立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2) 1433/01-02
(These minutes have been seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/FE

LegCo Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene

Minutes of Meeting
held on Monday, 28 January 2002 at 8:30 am
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

Members Present	:	Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP (Chairman) Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP (Deputy Chairman) Dr Hon David CHU Yu-lin, JP Hon James TO Kun-sun Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, JP Dr Hon YEUNG Sum Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung
Member attending	:	Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yee, JP
Members absent	:	Hon WONG Yung-kan Hon CHOY So-yuk Hon LEUNG Fu-wah, MH, JP Dr Hon LO Wing-lok Hon WONG Sing-chi
Public Officers Attending	:	Item IV Mrs Stella HUNG Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (A) Mrs Ingrid YEUNG

Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (A) 1

Mr David LAU
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (A) 2

Dr Y Y HO
Consultant (Community Medicine)(Risk Assessment and Communication)
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Item V

Mrs Stella HUNG
Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (A)

Mr David LAU
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (A) 2

Mr W H CHEUK
Deputy Director (Environmental Hygiene)
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr HUNG Chi-pai
Assistant Director (Operations) 1
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr CHEUNG Wai-ying
Superintendent (Licensing and Inspection Review)
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Item VI

Mrs Stella HUNG
Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (A)

Mr David LAU
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (A) 2

Mrs Marion LAI
Deputy Director (Administration & Development)
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mrs Angel CHOI
Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 2

Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr K K LEE
Assistant Director (Operations) 2
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Mr WONG Shiu-kwan
Project Director 3
Architectural Services Department

Mr Gary NG
Project Electrical and Mechanical Engineer
Architectural Services Department

Attendance by Invitation : Item IV

Greenpeace

Mr Howard LIU, Ph. D
Campaign Director

Miss Nicole TSE
Campaign Assistant

Clerk in Attendance : Mrs Constance LI
Chief Assistant Secretary (2)5

Staff in Attendance : Ms Joanne MAK
Senior Assistant Secretary (2)2

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes of meetings
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)809/01-02 and CB(2)966/01-02)

The minutes of the special meeting on 5 November 2001 and the regular meeting on 30 November 2001 were confirmed.

II. Date of next meeting and items for discussion
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)967/01-02(01) and (02))

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration at the next regular meeting scheduled for 25 February 2002 (Monday) at 8:30 am -

Action

(a) Arrangements for stallholders affected by the redevelopment of Central Market;

(b) Report on the outcome of the consultation on outside seating accommodation and the way forward; and

(c) Marine Fish Culture (Amendment) Bill 2002.

III. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting
(LC Paper No. CB(2)748/01-02)

3. Members noted that the Administration had provided supplementary information on certain issues raised by members at the meeting on 30 November 2001.

IV. Results of the public consultation exercise on genetically modified (GM) food
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 713/01-02(05) and 967/01-02(03) and (04))

4. The Chairman said that the item was deferred from the last meeting. He informed members that the LegCo Secretariat had prepared a background paper on the labelling of genetically modified (GM) food for members' reference. He added that the Greenpeace had also provided a submission to the Panel.

The Administration's position

5. Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (A) 1 (PAS(EF)(A)1) referred members to the Administration's paper which set out the results of the public consultation exercise on GM food labelling and the proposed way forward. PAS(EF)(A)1 said that the food trade had indicated that if a mandatory GM food labelling system was adopted for Hong Kong, they would need to obtain documentation from suppliers or producers of raw materials to certify whether the raw materials had been genetically modified. They would also have to conduct tests on the raw materials and food products to verify the information provided by the suppliers. These would substantially increase the costs for the food trade.

6. PAS(EF)(A)1 further said that the trade had pointed out that Hong Kong was a small market for overseas food manufacturers. If the GM food labelling system in Hong Kong was very different from those implemented in other markets, overseas food manufacturers or suppliers would probably give up the Hong Kong market. The trade was worried that there would be an increase in food prices and a reduction in the variety of food products available for the community.

