

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)430/03-04 [Revised version]
(These minutes have been seen by the
Administration)

Ref: CB1/PL/CI/1

Panel on Commerce and Industry

Minutes of meeting
held on Thursday, 13 October 2003 at 4:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

Members present : Hon Kenneth TING Woo-shou, JP (Chairman)
Hon HUI Cheung-ching, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon NG Leung-sing, JP
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon SIN Chung-kai
Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS, JP
Hon MA Fung-kwok, JP

Members absent : Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, JP
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong

Public officers attending : **For Item I**

Miss Denise YUE, JP
Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry and
Technology (Commerce and Industry)

Mr Clement LEUNG
Deputy Director-General of Trade and Industry

Mr Andrew WONG
Head of Trade Controls,
Customs and Excise Department

Clerk in attendance : Miss Polly YEUNG
Chief Assistant Secretary (1)3

Staff in attendance : Mr TSANG Siu-cheung
Senior Assistant Secretary (1)7

Ms Sharon CHAN
Legislative Assistant 6

Action

I The Mainland and Hong Kong Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement (CEPA)

(LC Paper No. CB(1)2524/02-03(01) -- Information paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)2101/02-03(01) -- Information paper provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)2101/02-03(02) -- Presentation materials provided by the Administration

LC Paper No. CB(1)40/03-04 -- Leaflet provided by the Administration on the six Annexes to and implementation details of CEPA

LC Paper No. CB(1)2219/02-03 -- Leaflet provided by the Administration summarizing the major aspects and benefits of CEPA

LC Paper No. CB(1)2396/02-03 -- Minutes of special meeting held on 30 June 2003)

The Chairman commended the Administration for reaching an agreement with the Mainland on the six Annexes to the main text of CEPA and said that the implementation details of CEPA contained in the Annexes would be conducive to the further economic development of Hong Kong and the Mainland.

Collecting views on CEPA from the industries

2. Mr SIN Chung-kai opined that CEPA marked the continuous development of the economic and trade links between Hong Kong and the Mainland. Given that different sectors and industries might have different needs regarding the specific details and implementation arrangements of CEPA, he was concerned whether any measures were in place to canvass industries' views. The

Chairman enquired about the appropriate policy bureau to which individual trade organizations could express their views on the contents of CEPA.

3. The Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry and Technology (Commerce and Industry) (PSCIT) advised that the implementation details of CEPA would ultimately be coordinated by the Commerce, Industry and Technology Bureau (CITB). However, individual trade organizations could reflect their views to the relevant policy bureaux while CITB would assume a coordinating role. She further explained that although Hong Kong and the Mainland had agreed on the contents and implementation details of CEPA, the Administration still relied on different relevant policy bureaux to maintain close contact with the respective trade associations and organizations and to receive their views for the purpose of securing more opportunities to access the Mainland market. Moreover, at present, individual organizations also wrote to or requested to meet with the Administration to express their views on CEPA. The Administration was collecting the relevant views which would then be conveyed to the Mainland for discussion in due course.

Monitoring the implementation progress of CEPA

4. Mr SIN Chung-kai was concerned whether Hong Kong and the Mainland would consider formulating specific measures or a mechanism to monitor the implementation progress of CEPA. PSCIT responded that where necessary, the Joint Steering Committee headed by the Financial Secretary and the Vice Minister of Commerce of the People's Republic of China would meet to review the implementation of CEPA and study relevant proposals put forward by different sectors. As CEPA was a bilateral agreement, the Administration would convey the views of local industries to the Mainland as far as possible to facilitate progressive expansion of the scope of CEPA.

Interpretation of the origin rules

5. Mr MA Fung-kwok was concerned about the agreement and understanding reached by Hong Kong and the Mainland on CEPA. In the event of any breach of rules or disputes with the Mainland over the interpretation of the origin rules, Mr MA was concerned how these matters would be handled. Furthermore, he was also concerned about the channels, if any, for local manufacturers to seek redress if their applications for the relevant certificates of origin were rejected.

