

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1478/01-02
(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/BC/15/00/2

**Bills Committee on
Noise Control (Amendment) Bill 2001**

**Meeting on
Friday, 22 March 2002, at 10:00 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon IP Kwok-him, JP (Chairman)
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP
Hon HUI Cheung-ching, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk
Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon LI Fung-ying, JP
Hon Michael Mak Kwok-fung
Hon LAU Ping-cheung
- Members absent** : Dr Hon David CHU Yu-lin, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon YEUNG Yiu-chung, BBS
- Public officers attending** : Mr Howard CHAN
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food
- Mr Elvis AU
Assistant Director of Environmental Protection
- Mr K S CHAN
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Geoffrey FOX
Senior Assistant Law Draftsman

**Attendance by
invitation:**

The Hong Kong Construction Association Limited

Mr Joseph SHEK Y M
Environmental Committee Chairman

Mr Patrick CHAN W T
Secretary General

MTR Corporation Limited

Dr Glenn FROMMER
Environmental Manager

Hong Kong Environmental Law Association

Mr Ian COCKING
Vice-Chair

Hong Kong Institute of Acoustics

Mr Richard KWAN
Immediate Past Chairman

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

Staff in attendance : Mr LEE Yu-sung
Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1

Ms Bernice WONG
Assistant Legal Adviser1

Miss Yvonne YU
Senior Assistant Secretary (1)4

I. Confirmation of minutes

1. The minutes of meeting held on 21 February 2002 were confirmed.

II. Meeting with deputations and the Administration

- LC Paper No. CB(1)1317/01-02(01) - Submission from the Hong Kong Construction Association Limited
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1317/01-02(02) - Submission from MTR Corporation Limited
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1317/01-02(03) - Submission from The Chinese Manufacturers' Association of Hong Kong
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1317/01-02(04) - Submission from Hong Kong Cable Television Limited
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1317/01-02(05) - Submission from The Hongkong Electric Company Limited
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1359/01-02(01) - Submission from Hong Kong Environmental Law Association
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1359/01-02(02) - Submission from Hong Kong Institute of Acoustics
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1350/01-02(03) - Submission from Masons International Law Firm
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1359/01-02(03) - Submission from Tai Po Environmental Association
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1359/01-02(04) - Submission from Federation of Hong Kong Industries
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1350/01-02(01) - The Administration's response to the issues raised at the meeting on 21 February 2002
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1350/01-02(02) - The Administration's consolidated response to the submissions from five deputations
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1359/01-02(05) - The Administration's response to the submissions from Masons International Law Firm

The Bill, related papers and other papers previously issued

- LC Paper No. CB(3)790/00-01 - The Bill
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/01-02(02) - Marked-up copy of the Bill prepared by the Legal Service Division
- The Legislative Council Brief on the Bill issued by the Environment and Food Bureau in June 2001
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/01-02(03) - Paper provided by the Administration in February 2002 supplementing the Legislative Council Brief
- LC Paper No. LS133/00-01 - The Legal Service Division Report on the Bill dated 26 June 2001
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/01-02(04) - Letter dated 26 June 2001 from Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1 to the Secretary for Environment and Food
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/01-02(05) - The Administration's response dated 28 June 2001 to Letter dated 26 June 2001 from Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1 to the Secretary for Environment and Food
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1148/00-01(03) - Discussion paper provided by the Administration for the meeting of the Environmental Affairs Panel on 8 May 2001
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1812/00-01 - Extract of the minutes of the meeting of Environmental Affairs Panel on 8 May 2001 (which was re-circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1139/01-02 on 22 February 2002)
2. The Committee deliberated (Index of proceedings attached at **Annex A**).
3. The Administration undertook to follow up the following issues and provide response/information as appropriate:

Human rights implications of the Bill

- (a) The Hong Kong Environmental Law Association (HKELA) considered that as under the proposed amendments to the Noise Control Ordinance (NCO) (Cap. 400), the prosecution would no longer need to prove the "consent, connivance, negligence or omission" on the part of a director, the proposed provisions were therefore wrong in principle and could potentially have human rights implications. While the Administration advised at the meeting that the Human Rights Unit and Basic Law Unit of the Department of Justice had found the Bill in order, members were still concerned about the human rights implications of the Bill and requested further comments from the Administration. Members would also appreciate if the HKELA could elaborate its views on human rights implications in writing.

