

HONG KONG INSTITUTE OF ASIA-PACIFIC STUDIES

香港中文大學

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

香港亞太研究所

SHATIN · NT · HONG KONG

TEL: (852) 3943 6740

FAX 圖文傳真: (852) 2603 5215 E-MAIL電子郵件: hkiaps@cuhk.edu.hk

香港 新界 沙田·電話:(八五二) 三九四三 六七四零

中大香港亞太研究所民調: 五成半市民贊成通過垃圾徵費法例

為盡量減少都市固體廢物,政府最近正式推出垃圾徵費計劃,並於十一月中 向立法會提交相關條例草案進行首讀和二讀。香港中文大學(中大)香港亞太研 究所就此進行了一次民意調查,結果發現,約五成半市民贊成立法會通過該條法 例。不過,近七成人估計,若法例通過將會有頗多或非常多的違法棄置垃圾情况 出現。然而,亦有六成市民表示,為了令香港更環保,垃圾徵費仍是值得推行的。

是次調查於 2018 年 11 月 19 至 22 日晚上以電話訪問形式進行,共成功訪問了 713 名 18 歲或以上的香港市民。調查結果顯示,85.0%的受訪者表示知道政府計劃推行垃圾徵費,不知道的只有 15.0%(見附表一)。86.4%的受訪者贊成要盡量減少都市固體廢物,以減輕堆填區負擔,只有 5.9%不贊成(見附表二)。對於政府最近正式向立法會提交有關垃圾徵費的條例草案,規定市民日後要購買指定垃圾袋棄置家居垃圾,否則會被罰款,56.0%的受訪市民表示贊成立法會通過有關法例,不贊成的則佔 33.5%(見附表三)。

雖然有八成多受訪者贊成要減少都市固體廢物,過半數贊成通過垃圾徵費法案,但不少受訪市民認為在實際執行上仍有困難。68.2%的受訪者估計,若法例通過,偷偷地將垃圾棄置於後樓梯或者橫街後巷的人將會頗多或非常多,認為這種情況會頗少或非常少的只佔 19.1%(見附表四)。政府估計,在這個垃圾收費制度下,一個三人家庭每月大約會多支出 33 至 51 元,45.3%的受訪者認為,這個收費水平對減少香港垃圾數量有幫助,可是,也有 39.7%認為沒有幫助(見附表五)。對於計劃能否順利推行,46.2%的受訪者表示信心頗大或非常大,36.8%

的受訪者的信心則頗小或非常小,可見不少人仍對計劃存有疑慮(見附表六)。 雖然如此,當受訪者被問到是否同意垃圾徵費長遠可令香港更環保,故此是值得 推行時,60.5%表示同意或非常同意,不同意或非常不同意的只有 31.0%(見附 表七)。

在收費方面,政府將每公升訂為 0.11 元,即一個 10 公升垃圾膠袋售 1.1 元, 48.7%的受訪者表示這個收費水平合適,35.2%認為過高,只有 1.4%感到過低。 至於無法裝入指定垃圾袋的大型垃圾,法例規定棄置前要貼上指定標籤,每件標 籤收費 11 元,45.2%的受訪者認為這個收費水平過高,38.8%感到合適,只有 4.3% 表示過低。在罰款方面,48.1%的受訪者認為 1,500 元這個罰款額合適,37.7%感 到過高,6.0%表示過低(見附表八)。

是次調查的成功回應率為 38.9%,以 713 個成功樣本數推算,百分比變項的抽樣誤差約在正或負 3.67 個百分點以內(可信度設於 95%)。

中大香港亞太研究所電話調查研究室

二零一八年十二月三日

傳媒查詢:中大香港亞太研究所助理所長鄭宏泰博士(電話39431341)

附表一:是否知道政府計劃推行垃圾徵費(百分比)

	百分比
知道	85.0
不知道	15.0
(樣本數)	(713)

題目:「你知唔知道政府計劃推行垃圾徵費呢?」

附表二:是否贊成要盡量減少都市固體廢物,以減輕堆填區負擔(百分比)

	百分比
贊成	86.4
不贊成	5.9
不知道/很難說	7.7
(樣本數)	(713)

題目:「你贊唔贊成香港要盡量減少都市固體廢物,以減輕垃圾堆填區嘅負擔呢?」

附表三:是否贊成立法會通過垃圾徵費法案(百分比)

	百分比
贊成	56.0
不贊成	33.5
不知道/很難說	10.5
(樣本數)	(713)

題目:「政府最近正式向立法會提交都市固體廢物收費法案,規定市民日後要購買指定垃圾袋棄置家居垃圾,否則會被罰款1,500元。你贊唔贊成立法會通過呢個法案呢?」

附表四:估計多不多人違法棄置垃圾(百分比)

	百分比
非常多	22.2
頗多	46.0
頗少	14.2
非常少	4.9
不知道/很難說	12.8
(樣本數)	(713)

題目:「如果垃圾徵費法例能夠通過,你估計多唔多人會偷偷地將垃圾棄置喺後樓梯,或者 橫街後巷等地方呢?係非常多、幾多、幾少,定係非常少?」

附表五:該垃圾收費水平對減少香港垃圾數量有無幫助(百分比)