6. The Deputy Director-General of Trade and Industry (DDGTI) advised that at present, well-established procedures on the application for certificate of origin for goods were in place. He stressed that when applying for a certificate of origin, local manufacturers were required to provide sufficient and accurate information on the products they produced. The penalty for breaches had been clearly stipulated in existing legislation. He pointed out that under CEPA, Hong Kong and the Mainland agreed to deal with breaches and non-compliance according to their respective legal systems. As regards disputes arising from the

interpretation of the origin rules, disputes which involved matters of principle might be referred to the Joint Steering Committee set up under CEPA for consideration. If necessary, the Joint Steering Committee might set up an expert group to examine in detail the points of contention with a view to finding a solution. For individual local manufacturers whose application for certificate of origin was rejected, DDGTI said that a review mechanism was already in place. The Chairman advised that the certificate of origin issued by the approved certification organizations in Hong Kong had acquired international recognition. Most local manufacturers were familiar with the current application procedures and the relevant appeal mechanism.

7. Mr MA Fung-kwok opined that as CEPA had just been agreed on by Hong Kong and the Mainland, disputes on the interpretation of the origin rules would inevitably arise. He was concerned that the relevant authorities in both places might take quite some time to resolve the issues concerned. DDGTI said that both Hong Kong and the Mainland adopted a pragmatic approach in dealing with the interpretation of the origin rules to avoid causing consignors and manufacturers unnecessary delay in customs clearance. As stipulated under CEPA, if there was any doubt about the origin of a certain shipment of goods, the customs administration at the port of clearance could act in accordance with the stipulated import procedures and release the goods first. However, a deposit of an amount equivalent to the tariff charged at the applicable non-CEPA import tariff rate would be collected for the goods. The customs administration at the port of clearance should verify and confirm the status of the certificate of origin of the goods within 90 days following the release of the goods. Subject to the outcome of the verification, the deposit would either be returned to the importers or converted to non-CEPA import tariff chargeable on the goods concerned. DDGTI added that as far as he understood, Hong Kong and the Mainland agreed in principle to deal with suspected cases concerning certificates of origin promptly and to resolve the issue before the expiry of the 90-day period.

8. Mr Henry WU appreciated the efforts made by the Administration in connection with CEPA. He concurred with Mr MA Fung-kwok that Hong Kong and the Mainland might have different interpretations on the origin rules. As such, he hoped that the Administration would further communicate with the Mainland to resolve the issue. DDGTI anticipated that for the technical issues concerning certificates of origin, the vast majority of them could be resolved through discussions at working level and might not be escalated to the level of the Joint Steering Committee.

Origin criteria and enforcement issues

9. Mr HUI Cheung-ching expressed concern about the origin criteria for knitted products, watches and clocks under CEPA. DDGTI advised that basically, the origin of knitted products could be determined by two processes, i.e. the principal process of the knitting of yarn into knit-to-shape panel and the process of linking or stitching. If either of the processes was done in Hong Kong, the products would be of Hong Kong origin. He said that under CEPA,

the Mainland had agreed that as long as one of the two aforesaid processes was carried out in Hong Kong, the knitted products would be regarded as manufactured in Hong Kong and be eligible for zero tariff under CEPA.

10. On watches and clocks, DDGTI explained that the existing origin criteria based on watch movements would make it impossible for the local watch and clock industry to benefit from zero tariff as watch movements were seldom manufactured in Hong Kong. In view of this, the Administration had successfully reached an agreement with the Mainland on another arrangement. The origin of watches and clocks would be determined by whether the assembly, testing and adjustment processes were carried out in Hong Kong and whether the product could fulfil the value-added content requirement. This would allow more watch and clock manufacturers to benefit from zero tariff. Members noted that “value-added content” referred to the total value of raw materials, component parts, labour costs and product development costs exclusively incurred in one side being greater than or equal to 30% of the Free On Board value of the exporting goods. However, DDGTI added that it was necessary for the Administration to introduce certain technical amendments to the existing Trade Descriptions Ordinance (Cap. 362) in order to implement the above proposals. As individual businesses might export their products to different markets and the manufacturing processes concerned also varied, manufacturers were required to declare the processes involved in the manufacture of their products when applying to the approved certification organizations for certificates of origin. He stressed that under CEPA, the Administration would adopt a flexible approach as far as practicable in respect of the origin criteria for products of different industries so that more local enterprises could benefit from zero tariff.

