

立法會
Legislative Council

Ref : CB2/PL/FE

LC Paper No. CB(2) 2777/03-04
(These minutes have been seen by
the Administration)

Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Friday, 2 April 2004 at 10:45 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)
Hon WONG Yung-kan
Hon YEUNG Yiu-chung, BBS
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung
Hon LEUNG Fu-wah, MH, JP
Dr Hon LO Wing-lok, JP

Members attending : Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP

Public officers attending : Items I & II

Dr YEOH Eng-kiong, JP
Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food

Mrs Carrie YAU
Permanent Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food

Mr Eddy CHAN
Deputy Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food
(Food & Environmental Hygiene)

Mr Gregory LEUNG
Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene

Mr Thomas CHAN
Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation

Item III

Mr Eddy CHAN
Deputy Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food
(Food & Environmental Hygiene)

Miss Vivian KO
Principal Assistant Secretary (Food & Environmental Hygiene) 1
Health, Welfare and Food Bureau

Mr Gregory LEUNG
Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene

Dr Thomas CHUNG
Assistant Director (Food Surveillance and Control)
Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

Clerk in attendance : Mrs Constance LI
Chief Council Secretary (2)5

Staff in attendance : Ms Amy WONG
Senior Council Secretary (2)1

Action

I Progress report on measures to address the avian influenza problem
[LC Paper No. CB(2) 1930/03-04(01)]

Importation of live poultry

The Chairman asked about the latest development in resuming the import of live poultry, and whether live chickens could be imported from the Mainland earlier than 12 May 2004.

2. Permanent Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food (PS(HWF)) said that the Administration was assessing the situation in the neighbouring region and had not set a date for resuming the import of live chickens into Hong Kong. PS(HWF) further said that the situation was better than expected. As there was no further outbreak of avian

Action

influenza (AI) in the region, the European Union had lifted its import restrictions for AI affected places. PS(HWF) added that while the Office International des Epizooties (OIE) had suggested a 3-month period for declaring places to be free from AI infection, it would be appropriate for Hong Kong to discuss with the Mainland authorities the monitoring measures and hygiene conditions of the farms supplying live chickens to Hong Kong, before deciding on the resumption of importation of chickens. She said that officers of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) had paid visits to certain Mainland farms supplying live chickens to Hong Kong, and these farms were free from AI infection.

3. Mr Tommy CHEUNG said that it was necessary to gradually restore public confidence in the consumption of live chickens. He urged that import of live chicken should resume as soon as possible if no problems were found with the Mainland farms supplying live chicken to Hong Kong. He asked about the lead-time for Mainland live chickens to reach Hong Kong.

4. PS(HWF) responded that it would take about one week to 10 days for the first batch of live chickens to arrive in Hong Kong. PS(HWF) said that it was ultimately a question of whether the public had confidence in the consumption of chickens. It was therefore reasonable to resume import of small quantities of live chickens during the initial period.

5. Mr Tommy CHEUNG commented that it would be difficult to restore public confidence if the Administration procrastinated on the matter of resumption of import of live chicken. Mr CHEUNG also asked why import of chilled geese and ducks had not resumed.

6. In response to Mr CHEUNG, Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) said that Hong Kong had no objection to resuming import of chilled geese and ducks. Nevertheless, the Mainland authorities had adopted a cautious approach and had not allowed the export of chilled geese and ducks to Hong Kong.

7. Mr WONG Yung-kan pointed out that the proposed 3-month period had yet to be discussed by OIE in its coming meeting. Mr WONG said that Hong Kong had adopted a different approach from the Mainland in educating the public about prevention of AI, in that Hong Kong only asked people to avoid contact with poultry. He further said that the import ban on poultry had affected the livelihood of a few thousand workers in the poultry trades in Hong Kong and also in the Mainland. He urged the Administration to resume import of live chicken quickly, if FEHD staff had already inspected the Mainland farms and found them satisfactory.

8. PS(HWF) said that FEHD staff had inspected the hygiene conditions of many Mainland poultry farms. She further said that the Administration was aware of members' concerns and would announce the timetable for resumption of import of live chicken once ready.

