

傳媒報導雲南團事件不盡不實

A misreported incident concerning a Yunnan tour

本刊記者 Staff reporter

(編按：二零零三年九月十六日，一個雲南旅行團懷疑在香港被拒接待。雖然事件經議會深入調查後，發現只是一場誤會，但傳媒大量失實的報導，已經嚴重損害了香港旅遊界的聲譽。本刊為此特別撥出篇幅，細述事件始末，以正視聽。)

(Editor's note: On 16 September 2003, a Yunnan tour group was allegedly left unattended in Hong Kong. Although the investigation by the TIC revealed that the incident was merely caused by misunderstanding, the reputation of Hong Kong's tourism industry has already been seriously damaged by extensive and inaccurate media coverage. We have therefore decided to give a detailed account of the incident here to set the record straight.)

事件經過

——百多名雲南旅客參加了昆明風情國際旅行社組辦的
——港澳遊，於九月十五日到港，由萬通旅遊接待。九月十六日晚上八時，萬通致電議會，表示承接該團的中介旅行社深圳特區華僑城中國旅行社仍未繳付當天到期的接待費餘款，合共港幣八萬多元，希望議會協助。議會於是與深圳市旅遊局聯絡，得知華僑城中旅否認接辦過該團。

十六日晚上十時許，當團員遊覽完金紫荊廣場後，不見香港的導遊，又沒有旅遊車來接載，因而以為被接待社丟下不顧。原來內地的領隊因為不耐煩被香港的導遊多番催促付款，因此去了報警，香港的導遊因為他突然失蹤而四出找尋。正當導遊回到廣場時，警察抵達現場。由於警察需要錄取口供，結果延至深夜團員才回到酒店。

香港的導遊當晚再與內地的領隊商議，對方終於承諾，假如華僑城中旅不付款，雲南的組團社會代付。翌日上午，旅行團按行程前往澳門，下午，萬通收到與其接洽的尤鳳蓮所支付的款項。深圳市旅遊局經調查後，揭發尤鳳蓮冒充華僑城中旅的職員與萬通交易，但她現已不知所終。

傳媒失實

綜觀傳媒報導，都說香港的旅行社因收不到接待費而拒絕接待旅行團，又說導遊和旅遊車丟下旅客不顧而去，更有報導指接待社沒有為旅客安排住宿。這些指摘不盡不

The incident

A tour group with about 200 tourists from Yunnan province arrived in Hong Kong on 15 September. The tour was organised by a Yunnan tour operator and the Hong Kong receiving agency was Million Tour. At 8 pm on 16 September, Million Tour called the TIC to ask for help since the balance of the tour's reception fees, of an amount over HK\$80,000, was due on that day but the intermediary Shenzhen agency had not settled it yet. The TIC contacted the Shenzhen Tourism Bureau and was told that the Shenzhen agency concerned denied having taken the tour group.

At around 10 pm, the tour members, after visiting Golden Bauhinia Square, could not find the Hong Kong tourist guide and the tour coaches, and therefore thought they were abandoned. It was later discovered that the Hong Kong guide was looking around for the Yunnan tour escort, who was apparently annoyed by the guide's repeated requests for the reception fees and went to call the police. Just when the guide came back to the square, the police arrived. Having to make a statement to the police, the tour group returned to the hotel late at night.

That night, the Hong Kong guide finally extracted a promise from the Yunnan escort that the tour operator would pay the money if the Shenzhen agency refused to do so. The tour group travelled to Macau the next morning as scheduled and Million Tour received the money in the afternoon from a Ms You Fenglian, whom the Hong Kong agency had been dealing with all along. The Shenzhen authorities later found out that Ms You had posed as staff of the Shenzhen agency and she is at large now.

