

**立法會**  
*Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(4)1236/17-18  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/EDEV

**Panel on Economic Development**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 26 March 2018, at 10:45 am**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Alvin YEUNG (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon SHIU Ka-fai

Hon CHAN Chun-ying  
Hon LUK Chung-hung  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

**Member attending** : Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP

**Members absent** : Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP

**Public Officers attending** : Agenda item IV

Ms Angela LEE  
Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing  
(Transport)5

Ms Louisa YAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and  
Housing (Transport)10

Mr CHOI Chi-chuen  
Assistant Director / Multi-lateral Policy  
Marine Department

Mr Barry LIU  
Chief, Technical Policy  
Marine Department

Agenda item V

Ms Vivian SUM, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Commerce and Economic  
Development (Commerce and Industry) 1

**Related organization** : Agenda item V

Competition Commission

Ms Anna WU, GBS, JP  
Chairperson

Mr Brent SNYDER  
Chief Executive Officer

Mr Rasul BUTT  
Senior Executive Director

**Clerk in attendance** : Ms Shirley CHAN  
Chief Council Secretary (4)5

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Bonny LOO  
Assistant Legal Adviser 4 (Agenda item IV only)

Ms Shirley TAM  
Senior Council Secretary (4)5

Ms Lauren LI  
Council Secretary (4)5

Ms Zoe TONG  
Legislative Assistant (4)5

Miss Mandy LUI  
Clerical Assistant (4)5

---

Action

**I. Confirmation of minutes of meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)740/17-18 — Minutes of meeting held on  
22 January 2018)

The minutes of meeting held on 22 January 2018 were confirmed.

**II. Information papers issued since the last meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)683/17-18(01) — Administration's paper on  
tables and graphs showing the  
import and retail prices of  
major oil products from  
February 2016 to January 2018

LC Paper No. CB(4)783/17-18(01) — Administration's response to the discussion on the "Report of the Transport and Housing Bureau's Investigation into Staff Conduct in the Marine Department in relation to the Vessel Collision Incident near Lamma Island on 1 October 2012" and a related letter from Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding dated 25 January 2018)

2. Members noted the above papers issued since the last regular meeting.
3. Mr James TO reiterated his request that the Administration should make arrangements again for Legislative Council ("LegCo") Members to peruse the redacted version of the "Report of the Transport and Housing Bureau's Investigation into Staff Conduct in the Marine Department in relation to the Vessel Collision Incident near Lamma Island on 1 October 2012" ("the Report") under a confidentiality undertaking. To save LegCo Members the trouble of having to go to another venue to peruse the redacted version of the Report, he also suggested that a closed meeting of the Panel could be arranged for LegCo Members to peruse and discuss the Report simultaneously after signing the confidentiality undertaking.
4. Mr Holden CHOW noted that there was no update to the contents of the Report since the investigation was completed in March 2014. As the redacted version of the Report might contain some confidential information which the Administration might need to seek legal advice on handling such information, he suggested the Panel could consider discussing again the summary of the Report which was submitted to the Panel for discussion on 28 April 2014 as well as the related follow-up actions taken by the Administration since then so that Panel members, including new ones who did not participate in the previous discussion, could express views on the incident and/or other issues arising therefrom.
5. Mr CHAN Chun-ying shared similar views. He was also of the view that discussion on the measures to enhance marine safety and prevent future occurrence of similar incidents based on the summary of the Report could be another option for members to follow up on the matter.

6. Mr James TO said that he did not object to discussing the summary of the Report but the redacted version of the Report, which was not made public, was worth discussing by LegCo Members at a closed meeting of the Panel. He urged LegCo Members of different political affiliations to spend time to peruse the redacted version of the Report.

7. The Chairman said that he would follow up with the Administration on members' views. Noting that the Administration might need to seek legal advice on the detailed arrangements for LegCo Members' to peruse and discuss the redacted version of the Report, Mr Holden CHOW requested the Administration to do so and forward the related information to the Panel for consideration.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)968/17-18(02) on 24 April 2018.)*

### **III. Items for discussion at the next meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)753/17-18(01) — List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(4)753/17-18(02) — List of follow-up actions)

8. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 23 April 2018 at 10:45 am –

(a) Reform of regulatory regime for pleasure vessels; and

(b) Update on the development of the three-runway system at the Hong Kong International Airport.