	百分比
有幫助	45.3
無幫助	39.7
不知道/很難說	15.0
(樣本數)	(713)

題目:「政府估計, 喺呢個垃圾徵費制度之下, 一個三人家庭每月大約會多支出 33 至 51 元。 你認為呢個收費水平對減少香港嘅垃圾數量有無幫助呢?」

附表六:有多大信心計劃能夠順利推行(百分比)

	百分比
非常大	6.3
頗大	39.9
頗小	24.1
非常小	12.7
不知道/很難說	17.0
(樣本數)	(710)

題目:「若果香港真係實行垃圾徵費,你有幾大信心佢能夠順利推行呢?係非常大、幾大、 幾細,定係非常細?」

附表七:有多同意垃圾徵費制度值得推行(百分比)

	百分比
非常同意	15.4
同意	45.1
不同意	23.4
非常不同意	7.6
不知道/很難說	8.5
(樣本數)	(709)

題目:「有人話,垃圾徵費制度長遠嚟講可以令香港更環保,所以係值得推行嘅。你有幾同意呢種講法呢?係非常同意、同意、不同意,定係非常不同意呢?」

附表八:對收費及罰款的看法(百分比)

	過高	合適	過低	不知道/	(樣本數)
				很難說	
垃圾袋收費定為每公升 0.11 元	35.2	48.7	1.4	14.7	(713)
大型垃圾標指定籤劃一收費 11 元	45.2	38.8	4.3	11.6	(713)
違反法例被罰款 1,500 元	37.7	48.1	6.0	8.1	(713)

題目:「政府將垃圾袋嘅收費定為每公升一毫一仙(0.11 元),即係一個 10 公升垃圾袋賣個一(1.1 元),15 公升垃圾袋賣個七(1.7 元)。你認為呢個收費水平係過高、過低,定係合適呢?」

題目:「無法裝入指定垃圾袋嘅大型垃圾,法例規定棄置前要貼上指定標籤,每件標籤劃一收費11元。你認為呢個收費水平係過高、過低,定係合適呢?」

題目:「違反垃圾徵費法例嘅人會被罰款 1,500 元。你認為呢個罰款額係過高、過低,定係合適呢?」

Survey findings by Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies at CUHK on Public Attitudes towards Municipal Solid Waste Charging

In order to minimise the amount of municipal solid waste, the Government has recently proposed a waste-charging scheme. It has submitted a related draft bill to the Legislative Council in mid-November for first and second readings. To gauge public opinions on the waste-charging scheme, a telephone survey was conducted from 19 to 22 November 2018 by the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK). 713 respondents aged 18 or above were successfully interviewed, with a response rate of 38.9%. The sampling error is estimated at plus or minus 3.67 percentage points at the 95% confidence level.

Major findings are summarised as follows:

The survey results showed that 85.0% of the respondents knew that the Government is going to launch the waste-charging scheme. Only 15.0% did not know. 86.4% of the respondents agreed to reduce municipal solid waste in order to ease the burden on landfills, while only 5.9% disagreed.

The Government recently tabled a waste-charging bill at the Legislative Council to require the citizens to buy designated garbage bags for rubbish; otherwise, they would be fined. While 56.0% of the respondents agreed that the Legislative Council should pass the bill, 33.5% disagreed.

Although more than 80% of the respondents agreed to reduce municipal solid waste and more than half of them supported the waste-charging bill, many doubted whether the scheme could be implemented properly. As many as 68.2% of the respondents believed that many or quite a lot of people would dump their rubbish sneakily on rear staircases, side streets or back lanes if the bill was passed. Only 19.1% thought that a few or very few people would do so.

The Government estimated that a family of three would have to pay HK\$33 to HK\$51 more per month under the charging scheme. While 45.3% of the respondents thought that such level of charging could help reducing the amount of waste in Hong Kong, 39.7% thought the opposite. Although 46.2% of them had great confidence or very great confidence that the scheme could be implemented smoothly, 36.8% only had little or very little confidence in it. In spite of the survey results, when the respondents were asked if waste charging could make Hong Kong more green in the long run and

therefore it was worth to launching, 60.5% replied that they agreed or strongly agreed. Only 31.0% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

With regard to the level of charging, the Government proposed that garbage bags would cost HK\$0.11 per litre on average; that is, a 10-litre bag would cost HK\$1.1. Although 48.7% of the respondents regarded the fee as appropriate, 35.2% thought that it was too high and only 1.4% thought it was too low. The proposed bill requires that oversized waste that cannot be put in the designated bags had to have labels, which cost HK\$11, before disposal. While 45.2% of the respondents thought that the cost of the labels was too high, 38.8% believed that it was appropriate. Only 4.3% regarded it as too low. Concerning the fine of HK\$1,500, 48.1% of the respondents regarded it as appropriate, 37.7% thought that it was too high but 6.0% believed that it was too low.

Media Contacts: Dr. ZHENG Wan-tai Victor, Assistant Director (Tel: 3943 1341)