Liability of public officers

- (b) In response to the concerns raised by members and the Hong Kong Construction Association Limited (HKCA) that no personal criminal liability was placed on public officers, the Administration advised that there was a well established and effective mechanism in dealing with contraventions of NCO by public officers in the course of carrying out their official duties. If such contraventions were not terminated to the satisfaction of the Noise Control Authority, the latter would report to the Chief Secretary (CS). The Administration undertook to provide further details on the number of cases in which the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) required government departments to take remedial action under the NCO, as well as the number of cases that were subsequently reported to CS and their outcome.
- (c) In the course of discussion, the Administration had compared the role of the Government in work projects to that of a property developer which had engaged a contractor to carry out construction works. However, some members pointed out that some Government departments could assume the role of a contractor of a project and engage workers for carrying out the works. They sought clarification from the Administration on whether there were such cases.

Assistance to the construction trade

- (d) Members noted the HKCA's remarks that the Administration had not provided them with clear guidance as to how to comply with certain statutory requirements. They also noted the suggestion of the Hong Kong Institute of Acoustics that some new construction methods and equipment might reduce the noise levels, as well as the view of the MTR Corporation Limited on a reward system for environmental compliance. The Administration was requested to consider these

suggestions and provide comments as appropriate.

Report of the Construction Industry Review Committee

- (e) Given that the Works Bureau (WB) was appointed as the lead agency within the Government to co-ordinate with relevant bureaux and departments on all construction-related matters, and to co-ordinate the implementation of the recommendations of the Construction Industry Review Committee (CIRC), the Environment and Food Bureau undertook to refer members' concern on the progress on the implementation of recommendations of the CIRC to the WB.

Regulatory impact on the construction trade

- (f) HKCA pointed out that no matter how much effort the management of a construction company would put into developing and enforcing management controls at work sites, there was always the possibility that a worker or a sub-contractor's worker could circumvent the system and violate the NCO. The director, manager, or secretary of the management had no absolute control to stop this from happening. However, the Bill would hold them personally criminally liable. The Administration might wish to comment on the HKCA's concern about the special nature of noise pollution and the liability of the corporate management on acts over which they did not have absolute control.

Conviction statistics

- (g) HKCA pointed out that as the majority of construction companies undertaking large-scale works were bodies corporate and during the peak period of the construction trade, they would inevitably stand a higher chance of committing offences and being prosecuted than partnerships or sole proprietors. The Administration's comments were sought on the HKCA's argument.
- (h) HKCA and some members pointed out that contractors might find the equipment assumed in the project proponents' relevant Environmental Impact Assessment report for construction noise assessment unsuitable only after they tendered for the construction works. Given the tight time frame for completing the works, the construction company could not afford to apply to the EPD for a new construction noise permit and carried out works at the site in breach of the NCO. At the request of members, the Administration would provide a breakdown on the number of convicted companies that had carried out works without applying for a construction noise permit, and the number of convicted companies that had been issued with a valid construction noise permit but had carried out the prescribed construction work or used equipment not in accordance with the relevant permit condition.

Overseas practices

- (i) At the request of members, the Administration would provide information on overseas practices in handling noise offences, especially the practices of countries which had high regard for environmental protection. Members would like to find out whether overseas jurisdictions also implemented similar legislation to impose a personal criminal liability on the management of a body corporate.

Validity period for the warning system

- (j) The Administration was requested to note the strong views advanced by HKCA and some members of the Bills Committee on providing a time limit for the warning system, especially where the construction projects were of a large scale and expected to last for a long duration.

Views of concern groups

- (k) At members' request, the Administration undertook to provide the views expressed by the Advisory Council on the Environment and green groups which had been consulted on the Bill.
- (l) The Administration would provide its detailed response to concerns raised by the deputations at the meeting, as well as other submissions received at/after the meeting.