### **IV. Proposed making and amending of the subsidiary legislation under the Merchant Shipping (Safety) Ordinance (Cap. 369) for implementation of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea of the International Maritime Organization**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)753/17-18(03) — Administration's paper on incorporating in local legislation the latest requirements of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea)

### Presentation by the Administration

9. At the invitation of the Chairman, Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)5 ("DSTH5") briefed members on two legislative proposals to incorporate in local legislation the latest requirements of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea ("SOLAS") of the International Maritime Organization ("IMO") relating to the construction and survey, as well as fire safety of ships by making and amending the subsidiary legislation under the Merchant Shipping (Safety) Ordinance (Cap. 369). With the aid of the powerpoint presentation material, Assistant Director / Multi-lateral Policy ("AD/MP") of Marine Department ("MD") elaborated further on the proposals. Details of the legislative proposals were set out in LC Paper No. CB(4)753/17-18(03).

*(Post-meeting note: The powerpoint presentation material provided by the Administration was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)819/17-18(01) on 26 March 2018.)*

### Discussion

#### *The legislative proposals*

10. Mr Holden CHOW considered it necessary to follow the latest requirements of SOLAS in order to catch up with the international standards relating to the construction and survey, as well as fire safety of ships. Mr CHOW enquired about the relevant inspection work after incorporating the requirements into local legislation.

11. DSTH5 advised that the requirements under the two legislative proposals applied to all Hong Kong-registered ocean-going vessels ("OGVs") and all non-Hong Kong registered OGVs in Hong Kong waters. As regards Hong Kong-registered OGVs, regular inspections should be conducted by either MD or recognized organizations of MD to ensure compliance with international standards when these ships made applications for survey and certification services. As for non-Hong Kong registered OGVs in Hong Kong waters, MD would conduct random inspections on board and could request relevant documents from ships for inspection when necessary.

12. Mr Holden CHOW followed up by asking whether penalties should be imposed by Hong Kong or the relevant flag State if a non-Hong Kong registered OGV visiting Hong Kong failed to comply with the relevant requirements. DSTH5 advised that Hong Kong would enforce the relevant laws in local legislation if any non-compliance was identified.

13. Mr James TO noted the latest requirements of SOLAS of IMO relating to the construction and survey, as well as the fire safety requirements of ships. He deemed it necessary for Hong Kong, a member of the international community, to follow such requirements. Noting that the requirements in the legislative proposals would apply to all Hong Kong-registered OGVs and all non-Hong Kong registered OGVs in Hong Kong waters, Mr TO sought information on the estimated number of OGVs which would be affected by the new requirements.

14. DSTH5 advised that IMO would discuss with its member States when it decided to amend certain requirements in order to ensure compliance by the shipping industry. Generally speaking, when IMO proposed amendments to requirements relating to the structure and/or design of ships, the new requirements would only be applicable to ships built after a specified date. As for amendments to requirements involving no structural changes to ships and thus would more easily be complied with, all ships would be required to comply. Furthermore, a transitional period would normally be given before the new requirements came into force so as to allow time for shipping companies to prepare as appropriate for compliance with the new requirements.

15. DSTH5 further advised that as the port authority of Hong Kong, MD had the right and power to conduct inspections on ships in Hong Kong waters. MD would consider certain factors in conducting such inspections such as the past record of compliance with international maritime conventions by the flag State of a ship. AD/MP added that there were currently about 2 300 Hong Kong-registered OGVs and they would need to comply with the new legislation to a varying extent. OGVs of other flag States would also be subject to the new regulations when they were in Hong Kong waters after the latest requirements of SOLAS incorporated into local legislation had come into operation.

16. Mr James TO was of the view that views of large shipping companies might have well been considered by IMO when the Organization formulated the requirements under the relevant international maritime conventions. However, he expressed concern that views of smaller shipping companies might not be given due consideration in the process, making it more difficult for them to comply with IMO's latest requirements.