Action

9. Mr WONG Yung-kan asked how long it would take for FEHD staff to complete inspection of the Mainland chicken farms. He said that if these farms were found to have met the hygiene requirements, he could not understand why import of live chickens could not resume earlier than 12 May 2004. PS(HWF) undertook to convey Mr WONG's concern to SHWF.

10. Mrs Selina CHOW urged the Administration to set a timetable for the resumption of the import of live chicken, so that preparatory work by the trade could proceed in parallel to the Administration's discussions with the Mainland authorities. She did not consider it necessary to wait until 12 May if the exporting farms already satisfied the hygiene requirements. She said that certainty was important to business operators, while import quantities could be adjusted by market force.

(SHWF arrived at the meeting at this juncture.)

11. SHWF said that the Administration had no intention to hinder normal business operations. The Administration would conclude discussions with the Mainland authorities and the poultry trade as soon as possible, and would resume import of live chicken once it was safe to do so.

12. Mr IP Kwok-him said that the Administration should respond positively and promptly to the community's concerns and should not be hindered by the procedural considerations. He urged that import of live chicken be resumed as soon as possible.

Admin

13. The Chairman requested the Administration to inform the Panel once it had taken a decision on the resumption of importation of live chicken. The Administration agreed.

II. Consultation paper on segregation of poultry from customers at the retail level

14. With the aid of powerpoint presentation, SHWF and PS(HWF) briefed members on the Administration's consultation paper on segregation of poultry from customers at the retail level. SHWF highlighted the background and the Government's long-term vision to separate humans from live poultry and to minimize contact between the public and live poultry. He said that there were two possible long-term approaches, i.e. the "Cold Chain" and "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" options. In the meantime, eight immediate and medium term measures had been introduced to reduce the potential threat of AI to human in view of the recent widespread outbreak in the region. He would welcome Members' views on the two possible long-term strategies as described in Chapter 6 of the Consultation Paper. There would be a three-month public consultation period which would end on 2 July 2004.

Action

15. PS(HWF) invited Members to note the differences between the two strategies, and their resource implications as compared to the present costs for preventing AI. She explained that under the "Cold Chain" approach, the slaughtering process could be conducted in one slaughterhouse, and dressed poultry would have to undergo a chilling process and be kept in the cold chain throughout packaging, transportation and sale to ensure their wholesomeness. The capital expenditure for constructing a central slaughterhouse would be about \$200 million. The Administration would also have to offer some kind of financial compensation or "buy-out" packages to existing operators who would be directly affected by the change.

16. As regards the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" approach, PS(HWF) explained that the slaughtering process would be conducted in a few regional slaughtering hubs. In the hubs, there would be retail outlets separate from the poultry storage and culling area. Customers could have a choice of purchasing either chilled chickens or freshly slaughtered chickens. The dressed poultry might not undergo a chilling process and must be sold on the day of slaughtering. Customers could purchase freshly slaughtered chickens from these outlets or have them delivered to their home/restaurants. While the capital expenditure for building a regional slaughterhouse would be less than \$200 million, the total costs for building several of them would be higher. There was also a need to offer financial assistance to existing operators who would be directly affected by the change.

(Post-meeting note: The presentation materials were issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2) 1938/03-04(01) on 6 April 2004.)

Strategy to reduce the contact between the public and live poultry

17. Mr Albert CHAN was of the view that the "Cold Chain" approach would drive the live chicken operators out of business and destroy the live poultry industry. He considered the approach impractical and a waste of taxpayers' money because the central slaughterhouse in Hong Kong would not be able to compete with those in the Mainland. He said that separating customers from live poultry could be implemented at the retail level through modification of the market design.

18. Mr Andrew CHENG shared Mr Albert CHAN's concern. He said that the "Cold Chain" approach could lead to unemployment of many poultry workers. As regards the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" approach, he asked whether it was possible for consumers to place order for delivery of slaughtered chicken at any retail point other than the regional slaughterhouses. This would help retain employment of poultry workers at the retail level. He also requested the Administration to provide information on the number of poultry workers who could change to a new mode of operation and those who might lose their job under the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option.

