Ref : CB1/BC/4/00

Bills Committee on Securities and Futures Bill and Banking (Amendment) Bill 2000

Update on areas of concern raised by members during discussions on the Securities and Futures Bill and follow-up actions required from the Administration

This paper summarizes the major concerns, views and suggestions raised by the Bills Committee on **Parts XV and XVI** of the Securities and Futures Bill since December 2000. It has updated the list on areas of concern raised by members during discussions on the two Bills (LC Paper No. CB(1) 1379/00-01(01) issued on 29 May 2001 and summarized new issues and concerns raised by members during meetings held from June to October 2001 when the Bills Committee examined the two Bills clause-by-clause.

2. This paper should be read in conjunction with the relevant marked-up versions of the Blue Bill showing the Committee Stage Amendments to be proposed by the Administration which were issued to members in November and December 2001.

<u>Legislative Council Secretariat</u> 7 December 200

Part XV of the Securities and Futures Bill

Date of meetings: 18 & 21 May and 12 & 24 October 2001

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
Part XV - Disclo	sure of interests	
299	Interpretation of Part XV	
	Members have made comments or suggestions on the drafting of:	To consider.
	(a) "relevant share capital" and	
	(b) "underlying shares".	
300	Exemptions	
	There is suggestion that SFC should publish particulars of exemptions granted.	To consider.
304	Circumstances in which duty of disclosure arises	
	There is a question on why a new exemption is provided for intra-group transactions under clause 304(9).	The Administration has explained the policy for providing the exemption in Annex 1 to LC Paper No. CB(1) 2121/00-01 of 29 September 2001.

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
319	Offence for non-compliance with notification requirements	To consider the amendments.
	There are concerns that:	
	(a) Part XV is complex and inadvertent breaches may lead to prosecution and conviction; and	
	(b) it is a strict liability offence under clause 319 and defences available are insufficient.	
	There are suggestions:	
	(a) to add a "reasonable excuse defence" provision; and	
	(b) to consider adjusting the penalty levels to better match the severity of the breach; and	
	(c) to move clauses 319(4) to (6) relating to restrictions on shares to Division 12 of Part XV.	
320, 325	Power of listed corporation to investigate ownership of interests in its shares, etc; Offences for failure to provide information required by listed corporation	
	A member has expressed concern that it is very time consuming and costly for an intermediary to provide such information. It is unfair to require the defendant to prove that the requirement to give the information is frivolous or vexatious. The listed corporation should be required to set out the reasons for seeking the information and to reimburse the intermediary for the expenses incurred.	The Administration has responded to the concern in LC Paper No. CB(1) 1407/00-01 of 31 May 2001. On the question on reimbursement
	information and to reinfourse the intermediary for the expenses incurred.	of cost, the Bills Committee noted

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
		that no provision on reimbursement of cost is provided in comparable legislation in UK and Singapore. Members agreed not to propose change to the provision.
	Imposing criminal liability for failure to comply with the requirement is too harsh. A "reasonable excuse defence" should be provided.	To consider.
322	Listed corporation to investigate ownership of interests in its shares, etc on requisition by members There is concern that non-compliance with the request will be a strict liability offence.	To consider.
323	Listed corporation to report to members There is concern that non-compliance on the requirement will be a strict liability offence.	Members noted that the publication of a report arising from a clause 322 investigation is quite a rare event. The company would be put on alert at an early stage and should have ample time to meet this requirement.
	It is suggested that the listed corporation should publish a report prepared under clause 323(3).	To consider.

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
347	Power to investigate ownership of listed corporation	To consider.
	The reasons for FS to commence an investigation is unclear.	
	There is a comment that members of the listed corporation should not be required to pay for the cost of the investigation.	
	If an applicant is required to contribute to the cost, he must be informed of the estimated amount before the investigation commences.	
352	Obstruction of inspectors	
	Clause 370 (in Part XVI) also relates to obstruction. The two clauses should be reviewed.	To review clause 352 with clause 370.
354(1)	Expenses of investigation of affairs of corporation	To consider.
	There is a question on whether the Court may require the convicted person to pay for expenses of investigation. There is a concern about the liability for the convicted person to indemnify other persons mentioned in clause 354(1)(b) to (e).	
356	Power to obtain information as to those interested in shares, etc.	To consider.
	The grounds for FS to initiate an investigation or to require a person to provide information under clause 356(1) are unclear.	
	A "reasonable excuse defence" should be provided in clause 356(4).	

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
General	Disclosure regime as compared to those of overseas jurisdictions	
	The proposed disclosure regime goes considerably further than other international financial markets. It will be complex and costly to comply with the requirements. Thus may affect Hong Kong's competitiveness as an international financial centre. There is suggestion that if the proposed disclosure regime is passed into law, the Panel on Financial Affairs of LegCo should review the regime at appropriate time in light of actual implementation.	The Administration has responded to similar market comments in LC Paper No. CB(1) 2120/00-01 of 28 September 2001. The Administration has provided comparison on the Hong Kong/US disclosure regimes in LC Paper No. CB(1) 2120/00-01 of 28 September 2001.
	There is concern that the disclosure regime is not binding on the Government	The Administration has provided a paper on overseas jurisdictions (LC Paper No. CB(1) 2020/00-01 of 17 September 2001).
Part XV - Disclo	osure of interests (Chinese version)	
335	Notification of family and corporate interest and short positions by director and chief executive	
	It is suggested that the drafting of clause 335 should be reviewed.	To review.