11. In response to Mr HUI Cheung-ching’s concern about how the Customs and Excise Department (C&ED) could, in the process of enforcement, distinguish similar products which were manufactured by the same local manufacturer but were to be exported to different markets, PSCIT advised that depending on circumstances, C&ED would require the manufacturers to provide information and documentation on the raw materials and manufacturing processes to ascertain the place of origin. As Hong Kong and the Mainland had formulated the origin criteria in full consultation with the industry, she anticipated that C&ED would not encounter great difficulties when zero tariff came into effect on 1 January 2004.

12. On the Chairman’s concern about the origin rules for goods, DDGTI advised that for products which underwent processing treatments in the manufacturing process, the Administration would require the manufacturer concerned to state clearly the processing treatments carried out and the value-added content for the products. Such information would facilitate the Administration to assess whether the products satisfied the origin criteria under CEPA. Regarding the Chairman’s concern about the establishment of a computer linked verification system for the smooth implementation of the CEPA origin rules, DDGTI opined that since the origin rules for trade in goods were

clearly stipulated and there was a wide circulation of goods, a linked system could expedite the clearance process. On trade in services, given the different liberalization requirements for different service industries, and the fact that the applicability of the Mainland legislation to different industries also varied, a computer linked verification system would not be workable. In particular, information involving the scope of business and registered capital would require detailed vetting by the Mainland authorities to ascertain whether individual applications fulfilled the requirements of the liberalization in trade in services under CEPA.

Products to benefit from zero tariff

13. Mr NG Leung-sing was concerned whether the 273 Hong Kong product codes currently eligible for zero tariff would continue to enjoy the benefit in future, or whether their number would be reduced in the light of the actual circumstances. He was also concerned whether Hong Kong and the Mainland would conduct an annual review and announce the types of products eligible for zero tariff. DDGTI advised that in principle, the Hong Kong products eligible for zero tariff under CEPA would be progressively expanded to all products of Hong Kong origin. This could provide the manufacturers concerned with greater stability and sustainability.

14. Mr NG Leung-sing expressed concern about the arrangement for products not covered in the initial phase of tariff reduction. In response, DDGTI advised that the Administration would discuss and draw up appropriate origin rules with the Mainland having regard to the submission of applications by local manufacturers and the timetable set out in Annex 1 to CEPA. The Administration had already received applications from individual local manufacturers. In this connection, DDGTI urged manufacturers to provide detailed information on the products under application to facilitate negotiation with the Mainland in order that the products in question could benefit from zero tariff in the next round of negotiation. Such information included the categories of products, the Mainland tariff codes and the manufacturing processes carried out in Hong Kong. Views from individual businesses consolidated by trade associations would also facilitate the Administration's negotiation with the Mainland on the tariff reduction arrangements.

15. On Annex 1, Mr NG Leung-sing was concerned about the measures to be taken by the Administration to handle the goods proposed to be produced by local manufacturers. In response, DDGTI said that the SAR Government welcomed the inclusion of the goods proposed to be produced in the tariff reduction arrangements as this would help attract investment and facilitate the transformation and development of the local economy. To enable the goods in question to benefit from zero tariff, DDGTI advised that the Administration would issue a set of guidelines in due course setting out the information required from local manufacturers which could facilitate negotiation with the Mainland on including the goods under CEPA. Referring to paragraph 3 of LC Paper No. CB(1)2524/02-03(01) which stated that under CEPA, products which had not yet

been manufactured could enjoy zero tariff one year after production had commenced, DDGTI considered such arrangements reasonable as the Administration would have sufficient time to verify the processes and mode of production of the goods before implementing tariff elimination arrangements.

16. Mr NG Leung-sing was concerned that individual products enjoying zero tariff might no longer be eligible for tariff concessions under CEPA due to the change in the mode of production, such as the relocation of manufacturing processes outside Hong Kong. In this connection, the Chairman pointed out that individual products which could not fulfil the origin rules under CEPA would not be granted the relevant certificates of origin and hence, would not be able to benefit from the tariff concessions under CEPA.

Liberalization of the trade in services

17. Mr CHAN Kam-lam was concerned whether the areas of the trade in services covered by Annex 4 would be further expanded having regard to the actual needs. He opined that the existing threshold for the trade in services in the Mainland was very high, particularly in the areas of legal and accounting services, thus making it rather difficult for aspiring local professionals to develop their career in the Mainland. As such, he hoped that the Administration would actively take up the matter with the Mainland with a view to further lowering the threshold for the trade in services. In addition, he hoped that the liberalization measures could be extended to regions outside Guangdong Province, such as to Shanghai.