Inaccurate coverage

Million Tour refused to take care of the tour group because it was not paid the reception fees; the Hong Kong guide

實，實有澄清的必要。

首先，旅遊車不能停在金紫荊廣場，要待導遊召喚才可駛進廣場接載旅客。團員不見香港的導遊是因為他正在尋找內地的領隊，卻不知領隊原來已去了報警。當警察來到時，香港的導遊已準備接送旅客返回酒店，他只是因為尋找內地的領隊才耽誤了時間而已。

此外，旅行團九月十五日抵港當晚已經入住悅來酒店，接待社更有訂房的單據為憑。試問接待社假如沒有訂房，悅來酒店又怎可能在十六日深夜同時安排房間給二百多名沒有訂房的旅客？傳媒未經查證就說接待社沒有預訂酒店，未免捕風捉影。

這場風波的起因，可以說是香港的導遊和內地的領隊因接待費而互生嫌隙，最後內地的領隊貿然報警更令事情鬧大。香港接待社被中介的旅行社拖欠團費，向組團社直接追討也無可厚非，傳媒未有弄清事實就指責香港接待社放團，實在有失公允。

善後措施

為免類似事件重演，議會理事會九月十九日召開緊急會議，並通過即時生效的新指引，以保障入境旅客和會員旅行社(指引見「議會簡報」，頁十三)。同日下午，議會代表與深圳市旅遊局代表會面，雙方同意，假如深圳的合法旅行社拖欠議會會員的接待費，議會將代為墊支，再由深圳市旅遊局向有關旅行社追討。

萬通的個案其後交由議會規條委員會審理，委員會認為萬通並沒有違反議會的作業守則。議會已把委員會的裁決通知國家旅遊局，同時提醒萬通注意新指引，日後處理與內地旅行社的糾紛時，必須顧及旅客的感受。

這次事件雖然已經解決，但也揭露了內地出境業的不少陋習，像旅行社經常拖欠接待費，不少業者不尊重合約，不時有假冒旅行社等問題。當局若不大力整頓，最終受害的只會是旅客，守法的旅行社，以至整個行業。✎

and the tour coaches left the tourists unattended; the Hong Kong agency had not booked hotel rooms. So reported the media. Such kinds of rough handling of facts by the media not only leave much to be desired, but also necessitate clarification.

First, parking is forbidden at Golden Bauhinia Square and tour coaches enter the square to pick up tourists only when their drivers are told to do so by the tourist guide. In this incident, the Hong Kong guide was not around because he was searching for the "missing" Yunnan tour escort. The guide was in fact about to send the tourists back to the hotel when the police arrived.

Second, the tour group already stayed at the Panda Hotel when it arrived in Hong Kong on 15 September and there was written confirmation of the bookings. Had the Hong Kong agency not booked the rooms, how could the hotel accommodate over 200 walk-in customers late at night on 16 September? When did factual accuracy begin to be deemed unimportant in media reportage?

The incident, put simply, was caused by mutual resentment between the Hong Kong guide and the Yunnan escort over the reception fees. The escort pointlessly reporting the dispute to the police helped inflame the imagination of the media. What was wrong with the Hong Kong agency turning to the mainland tour operator for the reception fees which the intermediary agency refused to pay?

Follow-up actions

To ensure no similar incident would happen again, the TIC Board issued a directive to protect both inbound visitors and member agencies (see "Council Bulletin" for the directive on page 13). And the TIC and the Shenzhen Tourism Bureau reached an agreement that if any Shenzhen's licensed travel agency did not pay TIC members the reception fee, the TIC would pay its members first and the Bureau would recoup the money from the Shenzhen agency afterwards.

The case of Million Tour was later heard by the TIC Compliance Committee, which ruled that the company had not violated any rules. The China National Tourism Administration was informed of the ruling and Million Tour was advised to be considerate towards tourists while handling trade disputes in future.

Although the incident is now over, it has exposed many deficiencies in the mainland's outbound industry such as delays in payment of reception fees, a lack of respect for contracts and a large number of bogus travel agencies. If these problems were not rectified, the victims would not only be travellers and those law-abiding travel agencies, but the whole industry as well. ✎