III. Any other business

- 4. The Committee agreed to hold the next meeting on Monday, 22 April 2002 at 10:45 am to continue discussion with the Administration.
- 5. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:45 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat
18 April 2002

**Proceedings of the meeting of the Bills Committee on
Noise Control (Amendment) Bill 2001**

**on Friday, 22 March 2002, at 10:00 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
<i>Agenda Item I – Confirmation of minutes</i>			
00000-000113	Chairman	- Confirmation of minutes of meeting held on 21 February 2002 - Acceptance of late membership of Mr Michael MAK and Mr Abraham SHEK to the Bills Committee in accordance with the House Rules	
<i>Agenda Item II – Meeting with deputations and the Administration</i>			
000114-000530	Chairman	- Welcoming remarks	
000531-001450	The Hong Kong Construction Association Limited (HKCA)	- Presentation by Mr Joseph SHEK (LC Paper No. CB(1)1317/01-02(01))	
001451-001726	MTR Corporation Limited (MTRC)	- Presentation by Dr Glenn FROMMER (LC Paper No. CB(1)1317/01-02(02))	
001727-003049	Hong Kong Environmental Law Association (HKELA)	- Presentation by Mr Ian COCKING (LC Paper No. CB(1)1359/01-02(01))	
003050-003257	Hong Kong Institute of Acoustics (HKIA)	- Presentation by Mr Richard KWAN (LC Paper No. CB(1)1359/01-02(02))	
003258-003321	Chairman	- Discussion between members and representatives of deputations	
003322-003627	Ms Emily LAU	- Given HKCA's objection to the Bill, any feasible measures that could be taken by the trade to deter recurrent noise offences	
003628-004315	HKCA	- Agreed with the Administration's objective to provide a better environment for the community and a Best Practice Guide was issued for such purpose - Environmental Protection Department (EPD) did not provide	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>the trade with clear guidance on what and how improvements should be made so as to prevent being prosecuted again</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There already existed a number of environmental protection ordinances - The management was personally criminally liable where they had no absolute control over certain behaviour of their workers or subcontractor's workers 	
004316-004700	MTRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing the maximum fine levels to \$500,000 or \$1,000,000 might enhance the deterrent effect for noise offences 	
004701-005205	HKCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The right approach was to help construction companies establish good noise control practices by education, training, awareness enhancement and pride promotion 	
005206-005314	Ms Emily LAU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether the construction trade would consider that increasing the maximum fine was a feasible deterrent 	
005315-005558	HKCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Given the unemployment rate of 12% in the construction trade, the trade considered that the maximum fine at \$200,000 was already a very heavy punishment - Compared with personal criminal liability, the trade might prefer a higher level of maximum fine instead 	
005559-005725	Mr LAU Ping-cheung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Asked whether deputations could recommend practical measures to improve noise pollution 	
005726-010058	HKIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In support of the Bill as the proposed amendments would provide a useful mechanism to foster more effective enforcement - There were new construction methods and equipment which could reduce the construction noise levels 	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
010059-010345	HKELA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noises were generated from all quarters and therefore an integrated approach in tackling environmental nuisances would be more effective 	
010346-010612	MTRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A reward system for environmental compliance would be more effective than draconian legislation 	
010613-010805	HKCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One important issue was whether the stipulated time frame for completing the construction works was reasonable - Agreed with HKIA that improving the methods and equipment would be effective in improving the noise environment 	
010806-010954	Mr LAU Ping-cheung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreed with MTRC that a reward system should be introduced - Concerned about the human rights implications of the Bill 	
010955-011033	Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The legal aspects on the Bill could be further discussed during the clause by clause examination 	
011034-011119	HKCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disagreed with the HKIA's point that the majority of construction companies committed noise offences because they carried out works without first applying for a construction noise permit 	
011120-011205	Chairman/HKCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reminded deputations to address the Bills Committee instead of discussing each other's viewpoint 	
011206-011605	Mr Abraham SHEK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreed with the HKCA that: - EPD failed to provide clear guidance to the trade as to how to comply with certain statutory requirements - Given the subcontracting system, the management did not have absolute control on the sites - EPD failed to give effect to the recommendations of the Construction Industry Review Committee (CIRC) - No personal criminal liability was placed on public officers for 	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		committing noise offences in the course of performing their duties	
011606-011630	Chairman	- ditto -	
011631-011636	Mr Abraham SHEK	- Asked the trade to suggest feasible ways in tackling construction noise nuisances given the prevalence of the subcontracting system	
011637-011830	HKCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhancing the environmental awareness of all tiers involved in the construction works - A reasonable time frame should be provided to contractors for completing the works - Enhancing environmental protection techniques 	