Action

19. SHWF explained that the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option would allow flexibility and opportunity for existing poultry workers to change to a new mode of operation. However, the Administration did not have the requested information in hand. He pointed out that much would depend on the demand, the future operation mode and the price difference between chilled and freshly slaughtered chickens.

Admin

20. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide the information as requested by Mr Andrew CHENG, to assist the Panel's consideration of the two approaches.

21. Miss CHAN Yuen-han asked whether the Administration would consult the live poultry industry on the two approaches. She suggested that the Administration should set up a task force to discuss with the trade and deliberate on the long-term strategies. She commented that the Administration seemed to suggest that segregation of human from live poultry was inevitable, and the community could only choose between the two approaches. She said that the Administration should not think that offering compensation or buy-back packages would solve all problems. As far as she was aware, only 10% to 20% of the stall holders would be willing to surrender their licences for compensation. She urged the Administration to explore new measures to improve the crowded conditions in public markets, instead of stamping out the live poultry trade. She added that Members belonging to the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions had earlier voted against the funding proposal for ex-gratia payment to live poultry operators because the proposal did not include assistance to workers in the relevant trades.

22. SHWF said that under any of the two approaches, the Administration would endeavour to allow room for the live poultry trade to survive and assist the operators/workers to adapt to the new mode of operation or to change trade. SHWF agreed that compensation or financial assistance was not the only way to solve the problem, and the Administration would discuss the appropriate arrangements with the trade. On the buy-back packages, SHWF said that operators would be allowed one or two years to opt for the surrender of licence, and he hoped the packages could attract some of the operators. As regards the earlier funding proposal on ex-gratia payment, he explained that as Government was not the employer of poultry workers, it could only encourage employers to pay their workers after receiving compensation. He added that there would be further proposals on providing re-training and assistance to employees in the poultry trades.

23. Mr WONG Yung-kan said that Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong would oppose the central slaughtering option. Mr WONG believed that the proposed central slaughterhouse in Hong Kong would not be able to compete with those in the Mainland, as it only took one or two hours to transport chilled chickens from across the border. He asked the Administration to learn from the failure of the central slaughterhouse for ducks and geese in Western District. He

Action

considered that the short-term measures of segregating customers from live poultry at retail level would be sufficient.

24. Mr WONG Yung-kan further said that the Administration should arrange for the trade to discuss with the experts so that they could reach consensus on the best approach to address the problem. He added that he was glad to note from paragraph 4.13 of the consultation paper that the compensation and ex-gratia payments paid to the trade in past years totalled \$250 million, and not \$1,000 million as claimed by some people. He said that the trade had contributed a lot in making Hong Kong an AI-free place despite the widespread outbreak in the region recently.

25. SHWF said that the Administration would listen to all views and not only those of experts and microbiologists. He stressed that the prime concern was to safeguard public health, while there should be flexibility to enable the poultry operators to survive or to change trade. He expressed appreciation of the trade's cooperation in combating AI. However, the existing measures in markets were not yet adequate to prevent AI. The Administration hoped to introduce four rest days a month at the retail markets, and he hoped Mr WONG could enlist the trade's support for the proposal.

26. Mr WONG Yung-kan asked whether there were statistics in support of the proposed additional rest days. He further asked whether the two existing rest days, coupled with the short-term measures for markets, were already adequate in addressing the AI problem.

27. SHWF responded that any such statistics would have to base on certain assumptions. He considered that introducing additional rest days would certainly improve the hygiene conditions of markets. He pointed out that apart from H5N1, live poultry also carried other types of viruses, such as H7 and H9, which could also mutate and affect humans.

28. The Chairman said that the Administration should provide supplementary information to support its proposal for additional rest days for markets. SHWF agreed.

Admin

29. Mr LEUNG Fu-wah said that he had the impression that SHWF had a hidden agenda to wipe out the live poultry industry. This could be seen from SHWF's reluctance to resume importation of live chicken and to provide assistance to employees in the poultry trades in the recent funding proposal concerning the poultry trade. Referring to the Consultation Paper, Mr LEUNG said that -

- (a) Hong Kong had a much better public health care system as compared to many other places in the region;
- (b) AI was different from SARS in that the fatality rate of AI was significantly less than that of SARS, and Hong Kong already had experience in dealing with AI; and

Action

- (c) The "zero tolerance" approach to the AI problem was too high a standard to achieve, and the Administration had not provided other options in case the two approaches recommended in the consultation paper did not have community support.