Action

7. PAS(EF)(A)1 advised that as food was a basic necessity, the Administration would have to consider the potential impact of a mandatory labelling system on the food prices and supply. Before deciding the way forward, the Administration would conduct an economic assessment on the financial impact of various proposed options of GM food labelling approach on every sector of the food trade and on food prices. The Administration would also need to assess the resource implications and the feasibility of each option.

The views of Greenpeace

8. At the Chairman's invitation, Miss Nicole TSE, representative of Greenpeace, briefed members on the submission and the findings of surveys conducted by Greenpeace. Miss TSE said that according to Greenpeace's survey in January 2002, all the food suppliers who had responded were in support of a labelling system for GM food. Moreover, contrary to the information provided by the Administration regarding the trade's concern, many food suppliers who had responded to the survey conducted by Greenpeace indicated that the cost implications for complying with the GM food labelling requirements were not significant, and that they would not transfer the additional costs to consumers. As such, Greenpeace considered that a labelling system for GM food should not lead to an increase in food prices.

9. Miss TSE said that many other places in the world had already adopted GM food labelling, and Hong Kong was lagging far behind. She further said that there were adequate laboratory facilities in Hong Kong to support the implementation of GM food labelling. She urged the Administration to introduce a mandatory GM food labelling system in Hong Kong as soon as possible.

Discussion

10. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong noted that the Administration had taken two years to study GM food labelling and the relevant public consultation exercise had also been completed. He said that it was clear from the consultation exercise that the majority of the community was in support of the adoption of a labelling system for GM food labelling which was also the prevailing trend of the international community. He considered that the Administration was only deferring a decision on the matter by conducting an economic assessment on the labelling system. Mr CHEUNG said that the interests of general public should have higher priority than those on the trade. He requested the Administration to explain its stance whether it was in favour of a labelling system for GM food. He said that he would have no objection if the economic assessment was conducted in parallel to other preparatory work for the implementation of the GM food labelling system.

11. PAS(EF)(A)1 responded that the possible impact of GM food labelling on food prices and supply was a matter of concern to both the trade and the general public. The Administration hoped that an economic assessment on the various proposed

Action

options would throw light on the feasibility of the options and would minimise any possible adverse impact on the trade and on consumers. She stressed that there was no scientific or medical evidence to date to suggest that GM food was unsafe for human consumption. She explained that the labelling of GM food was called for to enhance consumer information, rather than to enhance food safety.

12. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong considered that it was important to provide consumers with all necessary information to enable them to choose the food most suitable to them. He asked whether the Administration had formed any views on and proposed any timetable for the adoption of a labelling system for GM food. The Chairman also asked whether the Administration had already decided to introduce a labelling system for GM food, or whether a decision would depend on the outcome of the economic assessment.

13. Deputy Secretary for the Environment and Food (A) (DS(EF)(A)) responded that the purpose of the public consultation exercise was to gauge the views from all concerned parties. As the food trade had expressed strong views concerning the possible impact on food prices and supply, the Administration would need to assess the costs that consumers would be prepared to pay in return for more information on the GM content in food items. It was therefore necessary to conduct an economic assessment to facilitate the formulation of a proposal that would be acceptable to both the trade and consumers.

14. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong queried why there were discrepancies in the findings on the trade's concerns as obtained by the Administration and by Greenpeace. PAS(EF)(A)1 responded that the Administration had received views from major industry associations during the public consultation exercise. PAS(EF)(A)1 referred to a submission made by a trade association which expressed serious concern that a mandatory GM food labelling system would bring additional costs, because the importer would need to conduct tests on the raw materials and food products imported from countries like the United States of America (USA) and from Mainland.

15. Mr Jasper TSANG asked how the Administration would evaluate the different estimations provided by different food suppliers and manufactures during the economic assessment, particularly the assessment of whether overseas food suppliers would give up the Hong Kong market.