17. AD/MP advised that any amendments to a convention would be thoroughly discussed at IMO's meetings with the shipping industry and ships from both large and small shipping companies should be able to comply with IMO's relevant requirements. He added that classification societies of ships

would also advise shipping companies on how to comply with the new requirements. With the transitional period specified by IMO, small shipping companies should have adequate time to prepare for compliance. Furthermore, upon the enquiry of Mr James TO, AD/MP advised that the requirements to be incorporated in local legislation followed the ones stipulated in SOLAS.

18. Mr James TO referred to the proposal to require OGVs constructed on or after 1 January 2007 to keep on board and ashore a set of drawings of the ship's construction and design, and enquired if there were similar requirements in existing legislation.

19. AD/MP advised that all OGVs should have a set of drawings of the ship's construction and design, and that such drawings were usually kept by the relevant management company ashore. However, it was not mandated in SOLAS that a set of such drawings should be kept on board and ashore in the past.

20. Mr Holden CHOW asked if inflatable vessels for recreational purposes such as "banana boats" fell under the regulation of any existing legislation. In response, AD/MP advised that such vessels should fall under the definition of "pleasure vessel" within the meaning of, and be governed by, the Merchant Shipping (Local Vessels) Ordinance (Cap. 548).

### Conclusion

21. The Chairman concluded that the Panel was generally supportive of the two legislative proposals.

## **V. Report on the work of the Competition Commission**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)753/17-18(04) — Competition Commission's report on its work

LC Paper No. CB(4)753/17-18(05) — Paper on the work of the Competition Commission prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (updated background brief))

Presentation by the Competition Commission

22. At the invitation of the Chairman, Ms Anna WU, Chairperson of the Competition Commission ("the Commission"), briefed members on an overview of the activities of the Commission since March 2017 and provided an outlook for the coming year. Mr Brent SNYDER, Chief Executive Officer of the Commission, briefed members on an enforcement overview of the Commission. Mr Rasul BUTT, Senior Executive Director of the Commission, then introduced the Commission's work on market study, policy advice, as well as public engagement and advocacy in the past year. Details of the briefings were set out in the Commission's paper (LC Paper No. CB(4)753/17-18(04)).

Discussion

*Law enforcement*

23. Mr CHAN Chun-ying noted that since the full implementation of the Competition Ordinance ("the Ordinance") in December 2015, the Commission had received and processed over 2 800 complaints and enquiries. Among them, around 180 complaints were assessed further. The Commission had referred 25 cases to other law enforcement agencies and the Competition Policy Advisory Group, and it had filed two cases in the Competition Tribunal ("the Tribunal") during the period. He was of the view that the percentage of cases being further processed/ referred/ brought to the Tribunal was rather low, and cast doubt on the deterrent effect of the Commission's enforcement work.

24. Mr Brent SNYDER of the Commission advised that the Commission was optimistic about a number of investigations in the pipeline. The Commission was relatively new and the Ordinance had only been in effect for a limited period of time. Thus, the Commission had to undertake some investigations where the relevant conduct occurred before the effective date of the Ordinance. He pointed out that to the Commission's observation, some cartels that existed had stopped before the Ordinance came into effect.

25. Mr Christopher CHEUNG enquired about the details of the 2 800 complaints and enquiries received and processed by the Commission since December 2015, in particular whether any such complaints and enquiries were related to bundling and price fixing with respect to the financial services industry and financial service products. In case there were such cases, he asked if the Commission had liaised with the Hong Kong Monetary Authority and the Securities and Futures Commission ("SFC") with a view to tackling the anti-competitive conduct involved and enhancing competition in the industry.

26. Mr Brent SNYDER of the Commission advised that of the 2 800 complaints and enquiries received by the Commission, about 60% of them were related to the First Conduct Rule ("FCR") which governed anti-competitive agreements. Among these complaints and enquiries concerning FCR, more than 50% of them were related to cartel conduct including bid rigging, price fixing and market sharing. He further advised that bundling fell under the Second Conduct Rule ("SCR") which usually took place within a single firm, and that about 20% of the complaints and enquiries the Commission received were related to contravention of SCR. He advised that some complaints were assessed further but details of specific investigations could not be disclosed in order to preserve the integrity of the investigations and the confidentiality of the parties involved in the investigations.