011831-012145	Mr LAW Chi-kwong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members of the Democratic Party supported the Bill in principle - The Bill could add incentive in reducing too many tiers of the subcontractorship - A company should also have its social responsibility - Requested HKELA to explain its point that the content of the codes of practice was entirely within the discretion of the Authority and there was a lack of checks and balances (Paragraph 8 of LC Paper No. CB(1)1359/01-02(01)) 	
012146-012223	HKELA	- While the codes of practice provided standards by which every director would be judged when deciding whether he had taken reasonable precautions and exercised due diligence, there was no limit on the standards that could be set by the Authority	
012224-012344	Mr LAW Chi-kwong	- As the code of practice itself would have to be reasonable, he did not consider it necessary to explicitly state in the Bill that compliance with the requirements of the codes of practice could be evidence of having taken reasonable precautions or established a proper system	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
012345-012500	HKELA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pointed out that the defence under the Bill would be open to judicial interpretation and was concerned that such defence was quite narrow as the director had to prove to the Court that he had taken reasonable precautions and exercised due diligence to prevent the commission of the offence by a body corporate 	
012501-012632	HKCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agreed that the subcontracting system might not be a direct reason for noise offences - The tight time frame for completing the works might have compelled the contractor to proceed with works which contravened the NCO 	
012633-012754	Ms LI Fung-ying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requested HKCA's comments on why some construction companies were repeated offenders 	
012755-012853	HKCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The special nature of the construction trade - Almost all construction companies undertaking major works were bodies corporate, they would inevitably stand a higher chance of committing offences and being prosecuted than partnerships or sole proprietors which were much fewer in number - Meanwhile it was during the peak period of the construction trade 	
012854-012942	Ms LI Fung-ying/ Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requested the Administration's comment on the HKCA's argument 	Admin
012943-013001	Mr Abraham SHEK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sought HKCA's elaboration on its proposed validity period for the warning system 	
013002-013153	Mr LAW Chi-kwong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned that the Bill could have human rights implications 	
013154-013226	HKELA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unlike the Water Pollution Control Ordinance and the Air Pollution Control Ordinance, the prosecution would no longer need to prove the "consent, connivance, negligence or omission" on the part of a director under the proposed amendments to 	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		the NCO	
013227-013349	HKCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The construction trade would be under a continuous threat throughout the duration of the construction period if the warning could be valid for an infinite period of time - Suggested that a validity period of 6 to 12 months should be imposed 	
013350-013418	Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closing remarks for the discussion between deputations and members - Invited the Administration's preliminary response 	
013419-014636	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would respond as far as possible at the meeting and undertook to provide a detailed written response after the meeting - Reiterated the arguments and justifications for the Bill - HKELA wrote to the South China Morning Post on 27 February 2000 in support of the Bill - Reiterated the Administration's reservation on a validity period for the warning system 	Admin
014637-014945	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EPD had held 110 seminars in the past 3 years with over 12 000 participants, and in 2001 EPD held 3 seminars jointly with HKCA and would continue communication with the trade - Issued over 30 codes of practice - Since 1999, the Administration had consulted the construction trade and the Environmental Affairs Panel on the Bill - To address the concerns of HKCA, a provision was added to provide that the EPD should give a written warning to the directors and officers concerned of a body corporate after the body corporate had committed a noise offence 	
014946-015146	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Codes of practice only served as practical guidance to the trade 	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Human Rights Unit and the Basic Law Unit of the Department of Justice had found the Bill in order 	
015147-015417	Ms Emily LAU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requested HKELA to elaborate on the human rights implications and the Administration to provide its response - Sought HKELA's comment on its change of stance, if any - Shared some deputations' concern about the unfairness of exempting public officers from personal criminal liability 	Admin
015418-015834	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was a well established and effective mechanism in dealing with contraventions of NCO by public officers in the course of carrying out their official duties - If such contraventions were not terminated to the satisfaction of the Noise Control Authority, the latter would report to the Chief Secretary (CS) - From the 110 seminars, half of the seminars were for the construction trade while the remaining seminars were for the catering and other trades 	
015835-015937	Ms Emily LAU/ Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms LAU requested clarification from the HKELA 	
015938-020003	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An article from the Chairman of the HKELA, Mr Bryan BACHNER was published in the South China Morning Post on 27 February 2000 in support of the Bill 	
020004-020116	Chairman / HKELA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr COCKING could not comment on the article as he had not had sight of it before 	