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
356	It is suggested that the reference of "財政司司長" should be adopted.	To replace the reference to "司長" by "財政司司長" in the Chinese version.

Part XVI of the Securities and Futures Bill

Date of meetings: 25 May and 8 & 24 October 2001

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
Part XVI - Misc	ellaneous	L
366	Presentation of secrecy, etc	To consider improvements.
	There are concerns about:	
	(a) scope of the exceptions to secrecy under clause 366(3)(g);	
	(b) the condition (i.e. in the interests of the investing public or in the public interest) under which SFC may disclose information;	
	(c) independence of SFC may be compromised; and	
	(d) the Administration may be able to obtain information received by the SFC.	
	There is a view that the exceptions to secrecy provision should be restricted to those persons who have a clear reason to know.	
	The term "professional or semi-professional bodies" in clause 366(3)(h)(ii) is not clearly defined.	
	There is a comment that the drafting of clause 366(3)(f)(i)(B) is complicated and should be reviewed.	
	To consider narrowing the term "the police" in clause 366(3)(j).	

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
	There is concern about how to ensure there are "adequate secrecy provisions" in overseas regulatory organizations (clause 366(6)). It is suggested that there should be transparency in the public officer authorized under clause 366(12).	
368	Immunity There is doubt about whether "in good faith" is the sufficient threshold for immunity against civil liability.	See LC Paper No. CB(1) 1420/00-01(01) of 4 June 2001. Clauses 154 and 369 concerning immunity granted to auditors are also relevant.
370	Obstruction The clause is widely drafted. There are concerns about: (a) the phrase "any other person" is not clearly defined; and (b) whether there are sufficient checks and balances to guard against the extensive power of SFC. There is a view that the level of penalty under clause 370(1) should be comparable to similar offences.	The Administration undertook to provide a paper. See LC Paper No. CB(1) 512/01-02(04) of 7 December 2001.

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
372(3)(a)	Provision of false or misleading information	
	The circumstances under which a person will commit the offence is unclear.	To consider.
373	Power of Commission to intervene in proceedings	
	The rights, duties and liabilities of SFC in intervening in a proceeding are unclear.	To consider.
375	Standard of proof	
	There is doubt as whether the standard of proof in the provision should apply to "a court".	To consider.
376	Prosecution of certain offences by Commission	
	There are concerns about:	
	(a) the circumstances under which SFC can exercise this power are unclear;	
	(b) whether any guidelines will be made available as safeguards against possible abuse of power;	
	(c) a person "not qualified to practise as a barrister or to act as a solicitor" can appear and plead before a magistrate for prosecution cases;	To explain existing SFC practice in this respect. See LC Paper No. CB(1) 529/01-02(03) of 7 December 2001.
	(d) relationship of clause 376(3) with the Basic Law.	Confirmed consistent with the Basic Law.

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
378	Liability of officers of corporations for offence by corporations, and of partners for offences by other partners	To consider.
	To review phrases including "or attributable to any recklessness on the part of" and "is guilty of the offence". The term "recklessness" in the English and Chinese versions should be reviewed.	
384, 384A	Rules by Commission General provisions for rules by Commission	
	Clause 384A(3) may give SFC too much leeway not to conduct prior consultation on draft rules. It is suggested that a statutory Consumer Panel should be set up for consultation with the investing public.	See LC Paper No. CB(1) 423/01-02(01) of 27 November 2001.
	Criminal liability for breaching of rules (which are subsidiary legislation) should be specified in the primary legislation.	
	Clause 384A(6) will have the effect of turning breaches of rules, which are not criminal offences in the primary legislation, into criminal offences by way of regulations by CE in Council. The Administration should provide such examples in other legislation.	To provide relevant examples in other legislation. See LC Paper No. CB(1) 529/01-02(04) of 7 December 2001.
385(6)	Codes or Guidelines by Commission	
	There is comment that it will suffice to spell out that court may consider the code or guideline if it is "relevant" to the proceedings. The phrase "shall be taken into account" in determining that question should be reviewed.	To consider.

Clause No.	Concerns/Views/Suggestions	Administration's response or Follow-up by the Administration/Securities and Futures Commission
390	Exclusions of provisions of Gambling Ordinance The proposed CSA is complicated. The clause should be amended to restore the Blue Bill version.	To consider.

Abbreviations:

AI - Authorized institution

ATS - Automated Trading Services
BAB - Banking (Amendment) Bill 2000

BO - Banking Ordinance
CE - The Chief Executive
CJ - The Chief Justice

CO - Companies Ordinance

CSA - Committee Stage Amendments

ED - Executive Director

ETO - Electronic Transactions Ordinance

FRR - Financial Resources Rules FS - The Financial Secretary

FSMA - Financial Services and Markets Act 2000

HKBOR - Hong Kong Bill of Rights

HKEx - The Hong Kong Exchanges and Clearing Limited

HKMA - The Hong Kong Monetary AuthorityICC - Investor Compensation Companies

LegCo - The Legislative Council

MMT - Market Misconduct Tribunal

MOU - Memorandum of Understanding

MPF - Mandatory Provident Fund

PRP - Process Review Panel

SEHK - The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong

SFAT - The Securities and Futures Appeals Tribunal

SFB - Securities and Futures Bill

SFC - The Securities and Futures Commission

SO - Securities Ordinance

Legislative Council Secretariat

8 December 2001