27. Ms Anna WU of the Commission added that the Commission had been maintaining communication with SFC on various issues of common concern. The two parties were currently preparing a memorandum of understanding on issues of common interests.

28. In response to Mr YIU Si-wing's enquiry about the suspected anti-competitive behavior of a supplier via a trade association, Mr Brent SNYDER of the Commission advised that whether it was a contravention of the Ordinance would depend on the facts of particular circumstances and the Commission would consider any complaint it received regarding anti-competitive behavior. The Commission might conduct an investigation into the complaint if there was reasonable cause to suspect a contravention of the Ordinance.

29. Mr LUK Chung-hung welcomed the Commission's effort in bringing the case against 10 construction and engineering companies for suspected market sharing and price fixing in relation to the provision of renovation services for a public rental housing estate to the Tribunal. As regards the current practice that eligible contractors might apply to the Housing Department for being listed on the Reference List of Decoration Contractors ("the List"), Mr LUK suggested the Commission and the Government should consider reviewing if such a practice had discouraged competition in the market. He also urged the Commission to look into the prices and service quality of the contractors on the List to see if they were comparable with the ones offered by the contractors who were not on the List.

30. Mr KWOK Wai-keung noted that the Commission issued a set of model "Non-collusion clauses" and a "Non-collusion certificate" in December 2017. He considered the model clauses and certificate a useful reference for procurers

in various trades, and asked if staff in government departments and statutory bodies, such as the Housing Department, would also make reference to the model clauses and certificate in carrying out duties related to procurement, contracting and tender.

31. Mr Rasul BUTT of the Commission advised that the Commission had been actively promoting the model clauses and certificate to government departments and statutory bodies. Government departments and statutory bodies such as the Urban Renewal Authority, the Hong Kong Housing Authority and the Innovation and Technology Commission had responded positively in adopting the model clauses and certificate in their tender documents.

32. The Chairman relayed the concern of the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce ("HKGCC") that HKGCC, as well as trades concerned and the public, had not been consulted before the Commission published the model clauses and certificate. HKGCC was of the view that some terms in the model clauses and certificate went against certain commercial practices. The Chairman gave the examples that it was sometimes necessary for tenderers to communicate with suppliers/contractors for making assessments before submitting a bid; and that some small and medium enterprises would jointly bid for large projects, yet such cooperative arrangements could not be disclosed to the procuring organization due to the commercially sensitive nature of the cooperation. He said that the abovementioned practices seemed to be in conflict with certain terms in the model clauses and certificate, yet there was no channel for HKGCC to express the relevant views and concerns to the Commission.

33. Mr Rasul BUTT of the Commission advised that the model clauses and certificate which were drawn up according to the Ordinance aimed to give warnings and combat cartel conduct. The model clauses were intended as general references only and might not be appropriate for all tenders or all sectors. Therefore, undertakings should adopt the model clauses as appropriate to suit their individual needs.

34. Ms Anna WU of the Commission added that the model clauses would serve, inter alia, as a reference for the evidential requirements of cases under the Ordinance. The Commission would appreciate the chance to discuss the relevant matters with the business sector. Besides, she pointed out that the joint ventures exempted from the Ordinance were stated clearly in the relevant guidelines issued by the Commission. The guidelines could be reviewed on a need basis.

*Litigation work and resources of the Competition Commission*

35. Mr CHAN Chun-ying noted that the Government would provide the Commission with a dedicated funding of \$238 million for supporting the Commission's litigation work. He sought information on how the Commission was going to spend the money and whether the funding would be given to the Commission in one go or in phases. Furthermore, he suggested that relevant performance indicators such as the shortened time taken to process a case and the increase in the number of cases processed should be set with regard to the provision of the funding in order to facilitate the effective use of the money.