30. Mr LEUNG Fu-wah further said that according to the Consultation Paper, a total of \$273 million had been paid out from the public purse as compensation or rental waiver to the poultry trade since 1997. This meant that an average of \$42,000 had been paid to each of the 6 500 poultry trade workers over the past seven years. While he agreed that there should be prudent use of public money, he considered that the survival of the live poultry industry merited serious consideration.

31. SHWF said that he understood that many people would accept the direction of the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option as this would provide flexibility and opportunity for the trade to change to a new mode of operation. On the other hand, the "Cold Chain" option would be more cost effective. The two options were put forward in the Consultation Paper for the community to discuss. SHWF further said that it was necessary to consider long-term measures to address the AI problem, because the present measures, such as vaccination of chickens, were not foolproof. The World Health Organisation (WHO) had warned that the region had not taken adequate measures to prevent AI. A total of 7 persons had died of AI in the recent outbreak in the region, and the risks of recurrence of AI and mutation of H5 viruses still existed. SHWF stressed that the Administration would be cautious in deciding on the future direction, and would take into account the interests of the trade.

32. Mr LEUNG Fu-wah said that SHWF should provide empirical data to support why a "zero tolerance" approach was considered necessary or reasonable. He commented that the Administration had not taken a balanced approach in dealing with the problem, and the interests of the trade had not been given sufficient consideration.

33. SHWF responded that WHO had recommended the region to take measures to reduce the risk of recurrence of AI. He said that Hong Kong compared less favourably with other places because our markets were very crowded, and the large quantities of live chickens stocking up at poultry stalls had increased the risk of spread of AI.

34. Mrs Selina CHOW said that as the Consultation Paper was only tabled at the meeting, Members did not have time to study the contents. She further said that the initial view of the Liberal Party was that central slaughtering was infeasible. While the option of regional slaughterhouses could be further explored, it would take a relatively long time to materialise the proposal. She believed that there should be an Option C, comprising the short-term and medium-term measures currently adopted, to bridge the gap between now and the implementation of the long-term strategy. She considered that some markets had space to implement the proposed segregation of live poultry from customers, and the Administration should explore ways to further improve the

Action

interim measures. She agreed with Mr LEUNG Fu-wah that the issue was not to pay compensation to the trade but to enable it to survive. She commented that as long as there was demand for live poultry, the "buy-out" proposal would not be attractive to the operators. She considered that the "buy-out" proposal should not be imposed on the trade.

35. Mrs Selina CHOW further said that the number of market rest days should not be increased as this would greatly affect the operation of the retail markets.

36. Mr Tommy CHEUNG said that SHWF should balance the need to safeguard public health with the interest of the trade and the workers concerned, and also the need to maintain Hong Kong's reputation as a "food paradise". He said that "zero tolerance" was quite impossible to achieve because there were risks in the natural environment, for example, migratory birds were also carriers of viruses. He would not support the proposal of constructing a central slaughterhouse with \$200 million, as it would not be able to compete with slaughterhouses across the border. He pointed out that the goose and duck trade in Hong Kong shrunk significantly after 1997, from 20 000 to only a few hundred a day, after the introduction of central slaughtering for geese and duck. Currently, there were some 800 poultry stalls as compared to about 1 500 in 1997, while the number of poultry sold each day had decreased from 220 000 to 100 000.

37. Mr Tommy CHEUNG further said that he would support the proposal of buying back licences from poultry operators, but this should not be blindly applied to all stalls. He considered that the proposal could help reduce the number of poultry stalls in FEHD markets to provide more space for improvements and the segregation arrangements. He said that the ventilation of FEHD markets should also be improved. He suggested that the Administration should educate the public not to touch the live poultry, apart from the installation of acrylic panels in front of poultry cages.

