指出，過去說日本製造遠超中國是無需舉證的，不證自明。可是當前從船舶到機車，從光伏、風電到水電、火電、核電機組，從重型機器如挖掘機、起重機、水泥泵車，到港口設備、煤炭開採設備等等，中國製造都做出國際聲譽。不太為一般人知悉，既因宣傳不足，也因上述成績都不是家用電器。被搶購的日本馬桶蓋，已查知是中國杭州製造。至於日本已明顯落後於中國的領域，包括高鐵、軌道交通裝備、通信設備、智能手機、電網、水電火電、四代核電、工程建設、飛機、高性能電腦、北斗定位系統等等。像上述這些訊息，一般人不知道不為過，但某些中國知識精英也不肯面對便是觀念與現實脫節。行文收結前多介紹一人，就是杜建國文中介紹的德國人弗蘭克·澤林（Frank Sieren），他的著作《中國衝擊：看中國如何改變世界》、《慌恐與偏見：西方世界對一個崛起大國的複雜情感》，值得大家留意。 余 非



英語節拍

## 姓名的簡稱之二

農曆羊年前，本欄討論了不同英文的名字。本星期我們會討論M字開首的英文名稱。

不少外國人都信奉天主教（Catholicism）或基督教（Christianity），因此，不少男士取Matthew或Mathew為名，以紀念耶穌的十二門徒（disciple）之一馬太。除了Mathew外，不少天主教或基督教國家的人常見Teresa（杜麗莎）、Paul（保羅）、Francis（方濟）、John（約翰）、Joseph（約瑟）等宗教人物的名字。

在外國，不少男子的名稱是Michael。與很多名字不同，Michael可演變為另一個女性名字（Michaela）。除了Michael及Michaela外，Eric則是Eric女性化的名字。另外，Patrick & Patricia, Samuel & Samantha, Christopher & Christine/ Christina也是常見的例子。

上一期我們指出部分名字音節多，十分長。為了讓朋友更容易唸、容易記住或更親切地稱呼他，不少名字都有簡稱。在M字開首的英文名字，有不少有簡稱。以英國前首相戴卓爾夫人（Margaret Thatcher）為例，Margaret的簡稱是Marge。那讀音與March（三月）相同。

另外，很多朋友都稱呼Magdalene為Mag。值得一提，Mag也是Maggie及Maggy的簡稱。剛介紹的Michael的簡稱則是Mike。Mike也可以單獨成為一個名字。

在英語世界，名字是一門學問。除了宗教外，外國人也根據不同文化習俗，為子女取名。下星期，我們再討論另一些名字。

文章內容節錄自香港電台"Teen Power"英語節目《型英營》（TE-EN-GERS）。節目逢星期六下午6時至6時15分於香港電台"Teen Power"播出。

撰文：李慧慈（Ada）香港專業進修學校（港專）傳訊與拓展副總監、李慧文（Shida）香港專業進修學校（港專）語言傳意學部主任Ada & Shida同時身兼香港電台"Teen Power"《型英營》（TE-EN-GERS）節目主持



公共衛生

## 團體促加煙草稅 盼實現無煙香港

香港每年有近7,000人因吸煙及二手煙而死亡，經濟損失逾53億港元。香港吸煙與健康委員會遂聯同多個醫護團體、控煙組織及學者致函財政司司長要求增加煙草稅100%，防止青少年開始吸煙。但上周公布的2015至16年財政預算案，並無增加煙草稅，委員會對此表示失望。

委員會主席鄭祖盛表示，「香港過往大部分時間凍結煙草稅，未能充分發揮以價格減低煙草需求的作用。2009年及2011年稍為大幅調高煙草稅後，成效立竿見影；而2014年煙草稅提高僅11.8%，雖未能追上物價升幅，但仍見一定效力。」現時高煙稅的國家亦以增加煙草稅為減少吸煙和保障市民健康的方法，如澳洲規定2013年至2016年連續每年增加煙草稅12.5%，新西蘭亦於2014至2016年期間每年增加煙草稅10%。他認為，香港如要進一步降低吸煙率，必須採取有力和長遠的煙草稅政策，同時實施多管齊下的控煙策略，如提升戒煙服務和禁止所有形式的煙草廣告和宣傳包括陳列煙包等。委員會堅持要加煙草稅，盡快使香港吸煙率持續下降至個位數字。