36. Ms Anna WU of the Commission advised that the dedicated funding would be provided to the Commission in phases over a five-year period. Details on the disbursement and replenishment of the funding were still subject to the discussion between the Government and the Commission. The Commission would have to discuss with the Government the provision of further funding when the \$238 million funding was nearly used up. To facilitate public monitoring of the Commission's litigation work, the Commission would issue annual reports in which relevant information was included, as well as issue press release for every litigation case. Depending on the need and details of individual cases, the Commission would consider providing the public with more information on certain cases through other means.

37. Mr Kenneth LEUNG noted the dedicated funding of \$238 million for supporting the Commission's litigation work, and sought information on the proportion of the Commission's litigation work being handled internally and being contracted out.

38. Ms Anna WU of the Commission advised that the dedicated funding would be spent on the Commission's litigation work as well as paying the costs associated with the litigation work. Subject to further discussion between the Commission and the Government, such costs would be incurred by, for example, hiring lawyers, payment of legal costs as a result of adverse rulings by the court and handling appeals. She advised that most of the said work could be conducted internally. However, the litigation itself had to be contracted out to barristers and law firms given the requirements in respect of procedures, expertise and experience. The dedicated funding had provided a safety net for the Commission's litigation work.

39. The Deputy Chairman was concerned about how long the dedicated funding of \$238 million was expected to last, given the huge costs associated with court proceedings. He enquired if the Commission had reached any

consensus with the Government on the way forward regarding the resources for the Commission to carry out its litigation work.

40. The Chairman held a similar view that litigation costs could be enormous. He thus enquired if there was a mechanism for the Government to ensure the continuity of the Commission's litigation work by providing the Commission with adequate subvention.

41. Ms Anna WU of the Commission advised that the amount of the dedicated funding for the Commission's litigation work was estimated based on the anticipated yearly increase in the number of litigation cases of the Commission. The funding would be provided by the Government in phases over a five-year period. Nevertheless, new developments to individual cases might cause changes to such an arrangement, and that details of the arrangement were subject to further discussion between the Commission and the Government.

42. Mr Holden CHOW remarked that under the Ordinance, the Commission was responsible for bringing proceedings in the Tribunal. Mr CHOW asked if the Government/ the Commission would consider allowing private actions to the effect that the public had an additional way of seeking justice and that the workload of the Commission be reduced.

43. Ms Anna WU of the Commission considered that allowing private actions would be beneficial to the public as well as the Commission's work. This was because it would better protect the human rights of individuals and provide more precedents to the interpretation of the Ordinance due to an expected increase in court cases subsequently. She therefore remained open to the option of allowing private actions.

44. Mr Holden CHOW was glad to note that two cases had been brought to the Tribunal so far. Taking into account that investigation work could be complicated, time-consuming and labour intensive, Mr CHOW expressed concern about the manpower resources for the Commission to discharge its functions, in particular its investigation, law enforcement and litigation work.

45. Ms Anna WU of the Commission advised that the increased subvention from the Government would allow the Commission to expand its workforce. While work that required specialized professional expertise would be contracted out, the Commission would step up the training provided for its staff for enhanced efficiency and knowledge in competition matters. More cooperation with various professional bodies would be engaged to this end.

*Reviewing the Competition Ordinance*

46. Mr Dennis KWOK noted that with the Ordinance being in full implementation for more than two years, the Commission was planning to review some of its guidelines and policies. In this regard, he enquired about the Commission's views on reviewing the Ordinance.

47. Mr Kenneth LEUNG recalled that the Government had undertaken to review the Ordinance after three years of its full implementation. Given that statutory bodies were currently excluded from the regulatory ambit of the Ordinance, Mr LEUNG asked if the Government would consider covering these statutory bodies in the Ordinance during the review.

48. The Deputy Chairman asked if the Government would in future require government departments to assess if the government policies to be implemented would breach the Ordinance.