38. SHWF responded that Members had agreed that safeguarding public health should be the prime consideration. While he had previously explained the rationale behind the segregation policy, he would be happy to explain this again. SHWF stressed that the risks of AI still existed, and Hong Kong could not afford to have recurrence of AI outbreaks, in view of the crowded conditions in Hong Kong and the impact on economy. It was therefore necessary to minimize the contact between the public and live poultry in order to reduce public health risks. At the same time, the Government did not want to affect the trade and the economy or change the eating habit of the community. With these considerations, the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option was proposed to provide flexibility to the trade. Pending the implementation of the long-term measure, segregation arrangements would be carried out at retail markets as far as possible.

39. Dr LO Wing-lok said that under the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option, dressed chickens would not be required to undergo a chilling process. It would pose a health risk if such chickens were not immediately delivered to the consumers and were

Action

left under room temperature for some hours. Dr LO commented that unlike the retail poultry stalls which only slaughtered a small quantity of chickens each day, the proposed regional slaughterhouses would have to handle tens of thousands of chickens a day. There would be increased risks of cross infection among chickens under these circumstances. Dr LO was of the view that the "Cold Chain" option would be the best approach to achieve the objective of completely segregating human from live poultry. However, he considered that the Consultation Paper should not only propose two options for the community to consider.

40. Dr LO further said that he supported the "zero tolerance" policy. Nevertheless, he considered that the Administration should provide concrete information to support the adoption of such a policy, such as the extent the risk of AI could be reduced. He said that information such as the estimated gross product value of the poultry trade, the expenses spent on monitoring and regulating the trade and the compensation paid out in the past, would assist the public to make a rational choice.

41. SHWF explained that under the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option, the dressed chicken would immediately be delivered to customers who had placed order. The arrangements would be similar to the existing practice in retail markets. If the slaughtered chickens were not taken away immediately, they would be chilled at the regional slaughterhouses. Details of the operation would be further discussed with experts if this option was to be pursued.

42. Dr LO Wing-lok welcomed the proposed arrangement that, under the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option, dressed chickens would also be put under the chilling process if they were not delivered immediately to customers, or if they were to be slaughtered in large quantities.

43. Mr IP Kwok-him said that there should be thorough discussion on the potential risks and the practical need before formulating the long-term strategy to prevent AI. He was of the view that the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option was a modified central slaughtering approach, and it was necessary to consider its impact on the livelihood of the trade, particularly the workers. As regards the proposed increase in the number of market rest days, Mr IP said that there was feedback from the trade that this was impracticable and would greatly affect the operation of the trade. He considered that the Administration should provide justifications for increasing the market rest days. He further said that while he had no objection to the concept of segregating human from live poultry, it was a matter of balancing the interests of the trade with the need to safeguard public health.

44. SHWF explained that the directions of the two options were different. He said that the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option could provide more room for the poultry trade to change to a new mode of operation, and it did not seek to change the eating habit of the people. However, this option would be more expensive and take a longer period to materialise, because more than one slaughterhouse would have to be built.

Action

SHWF further said that no timetable for implementation had been set, and the Administration would need to look at how the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option, if pursued, would interface with the short-term measures. A series of measures, including assistance to workers in the relevant trades and arrangements for buying back licences, would be worked out in due course.

45. Mr Michael MAK commented that the questionnaire inviting public views on the two options only sought simple responses. It would be difficult for some people to give their views on such questionnaire. He asked how the Administration would collate the public opinion collected if there was great divergence of views on the two options. He considered that the simple response sought by questionnaire would make it difficult the Administration to comprehend the reasons behind the respondents' choices. He further said that it was ultimately a question of how the Administration would balance the need to safeguard public health with the interests of the trade. He did not consider that the Administration had paid sufficient regard to the interests of the workers in the relevant trades.

46. SHWF responded that the Consultation Paper was to gauge the views of the public and the trade. The Administration would analyse the responses received and would not just count the number of responses in support of either option. He said that the "Cold Chain" option was included in the Consultation Paper to provide an alternative approach for the public to consider. He reiterated that the "Cold Chain" option involved very low risks and was more cost-effective. As regards the "Freshly Slaughtered Poultry" option, the details would still have to be worked out. The Administration would formulate the long-term proposal, after collating public views, for the Legislative Council to consider.