020117-020233	Ms Emily LAU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advice and assistance which the Administration could provide to the construction trade 	
020234-020508	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For example, advice had been given to the construction trade in its formulation of the Best Practice 	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>Guide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Among the prosecution cases, 70% of the construction companies carried out works without first obtaining a construction noise permit - The Local Control Offices of EPD provided “one-stop shop” services to companies applying for construction noise permits 	
020509-020744	Mr Abraham SHEK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EPD failed to give effect to the recommendations of the CIRC - The Administration should make the best endeavour to render assistance to the trade 	
020745-021150	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assured members that advice and assistance would continue to be rendered 	
021151-021316	Mr Abraham SHEK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reiterated the concern about the feasibility of providing a validity period for the warning system 	
021317-021704	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works Bureau (WB) was appointed as the lead agency to coordinate with relevant bureaux and departments on all construction-related matters, and to coordinate the implementation of the recommendations of the CIRC - Environment and Food Bureau would refer members’ concern on the progress on the implementation of recommendations of the CIRC to the WB - Reiterated that imposing a time limit on the warning system would weaken the deterrent effect and run counter to the principle that the corporate management of a body corporate should comply NCO at all times - Would continue consultation with the trade on the codes of practice 	Admin
021705-021744	Mr Abraham SHEK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed to make reference to the points system for driving offences 	
021745-021957	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ditto - 	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
021958-022011	Chairman	- ditto -	
022012-022134	Admin	- Reiterated its reservation on a time limit on the warning system	
022135-022337	Miss CHOY So-yuk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Worried about the unfairness of the Bill if there were malicious/deliberate violations by workers - Reiterated the need for a validity period for the warning system - Shared members' concern that no similar personal criminal liability was placed on public officers - Requested the Administration to provide further details on the number of cases in which the EPD required the government departments to take remedial action under the NCO, as well as the number of cases that were subsequently reported to the CS and their outcome 	
022338-022627	Admin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed amendment, which only sought to specify the responsibility of the corporate management of those bodies corporate that had already been liable for prosecution under the existing NCO provisions, did not change the existing legislative control - Compared the role of the Government in work projects to that of a property developer which had engaged a contractor to carry out construction works - Agreed to provide the information as requested by Miss CHOY So-yuk 	Admin
022628-022716	Miss CHOY So-yuk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need to provide a validity period, especially where the construction projects were of a large scale and expected to last for a long duration - Some Government departments could assume the role of a contractor of a project and engage 	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		workers for carrying out the works	
022717-022908	Admin / Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sought clarification from the Administration on whether there were such cases 	Admin
022909-023018	Ms LI Fung-ying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The time required to apply for a valid construction noise permit - The workers might only discover that the equipment was unsuitable when they arrived at the construction site - The time required to re-apply for a valid construction noise permit - On the conviction statistics, the number of convicted companies that had carried out works without applying for a construction noise permit, and the number of convicted companies that had been issued with a valid construction noise permit but had carried out the prescribed construction work or used equipment not in accordance with the relevant permit condition 	
023019-023140	Admin/ Chairman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A permit would be issued in 18 days in normal cases - On discovering that the equipment was unsuitable, the company concerned was required to inform the EPD and if EPD found the proposed change of equipment acceptable, the permit would be re-issued in less than 18 days - Agreed to provide the breakdown as requested by Ms LI Fung-ying 	Admin
023141-023357	Ms Emily LAU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - She requested the following information: - analysis according to the nature of offences - overseas practices in handling noise offences, especially the practices of countries which had high regard for environmental protection, and whether overseas jurisdictions also implemented similar legislation to impose a personal criminal liability 	

Time	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		on the management of a body corporate - the views of the Advisory Council on the Environment and other green groups which had been consulted on the Bill - a detailed response to concerns raised by the deputations at the meeting, as well as other submissions received at/after the meeting	
023358-023508	Admin	- Agreed to provide the information as requested by Ms Emily LAU	Admin
023509-023700	Mr Abraham SHEK	- Concerted effort with the trade instead of prosecution was a better way to tackle noise pollution - The actual offender was not subject to prosecution under the Bill	
023701-023944	Admin	- Objective of the Bill	
023945-024418	Chairman	- Concluding remarks - Date of the next meeting	

Note: The audio records of the above proceedings are kept at the LegCo Library

Legislative Council Secretariat
18 April 2002