49. Mr Brent SNYDER of the Commission advised that to his understanding, the Government intended to review some aspects of the Ordinance as soon as possibly in 2018. Three areas might be reviewed. These areas included statutory bodies' exemption from the Ordinance; exclusion of private enforcement right from the Ordinance; and exclusion of cross-sector merger enforcement from the Ordinance. The Commission had already set up an internal working group to review these and other issues and to provide its views based on the Commission's experience with the Ordinance. In his opinion, private enforcement right could supplement the enforcement activities of the Commission and benefit the legal community who could gain more experience in representing clients.

50. Ms Anna WU of the Commission supplemented that certain aspects of the Ordinance had been discussed among the public before. Such aspects included whether or not Hong Kong should have a merger regime; whether the Commission should be provided with information gathering powers that would compel the production of materials when undertaking future market studies; and the deterrent effect of the Ordinance in terms of penalties. The Commission would discuss with the Government and consult LegCo after it had come up with a list of issues to be included in the review.

*Auto-fuel market in Hong Kong*

51. Mr KWOK Wai-keung noted that the Commission had identified a number of structural and behavioral features of the local auto-fuel market in the

report on its study into the auto-fuel market in Hong Kong released in May 2017. He enquired about the Commission's follow-up actions to such features and the recommendations made in the report.

52. Mr Holden CHOW noted the Commission's report on the study into the auto-fuel market in Hong Kong released in May 2017, and enquired about the progress in relation to two of the recommendations made in the report. The two recommendations were namely re-introducing 95 RON petrol to promote greater choice for consumers, and enabling more sites for petrol filling station use to be tendered and/or converted to reduce barriers to market entry.

53. Mr Rasul BUTT of the Commission advised that as outlined in the report, the two features of the Hong Kong auto-fuel market, namely that prices were relatively high in Hong Kong, and that prices were similar across companies, on their own could not be taken as hard evidence of anti-competitive conduct. However, the Commission would follow up should information of suspected anti-competitive conduct come to its attention. He added that as recommended in the report, introducing structural reforms to the auto-fuel market, such as various interventions at the terminal storage, would enhance competition in the market.

54. Mr LUK Chung-hung noted that currently the Consumer Council would post onto its website information of the various types of discounts on auto-fuel products offered by retailers. However, he opined that little information on the discounts offered to larger customers operating a fleet of vehicles was available in the public domain, in particular discounts relating to diesel purchases.

55. Mr Rasul BUTT of the Commission advised that the Commission had requested information relating to the fleet discounts offered by oil companies when it conducted the study into the auto-fuel market. He considered that such information would be useful for the Commission to assess and analyze the competition situation of the market. However, most oil companies declined to provide such information, claiming that the information was commercially sensitive.

56. Noting that auto-fuel products in Hong Kong were mostly imported from Singapore, Mr LUK Chung-hung considered that auto-fuel prices in Hong Kong could be lower if there were alternative sources of auto-fuel supply. In this regard, he enquired about the reasons for the single source of auto-fuel products at present.

57. Mr Rasul BUTT of the Commission referred to the response from the oil companies to the Commission that importing auto-fuel products from Singapore was a commercial decision. According to the information gathered by the

Commission, major oil companies in Hong Kong owned oil refineries in Singapore. It was therefore not unreasonable for these oil companies to import auto-fuel products from their own refineries.

(At 12:44 pm, the Chairman directed that the meeting be extended for 5 minutes.)

Motion

58. Mr Holden CHOW moved the following motion which was seconded by Mr WONG Ting-kwong –

"本委員會促請政府必須確保競委會具有足夠資源，持續為員工提供培訓，並擁有足夠經驗的人手，以跟進個案調查和相關執法工作。"

(Translation)

"This Panel urges the Government to ensure that the Commission will have adequate resources to provide staff training on an on-going basis and enough experienced staff to follow up case investigation and relevant law enforcement work."

59. The Chairman ruled that the motion was directly related to the agenda item under discussion. Members agreed that the motion should be dealt with at the meeting.

60. The Chairman put the motion to vote. All members took part in the voting voted for the motion. No members voted against the motion or abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response to the motion was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)996/17-18(01) on 30 April 2018.)*

**VI. Any other business**

61. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:46 pm.