18. PSCIT undertook to make further effort to urge the Mainland to lower the current threshold for the trade in services. As CEPA provided a mechanism for the continuous development of the economic and trade partnership between the Mainland and Hong Kong, she said that the Administration would strengthen the contents of CEPA through on-going liaison and negotiation with the Central Government. The Administration advised that it would further extend the coverage to the trade in other services such as education and medical services. The policy bureaux concerned were currently collating relevant views which would then be compiled and forwarded to the Mainland for the purpose of further discussion.

19. On the liberalization of the Mainland telecommunications market from 1 October 2003 and the commitments set out in Annex 4 to CEPA, Mr Henry WU was concerned about the reaction of the telecommunications industry. DDGTI advised that the industry responded positively to the liberalization measure. The Administration had issued notices and guidelines to the telecommunications industry on the application details of establishing joint ventures in the Mainland and the five types of value-added telecommunications services approved under Annex 4. He understood that the Administration had received many enquiries from the industry although no formal application had been received. The Administration would organize a seminar with the relevant Mainland authorities in due course to provide detailed information on the prospect and business

opportunities of the telecommunications industry in the Mainland. He anticipated that most of the Hong Kong telecommunications companies would attend the seminar before deciding whether to apply for establishing their business in the Mainland. DDGTI added that local telecommunications companies had to apply for the Certificate of Hong Kong Service Supplier from the Trade and Industry Department (TID) before they could apply to the Mainland authorities for the provision of the value-added telecommunications services approved under CEPA. Under normal circumstances, TID would complete the vetting process within 14 clear working days after receiving the completed application form, the certified copy of the statutory declaration and other supporting documents. Upon completion of the vetting process, TID would notify individual applicants of the results in writing.

20. The Chairman enquired about the timing of the seminar for the telecommunications industry. DDGTI advised that as discussion with the Mainland authorities was still underway, the Administration would inform the industry of the details in due course. Apart from the telecommunications industry, the Administration would collect views on CEPA and its implementation details from different industries through different policy bureaux in October 2003. This would enable the Administration to fully reflect their needs and concerns to the Mainland.

21. On the liberalization of legal services, Mr NG Leung-sing asked the Administration to clarify the definition of “operate in association with” and “partnership” in Table 1, Annex 4. DDGTI briefly explained that under the concept of “operate in association with”, participating enterprises could jointly own and deploy business resources (e.g. equipment and facilities) and share the business turnover as stipulated in the agreement. For “partnership”, participating enterprises should be jointly liable to any faults arising from the business operation. Regarding Mr NG Leung-sing’s concern about the reason for restricting local lawyers who had already acquired Mainland lawyer qualifications to engage in non-litigation practice only, DDGTI advised that at present, the Mainland still placed many restrictions on the work which could be undertaken by Hong Kong lawyers. However, the Administration would continue to discuss with the Mainland with a view to further liberalizing the relevant service industries.

22. Mrs Selina CHOW was concerned that the design industry had not been included as one of the services to be liberalized. DDGTI advised that although the design industry per se was not included in the current list, local people engaged in the industry could still develop their career in the Mainland through participation in other industries which would be liberalized. Mrs Selina CHOW however referred to the advice of certain Mainland officials that the design industry could establish sole proprietorship business in the Mainland. In this connection, PSCIT explained that many service industries in fact included an element of design work, such as the engineering, advertising and management industries, which would soon be liberalized under CEPA. The crux of the issue lay in how to package the design industry at this stage so that it could benefit

from the concessions under CEPA. Mrs Selina CHOW urged the Administration to provide support and assistance to the design industry to enable them to benefit from CEPA. PSCIT advised that in the next round of consultations, the Administration was prepared to discuss with the Mainland authorities about the inclusion of the design industry in the liberalization list under CEPA.

Admin

23. As regards the liberalization of financial services, Mr Henry WU welcomed the arrangements in Annex 4 which simplified the relevant procedures for Hong Kong professionals to apply for securities and futures industry qualifications in the Mainland. He referred to Table 1, Annex 4 which stated clearly that after obtaining the Mainland's insurance qualifications and being employed or appointed by a Mainland insurance institution, Hong Kong insurance agents could engage in the relevant insurance business. Mr Henry WU was concerned about the reasons for the absence of a similar requirement in respect of the liberalization of Mainland's securities services. DDGTI appreciated Mr WU's concern and advised that such arrangement reflected the difference in the degree of liberalization of different industries. He said that he was willing to follow up with the relevant policy bureaux after the meeting on the qualifications required for Hong Kong securities professionals to practise in the Mainland.