Way forward

47. As proposed by Mr Tommy CHEUNG, members agreed to hold a special meeting on 4 June 2004 from 9 am to about 12 noon to gauge the views of the trade and experts on the Consultation Paper.

III Recent ciguatera poisoning incidents

[LC Paper No. CB(2) 1923/03-04(01)]

48. Deputy Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food (DS(FEH)) briefed members on the Administration's paper. He said that there was currently no legislation regulating the landing of marine fish in Hong Kong. As he had informed the Panel at a previous meeting when fish tank water quality was discussed, the Administration was reviewing the legislation to extend regulatory control to live fish. Concrete proposals would be put forward to the Panel in three to four months.

Action

49. Mr Tommy CHEUNG said that he did not agree to using legislation in a casual manner to control commercial activities. He considered it more important to identify the source of the toxic fish, for example, whether it involved only one single batch/supplier or different batches/suppliers. If there was only one single batch of toxic fish, the trade could easily solve the problem. If the toxic fish was found to come from a new fishing area, FEHD could conduct sampling tests of the fish, and allow its importation on a pilot basis in the initial stage. The Administration could also consider requiring consignments of large coral reef fish to be subject to sampling tests before releasing them for distribution. He suggested that the Administration should discuss with the trade and issue guidelines on the voluntary notification system and the sampling requirements.

50. Assistant Director (Food Surveillance and Control) (AD(FEH)) advised that since 28 March 2003, a total of 17 cases of ciguatera fish poisoning had been reported to the Department of Health (D of H). Information obtained so far indicated that about 10 out of 17 cases were related to fish from a particular supplier or consignment, while other suppliers were involved in the remaining cases. According to the suppliers, the fish involved had been sample-checked prior to import, and the toxic level was found to be low. AD(FEH) said that there was a possibility that those fish not sample-checked might have a higher toxic level. To prevent recurrence of further poisoning cases, the food premises and suppliers concerned had been advised to stop selling and to dispose of the incriminated fish. FEHD would also discuss with the trade the control measure, e.g. requiring ciguatoxin tests of coral fish coming from new fishing areas prior to importation.

51. Mr Michael MAK said that ciguatoxic was difficult to detect by human eye. He asked whether the Administration had any interim measure to improve the situation as legislation could not be enacted within a short time.

52. DS(FEH) said that it was difficult to trace the source of coral fish as they were not confined to particular places. He agreed that it would be a complicated exercise to improve the legislation in this respect. In the meantime, the Administration would actively discuss with the trade the improvement measures and strengthen public education on prevention of ciguatera poisoning.

53. In response to Mr MAK's further enquiry, Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) said that FEHD would strengthen the administrative arrangements concerning the checking for ciguatoxin of coral fish from new fishing areas prior to importation. The Administration would also advise the public to avoid eating large quantities of big coral reef fish.

54. Mr WONG Yung-kan said that ciguatera poisoning also occurred in the past. The recent cases involved coral fish from a new fishing area in South Africa. He added that if problems were found with any of these fishes, both the fishing and catering industries would be affected. He said that the Administration should be cautious in

Action

handling these incidents and have regard to the interests of the industry. He suggested that the Administration should advise the public that cultured fish was safe to eat. He further suggested that in reviewing the legislation, the Administration should make reference to the experience of Japan which entrusted its fish marketing organisation to regulate fish wholesaling.

55. The Chairman asked whether Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) had a role to play in the ciguatera poisoning incidents.

56. DS(FEH) responded that it was basically a food safety matter. AFCD was primarily responsible for the regulation of live birds and animals from the animal health and zoonotic diseases points of view. The Administration would complete the legislative review as soon as possible and would strengthen the interim measures as discussed at the meeting.

57. The Chairman commented that some of the advice given in paragraph 7 of the Administration's paper was not useful. He said that the publicity materials should differentiate marine fish from culture fish as the latter was safe to eat. He considered that the Administration should target at large coral reef fish and those new fishing areas. The Administration noted the comments.

IV Any other business

58. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:10 pm.