16. PAS(EF)(A)1 replied that the Administration would engage a consultancy firm to conduct the economic assessment. It was envisaged that the consultant would seek information on the costs for obtaining the relevant documentation from food suppliers or producers and for conducting tests on the raw materials and food products. The consultant would also be required to obtain information from the trade on the profit margin that would attract them to stay in their business. The Administration would then assess the impact of the various options of GM labelling approach on food prices and consumers' acceptability of the price increases, taking into account the prevailing

Action

Admin

economic situation. PAS(EF)(A)1 added that the Administration could provide further information to the Panel on the mechanics of the economic assessment.

17. Mrs Selina CHOW said that she was not a member of the Panel but she would like to provide information on the trade's views on the matter. She informed members that the trade had reservations about introducing a GM food labelling system in Hong Kong, and the trade supported the Administration's proposal that an economic assessment should be conducted before deciding the way forward. Mrs CHOW pointed out that Hong Kong relied heavily on imported food, but the Hong Kong market was a very small one to overseas food manufacturers. She said that many major food suppliers did not have a mandatory GM food labelling system in their home countries. Therefore, if local importers purchased food products from those countries, the importers would have to conduct tests on these food products and this would incur extra costs. Given the additional costs and time for complying with the labelling requirements, the importers might be deterred from importing food products from those places or simply transfer the costs to consumers by increasing the food prices. Mrs CHOW further said that it was still unclear as to which approach would be adopted for GM food labelling and these would have different cost implications. She hoped that the Administration would conduct a detailed economic assessment on the implementation of GM food labelling, and that the Administration should balance the interests of the trade and consumers.

18. Mr Tommy CHEUNG expressed support for the Administration's proposal to conduct an economic assessment before deciding the way forward. He pointed out that the trade was particularly concerned that if the threshold of GM content was set at a low level such as 3% or 1%, it would significantly increase the costs for the food trade and would in turn increase the food prices. He said that while he supported enhancing consumer information, there was no urgency in implementing a mandatory labelling system since this might have adverse impact on the trade.

19. The Chairman said that some members of the trade had reflected to him that while they were prepared that GM food labelling would eventually be introduced in Hong Kong, they hoped that the Administration would conduct further assessment on the options. The Chairman asked about the timeframe for conducting the economic assessment and whether the Administration would make reference to the experience of overseas countries. PAS(EF)(A)1 replied that the consultant would also make reference to overseas experience, and the economic assessment would be completed by summer 2002. However, she pointed out that some overseas countries were major food suppliers and did not have to rely on imported food as much as Hong Kong did.

20. The Chairman sought clarification on a recent media report that Government was funding the marketing of GM tomato grown on the Mainland by Hong Kong Agritech Limited, and that Government would get dividends from the profits because it owned 40% of the company's shares. PAS(EF)(A)1 replied that the company in question had applied for funds from the Commerce and Industry Bureau for

Action

development of food products, which had nothing to do with labelling of GM food. She agreed to provide information after the meeting to clarify Government's involvement in the project and whether it owned shares of that company.

Admin

(*Post-meeting note* : The Administration had subsequently provided the information which was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2) 1157/01-02.)

21. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman requested the Administration to report to the Panel the outcome of the economic assessment and recommendations on the way forward around September/October 2002.

Admin

V. The inspection and open categorization of food establishments - outcome of consultation and the proposed way forward
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 757/00-01(01) and CB(2)967/01-02(05)-(06))

22. The Chairman said that the LegCo Secretariat had provided a background paper on previous discussions in the Council on issues relating to the inspection and open categorization of food establishments for members' reference.

23. Referring to paragraph 7 of the Administration's paper, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that the Administration should also consider providing a timetable for the implementation of the new Open Categorization Scheme (OCS). He expressed concern that there had been food poisoning cases caused by lunch boxes supplied to schools. He considered that the grading of food factories under an OCS would be useful information to schools in deciding whether to purchase lunch boxes from any particular food factory or establishment. He suggested that a pilot scheme of OCS covering those food factories and establishments which supplied lunch boxes to schools should start as soon as possible. The Chairman considered that the pilot scheme of OCS should cover all food factories which supplied large volume of different food products to different places.

24. Deputy Director (Environmental Hygiene) (DD(EH)) of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) responded that there was no less protection of public health now because food factories were subject to frequent inspection by health inspectors under the present inspection system. Nevertheless, he agreed to consider the suggestions of the Chairman and Mr CHEUNG.