Handling enquiries about CEPA

24. In response to Mr Henry WU's concern about the designated branch to be established under TID to handle CEPA-related issues, DDGTI advised that the Administration had deployed about 10 staff members to take up related duties, notably the provision of information to the public on the contents and implementation details of CEPA, and answering hotline enquiries. So far, about 1 100 enquiries had been received and the Administration had done its best to deal with the enquiries on the same day or on the following day. Statistics revealed that most enquiries were request for information. He believed that after the industries concerned had become more familiar with the contents of CEPA, individual businesses might raise more in-depth and complicated questions.

Feasibility of issuing notice of guaranteed zero tariff in advance

25. Mr NG Leung-sing was concerned whether CEPA could attract foreign investments to develop value-added products in Hong Kong. Mr NG enquired whether the Administration would consider issuing written notice of guaranteed zero tariff in advance to new products so that investors could be better assured when investing in the development of new products. DDGTI responded that for the trade in goods, the origin rules were the prime concern of manufacturers. Under the existing arrangement, the CEPA origin rules were promulgated well in advance so as to provide investors with greater certainty. At present, local manufacturers were required to submit information and declaration in respect of each shipment when applying for certificates of origin. As such, the

arrangement of issuing written notice of guaranteed zero tariff in advance might not be appropriate.

26. PSCIT added that even for existing products, the Administration would not issue notice of guaranteed zero tariff in advance. She opined that when the manufacturers became more familiar with the contents of the origin rules for the products concerned, they would be in a better position to assess whether the products they intended to manufacture could secure zero tariff and make an informed decision as to whether they should invest resources in the development of the new products. She also pointed out that in order to secure zero tariff under CEPA, a valid certificate of origin had to be obtained in respect of each shipment of Hong Kong's exports to the Mainland.

The impact and effectiveness of CEPA on Hong Kong's total export value

27. Mr HUI Cheung-ching advised that last year, the total value of Hong Kong's exports to the Mainland averaged at about \$3.5 billion per month while the total value of domestic exports to the rest of the world averaged at about \$10 billion per month. As such, the total value of domestic exports to the Mainland accounted for a substantial percentage of the overall total export value of Hong Kong. He asked whether the Administration had assessed the changes in Hong Kong's total export value after the implementation of zero tariff from January 2004. PSCIT said that apart from zero tariff, the total value of domestic exports would also be influenced by many factors, including the way individual manufacturers made use of zero tariff, the market competition faced by local manufacturers and the economic development of the Mainland. Therefore, it would be rather difficult to make an objective assessment of the impact of CEPA on Hong Kong's total export value at this stage.

28. Mr SIN Chung-kai was concerned about whether there were any specific indicators in place to quantify the benefits of CEPA. In reply, PSCIT advised that the Administration could not quantify the impact of CEPA because economic and trade development was a complex issue which involved the interplay of various economic factors. As such, it was difficult to directly attribute the market situation over a certain period of time to the implementation of CEPA or link this up with CEPA. Nevertheless, the Administration would study the issue with the Government Economist to see whether it was feasible to devise certain indicators and methods to evaluate the effectiveness of CEPA after it had been implemented for some time. However, she said that it might not be possible to rule out certain subjective judgement in the process.

Feasibility of establishing Hong Kong Economic and Trade Office in Shanghai

29. Given that the Administration had set up the Office of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in Beijing (Beijing Office) and the Economic and Trade Office in Guangdong (GDETO) to deal with issues and matters involving Hong Kong residents in the Mainland, Mr CHAN Kam-lam

enquired about the feasibility of establishing a similar office in Shanghai. He pointed out that at present, a considerable amount of foreign investments in Shanghai was from Hong Kong. The establishment of a Shanghai office could provide Hong Kong businessmen with more detailed information on the investment environment in Shanghai. In addition, the office could provide assistance to facilitate their investment and in resolving problems Hong Kong businessmen encountered in their business operations. PSCIT advised that due to resource constraint, the Administration would not be able to consider setting up a Shanghai office at this stage. She believed that the existing Beijing Office and GDETO, together with the offices of the Hong Kong Trade Development Council (HKTDC) and the Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTB) in Shanghai, could meet the needs of Hong Kong businessmen in expanding their businesses into Shanghai.

