

LegCo Panel on Financial Affairs

List of follow-up actions arising from discussions in previous sessions
(Position as at 2 December 2005)

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
1. Reinsurance cover for employee compensation insurance policies	20 December 2001	The Administration was requested to provide written reports, on a quarterly basis, on the up-to-date market situation of reinsurance coverage for terrorist activities on treaty arrangements and the Administration's assessment of the continued need for the \$10 billion facility as approved by Finance Committee on 11 January 2002.	The fourteenth quarterly report provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2381/04-05(01) on 6 October 2005.
2. Loan Guarantee Scheme for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Impacted Industries	Referred by the Finance Committee at its meeting held on 25 April 2003	The Administration undertook to report the operation of the Scheme to the Panel one year after its implementation, and to submit progress report at six month intervals thereafter.	The fourth report on the operation of the Scheme was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)164/05-06(01) on 27 October 2005.
3. Proposal of re-structuring the filing fees for non-Hong Kong companies	3 January 2005	The Administration was requested to report to the Panel in due course on the situation about non-Hong Kong companies' compliance with the new requirement for them to file a full annual return. The report should include, inter alia, the statistics on	Information awaited.

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
		<p>compliance, non-compliance and late returns, enforcement actions taken/to be taken (if any), and measures proposed by the Administration to improve the situation.</p>	
<p>4. Proposal to write off a judgement debt</p>	<p>6 June 2005</p>	<p>Members considered that the Administration had not provided the Panel with sufficient information for consideration of the proposal to write off the judgement debt owed to the Government by an auctioneer hired by the former Government Supplies Department (GSD) to conduct commercial disposal of unserviceable or obsolete government stores and confiscated goods. It was agreed that the Panel would further discuss the proposal in due course after the Administration had provided the supplementary information requested by members, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Actions taken to recover the outstanding payments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Please confirm whether GSD had, before reaching a Deed of Settlement with the Managing Director (MD) of the auctioneer on 31 March 1999, consulted the Department of Justice (DoJ) on whether the default in proceeds payment 	<p>Administration's response awaited.</p> <p>The Administration proposes to further consult the Panel on the proposal at the meeting to be held in February 2006.</p>

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
		<p>by the auctioneer involves any criminal offence, and whether criminal proceedings should be instituted against the auctioneer or its MD. In this connection -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● if GSD had consulted DoJ, please provide the advice given by DoJ;● if GSD had not consulted DoJ, please provide the reasons for having not done so. <p>(ii) Please respond to a member's views and question, as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● While the auctioneer had collected the auction proceeds for the Government, the proceeds were assets of the Government and not the auctioneer. Any proceeds owed by the auctioneer to the Government should be regarded as a liability of the auctioneer or its directors including its MD both under common law as well as under the Companies Ordinance, instead of a debt. In this connection, whether the	

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
		<p>auctioneer had gone into liquidation is irrelevant because the Government was not its creditor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● The Government should take appropriate actions (including legal actions) to recover the proceeds, and should not seek approval to write off the sum involved unless all possible means have been exhausted;● If the MD of the auctioneer took away the proceeds, he should be held liable for the offence. The Government should pursue its tracing claim to recover the proceeds from the directors including its MD and consider whether criminal proceedings should be instituted against him; and● In this connection, if GSD had consulted DoJ on its legal rights, please provide the advice given by DoJ. If not, please provide the reasons for having not done so. <p>(iii) With the discharge of the Warrant of</p>	

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
		<p>Arrest against the MD of the auctioneer in March 2004, please confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● whether the MD might return to Hong Kong and would be free from any liability (both criminal or civil) for the case; and● whether the Administration would conclude the case after seeking approval to write off the debt and take no further action to recover the proceeds. <p>(iv) In connection with item (iii) above, please confirm -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● what other legal actions the Administration would take to recover the proceeds; and● if the MD was subsequently located in other jurisdictions, whether the Administration would make arrangement to extradite the MD back to Hong Kong.	

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
		<p>(b) Internal investigation</p> <p>(i) Please provide the report of the internal investigation conducted by the Administration on the case, including –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● the report(s) of the disciplinary proceedings taken against the civil servants involved in the case, including a Senior Accounting Officer, a Accounting Officer I, a Principal Supplies Officer, two Chief Supplies Officers and one Senior Supplies Officer, and the dates on which the disciplinary proceedings commenced and were concluded; and● the outcome of the investigation on the responsibilities of the senior management of the GSD in the case, in particular the responsibilities of the then Director, Deputy Director and the immediate supervisor of the Senior Accounting Officer concerned. <p>(ii) Please provide the procedures and requirements for the concerned staff to</p>	

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
		<p>report to the senior management of GSD on the payment of auction proceeds during the period from 1996 to 1998 when the default happened;</p> <p>(iii) Please provide the date on which the default was brought to the attention of the senior management of GSD, and the reasons why the senior management was unable to identify the problem before then;</p> <p>(iv) Please set out the remedial actions taken by the senior management of GSD for the case since the default was brought to its attention in 1998; and</p> <p>(v) Please confirm whether the Administration considered that there were inadequacies in the senior management in handling the case.</p>	
5. The 2006-07 Budget	7 November 2005	The Administration was requested to provide the	Information provided by the

Subject	Date(s) of relevant meeting(s)	Follow-up actions	Outcome
consultation		following information: (a) A breakdown of Government expenditure on works projects and the changes in percentage for each of the past ten years (i.e. covering the financial years of 1995-96 to 2004-05); and (b) A breakdown of the profits tax revenue contributed by the top 600 taxpaying corporations for the year of Assessment 2003-04 (Chart 19 of the information pack for the Financial Secretary's consultations on the 2006-07 Budget).	Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)356/05-06(02) on 22 November 2005.