25. Mr TSANG Yok-sing said that during the Panel's previous discussions on the OCS proposal, members had expressed diverse views on the need for an OCS. He further said that while a grading system would provide useful information for FEHD in monitoring the hygiene standard of certain food establishments, he had doubts on the usefulness of an open grading system for food establishments. Noting that the

Action

Administration planned to launch a pilot scheme in 2003, Mr TSANG asked how its effectiveness would be assessed.

26. DD(EH) responded that the OCS was to reflect the difference in hygiene standards among food establishments and provide information to consumers. He explained that while a food establishment would get a licence after it had complied with all the health, building and fire safety requirements, its hygiene conditions could vary greatly afterwards. He said that under the new OCS, each inspection would cover a range of hygiene and food safety aspects and the scores attained during inspections over every six months would form the basis of the grading of a food establishment. He stressed that the score-based inspection system would be very objective. He further said that for the pilot scheme to be launched in 2003, the operators concerned would be informed of their grading which would not be made public. The operators could then make improvements to their food establishments before the implementation of the new OCS.

27. Mr TSANG Yok-sing further asked how the pilot scheme would affect the Administration's decision on the implementation date for the new OCS. DD(EH) responded that the pilot scheme would provide useful information such as the general scores attained by food establishments and the number of Hygiene Managers (HM) or Hygiene Supervisors (HS) trained. The new OCS would be implemented about one year after the pilot run.

28. Mr TSANG said that he would accept the new score-based inspection system if the score or grading was for better regulation and improvement of food establishments. However, he was worried that the new OCS would convey a message to consumers that they would have to be prepared for the risk if they chose to patronize a low-graded food establishment. DD(EH) responded that consumers would have various considerations, such as price, food quality and personal preference, in deciding whether to patronize a particular food establishment. He said that the grading under the new OCS was to provide additional information to consumers on the hygiene standard of a food establishment. He pointed out that there was no direct relationship between food prices and the hygiene standard of a food establishment.

29. Mr Tommy CHEUNG said that he agreed with the views expressed by Mr TSANG. He was of the view that if a food establishment was issued a licence, it meant that it had attained a satisfactory hygiene standard. He added that the food hygiene standard of food establishments in Hong Kong was high by international standard. He said that the trade opposed to the proposal of OCS because any grading awarded was time-related, and did not truly reflect the general hygiene standard of the food establishments. They also considered that the score obtained by the food establishments during inspection relied to a large extent on the subjective judgement of the inspectors. The trade was also of the view that any OCS was unnecessary as all food establishments were bound by the licensing requirements and put under the regulatory control of FEHD.

Action

30. Mr Tommy CHEUNG considered that there were more disadvantages than advantages in implementing an OCS. He pointed out that the previous "5-star" grading system was a failure as some food establishments graded as "5-star" were subsequently found in breach of the licensing requirements and associated with food poisoning cases. Mr CHEUNG further said that the problems with lunch boxes supplied to schools might be caused by factors beyond the control of the food factory, for example, the hygiene conditions during delivery and the food storage practice of schools. He urged the Administration to reconsider the need to introduce the proposed OCS.

31. DD(EH) explained that a licence would be issued if a food establishment complied with all the health, building and fire safety requirements, but the licence was not a guarantee of the hygiene conditions of a food establishment. He said that in 2001, 251 licensed food establishments had their licences suspended and about 350 food poisoning cases (with some 1 000 people affected) were associated with licensed food establishments. To allay the trade's concern about the objectivity of the grading system under the OCS, DD(EH) said that the Administration would publish a comprehensive "Food Hygiene Code" on inspection standards for reference by the trade and health inspectors. Moreover, the grading given under the new OCS would be reviewed every six months in the light of inspection results.

32. Mr Tommy CHEUNG welcomed the Administration's proposal of reducing the frequency of inspections and placing more emphasis on health education during inspection. He said that FEHD conducted about 490 000 inspections a year on food establishments in Hong Kong, which was significantly higher than those conducted in overseas countries. He added that in Los Angeles, inspections were made, by appointment, once every four months. Moreover, health education was the emphasis of those inspections.