The scope of Mainland residents visiting Hong Kong individually

Admin

30. Responding to Mr CHAN Kam-lam's enquiry about whether the Administration would discuss with the Mainland on further extending the scope of Mainland residents who could visit Hong Kong individually, PSCIT advised that under CEPA, the Mainland would allow residents from the whole of Guangdong Province to visit Hong Kong individually not later than 1 July 2004. She undertook to convey Mr CHAN's view to the Economic Development and Labour Bureau for further coordination with the authorities of Guangdong Province and the Central Government.

Ways to capitalize on and promote the benefits under CEPA

31. Mrs Selina CHOW noted that on liberalizing the trade in services, the specific commitments should conform to the relevant laws and regulations, and administrative regulations of the Mainland. However, she opined that to a certain extent, strictly following the administrative regulations might restrict full liberalization. She was particularly concerned about the ways in which Hong Kong could capitalize on the advantage in time provided by CEPA so that small and medium enterprises in Hong Kong could benefit.

32. PSCIT understood that time was crucial for one to fully grasp the business opportunities brought about by CEPA. As such, after the signing of the six Annexes to CEPA, the Administration held a seminar on 2 October 2003 with the Federation of Hong Kong Industries to brief the local business sector on the contents and implementation details of CEPA. Moreover, the Administration would organize several seminars next month through various policy bureaux to introduce to individual industries from a micro perspective the benefits of CEPA to them, as well as the relevant terms and application procedures. Invest Hong Kong (InvestHK) would highlight the importance of CEPA during its overseas promotion activities to attract and encourage foreign businesses to invest in Hong Kong. The publicity activities concerned had already been under preparation. Furthermore, InvestHK would join hands with the organizations, such as HKTDC, HKTB and some large enterprises, to promote overseas the investment

advantages and business opportunities brought about by CEPA. She believed that the benefits under CEPA would stay quite some time, probably until the same favourable treatment was available to other members of the World Trade Organization in future.

Admin

33. PSCIT added that in the next stage of development, CEPA would focus on trade and investment facilitation with a view to improving the transparency of the business rules of the Mainland and enhancing the further exchange of trade and commercial information between Hong Kong and the Mainland. She pointed out that the Guangdong authorities were very supportive of the early implementation of the various measures under CEPA and had already established a one-stop unit to promote CEPA and assist local businesses to expand into the Mainland. As to the liberalization of individual business operations in Guangdong Province, she said that the Administration would consider conveying the matter to the Guangdong authorities through the Hong Kong Guangdong Cooperation Coordination Unit.

34. Mrs Selina CHOW suggested that the Administration should consider stepping up efforts in promoting among the local service sector the benefits brought about by CEPA. Besides, she also suggested that the Administration should coordinate various promotional activities to enhance their effectiveness.

35. Referring to the specific commitments on liberalizing the trade in services set out in Annex 4, Mr NG Leung-sing remarked that the commitments might be subject to change in the light of the relevant laws, regulations and administrative regulations of the Mainland. Mr NG suggested that the Administration should consider establishing a notification system in this respect to facilitate compliance by local businesses. DDGTI advised that during previous discussions on CEPA, the Administration had developed close ties with its Mainland counterparts which had undertaken to keep a close watch on changes in the Mainland laws, regulations and administrative regulations and inform the Administration as appropriate.

II. Any other business

Secretariat

36. Mr SIN Chung-kai referred to the letter dated 8 October 2003 to the Panel from Kenfair International Limited, which complained that HKTDC competed with the private sector in the business of organizing exhibitions. He proposed to discuss related policy issues at the meeting to be held in November 2003. Mr SIN suggested that representatives of the Administration and HKTDC should be invited to the meeting and that Miss CHOY So-yuk could join the discussion if she was interested in the subject matter. As Mr SIN recalled that the Panel had discussed a similar subject in 2000, he requested the Secretariat to provide the relevant information papers and minutes of meeting for members' reference. The Chairman noted Mr SIN's suggestion and directed the Secretariat to liaise the Administration accordingly.

37. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:18 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
8 December 2003