33. Mr Tommy CHEUNG also welcomed the proposed improvements to the Demerit Points System and hoped that it could be implemented as soon as possible. On the proposal of introducing HM and HS requirements, Mr CHEUNG said that the trade welcomed the training courses which were provided by FEHD free of charge to employees of the food establishments. However, the trade was very concerned about the additional costs incurred to the trade for implementing the HM/HS requirements, as the proposal would involve extra duties such as training the food handlers and writing reports. He considered that FEHD already had sufficient power to monitor the hygiene standard of food premises. For example, FEHD could deploy more staff for inspections if necessary, and the Public Health and Municipal Services (Amendment) Ordinance 2002 which was recently enacted empowered the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene to make a closure order on any premises which posed an immediate health hazard.

34. DD(EH) made the following responses-

Action

(a) There would be flexibility in implementing the HM and HS requirements. For example, no demerit points would be applied to a food establishment operating without a HM/HS during an inspection, if the HM/HS was on leave or had just resigned. Moreover, a reasonable grace period would be allowed for the recruitment to fill the HM/HS posts.

(b) A risk-based inspection system would be introduced in the second half of 2002 and food establishments would be classified into categories I, II and III according to their risk level. More frequent inspections would be conducted on the food premises in the high-risk category and there would be more emphasis on health education during inspections.

(c) The improvements to the Demerit Points System would be introduced as soon as possible. Inspections to food establishments during peak hours were still necessary, although FEHD would try to minimise the impact on operators.

(d) DFEH would only exercise her power to make a closure order under very serious circumstances when the hygiene conditions (or the contamination) in the premises concerned were so poor that it posed an immediate heath hazard.

35. Mr James TO was of the view that while health education was important, it was no substitute for enforcement which was to ensure compliance of the necessary public health and hygiene requirements. He considered that it was important to provide consumers with information on the food safety and hygiene aspects of food establishments, and he supported the implementation of the new OCS. He believed that the cost implications of the OCS to the Administration and the trade were not significant.

36. Dr YEUNG Sum said that he appreciated the trade's concern about the proposed OCS, as food business was facing much difficulty under the present economic situation. However, he pointed out that it was necessary to uphold the food safety and hygiene standards of food establishments, because food incidents would adversely affect the international image of Hong Kong as a food paradise. He considered that the Administration should address the trade's concern when implementing the OCS and other proposals, in order to ensure that the proposed system was fair and objective and that it would not cause too much inconvenience to the trade. He also suggested that the Administration should conduct a review after a period of operation to fine-tune the system.

37. Mr Michael MAK asked about the differences between the previous and the proposed OCSs. DD(EH) responded that the previous "5-star" grading system relied

Action

on the results of only five inspections carried out from June to September 1999 covering twelve aspects. However, under the new OCS, the grading would be based on the results of regular inspections which would cover some 60 different aspects over a fairly long period of time. To reduce any human factor in the assessment during inspections, different health inspectors would be assigned to inspect the same food establishment.

38. In response to Mr Michael MAK, Assistant Director (Operations) 1 of FEHD said that the causes of food incidents included food sources, improper handling of food and poor cleanliness of the food establishments concerned. He added that there was room for improvement in the overall hygiene standards of the food establishments.

39. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that the Panel supported the proposals to improve the Demerit Points System and to refocus the inspection system, but members had divergent views on the need for an OCS. He added that except for Mr Tommy CHEUNG, members had no strong views on the HM and HS proposals.

VI. Proposal to replace the cremators at Fu Shan Crematorium

(LC Paper No. CB(2)967/01-02(07))

40. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong sought clarification as to whether the smoke emissions would be mitigated to an acceptable level after the replacement cremators came into operation. Deputy Director (Administration & Development) (DD(A&D)) replied that the design of the new cremators would fully comply with the relevant environmental protection criteria including the Guidance Notes on the Best Practical Means for Incinerators (Crematoria) issued by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD). She added that the replacement cremators would be equipped with high temperature combustion chambers to ensure complete combustion in the cremation process, and a flue gas filtering system to remove particles and waste gases in the emission from the cremators. As a result, the dark smoke emitted from the cremators would be mitigated.

41. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong asked why the cremators could commence operation in April 2004 if the project was estimated to complete in June 2004. DD(A&D) said that the project comprised two stages. The four new cremators would commence operation in April 2004, and the existing four cremators of the Fu Shan Crematorium would be demolished afterwards. The entire project (including the demolition of the existing cremators) was scheduled for completion by June 2004.

42. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong asked whether the smoke emitted from the new cremators would still disperse to the residential buildings at the upper level of the hill as Fu Shan Crematorium was located at the lower part of the hill. Project Director 3 (PD3) of the Architectural Services Department (ASD) responded that based on the air

Action

dispersion modelling analyses, the density of particles emitted from the new cremators would be very low and would not cause environmental problem to the residents nearby. Moreover, the dioxin produced in the cremation process would be filtered away and the emissions, such as smoke and particulate matter would be monitored by a computer system which would make an automatic report to EPD if any problem was detected.

43. Dr YEUNG Sum asked what measures the Administration would adopt to mitigate the dark smoke from the existing cremators before they were replaced in 2004. DD(A&D) explained that the dark smoke was caused by incomplete combustion in the cremation process. To mitigate the problem, the Administration had adopted the following measures -

(a) better maintenance and management of the existing cremators to ensure their effective functioning;

(b) deployment of experienced and trained staff to operate the cremators;

(c) installation of temperature monitoring device to the cremators to ensure complete combustion;

(d) appeal to the families of the deceased to use coffins made of more environmental friendly materials and to reduce the amount of mementos put into coffins.

44. DD(A&D) added that the emission from the cremators of Fu Shan Crematorium was being monitored by EPD which would advise FEHD on any necessary pollution abatement measures to be taken. In response to Dr YEUNG Sum, DD(A&D) confirmed that EPD had not requested FEHD to take any necessary mitigating measures recently.

45. Mr Michael MAK asked whether EPD had made any assessment on the emissions of Fu Shan Crematorium and whether EPD had any views on the timetable for the existing cremators to cease operation. DD(A&D) reiterated that emissions from the cremators was monitored by EPD which was also involved in the replacement project. So far, EPD had not indicated any serious problems with the emission of Fu Shan Crematorium.

46. In reply to Mr Tommy CHEUNG, PD3 of ASD said that state-of-the-art technology would be used for the proposed replacement cremators. The new cremators would be equipped with filtering devices so that the emissions would be odourless and smokeless. He added that the chimneys of the proposed cremators would be 19 metres tall, which was the optimal height having regard to the visual effect and circumstantial factors such as landscape and wind direction.

Action

47. The Chairman asked whether the replacement cremators would bring about any increase in efficiency, and whether there were similar replacement plans for the existing cremators in other crematoria, such as Diamond Hill Crematorium. DD(A&D) said that there would be an increase in efficiency after the replacement cremators were put to operation. At present, each of the existing cremators at Fu Shan Crematorium provide three cremation sessions daily, while each of the new cremators would provide five sessions daily. As regards the replacement of cremators in other crematoria, DD(A&D) provided the following information-

(a) the cremators of Cape Collinson Crematorium had all been replaced with new ones during 1995 to 2001;

(b) the construction of replacement cremators of Kwai Chung Crematorium was underway and expected to be completed by the end of 2002;

(c) the Environmental Impact Assessment for the construction and operation of replacement cremators in Diamond Hill Crematorium would commence soon, and construction works would start at the end of 2003;

(d) the Administration would closely monitor the conditions of existing cremators in the remaining crematoria to see if replacements would be required.

48. The Chairman said that the Panel supported the proposed replacement of cremators at Fu Shan Crematorium. Members noted that the Administration planned to submit the proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee in February 2002.

49. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:25 am.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
25 March 2002