

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1627/08-09  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

**Panel on Environmental Affairs**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 30 March 2009, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

**Members present** : Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP (Chairman)  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan (Deputy Chairman)  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP  
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP  
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun

**Member absent** : Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP

**Public officers attending** : **For item IV**

Mr Edward YAU  
Secretary for the Environment

Dr Ellen CHAN  
Assistant Director (Environmental Infrastructure)  
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Alex NG  
Principal Environmental Protection Officer  
Environmental Protection Department

**For item V**

Dr Kitty POON  
Under Secretary for the Environment

Mr Vincent TANG  
Assistant Director  
(Nature Conservation & Infrastructure Planning)  
Environmental Protection Department

Mr LAY Chik-chuen  
Assistant Director (Conservation)  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Dr SO Ping-man  
Senior Conservation Officer (Biodiversity)  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

**For item VI**

Dr Kitty POON  
Under Secretary for the Environment

Mr Vincent TANG  
Assistant Director  
(Nature Conservation & Infrastructure Planning)  
Environmental Protection Department

Mr LAY Chik-chuen  
Assistant Director (Conservation)  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Dr SO Ping-man  
Senior Conservation Officer (Biodiversity)  
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

**Clerk in attendance** : Miss Becky YU  
Chief Council Secretary (1)1

**Staff in attendance** : Mrs Mary TANG  
Senior Council Secretary (1)2

Mr Franco KWONG  
Council Secretary (1)1

---

Action

**I. Confirmation of minutes**

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1003/08-09 — Minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2009)

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2009 were confirmed.

**II. Information paper issued since last meeting**

2. Members noted the following information papers which had been issued since last meeting -

LC Paper No. CB(1) 960/08-09 — Information note on "Light pollution and the regulation of outdoor lighting in selected places" prepared by the Research and Library Services Division

LC Paper Nos. CB(1) 1006 and 1104/08-09 — Submissions regarding Clear Water Bay Country Park from Designing Hong Kong Limited and WWF Hong Kong respectively

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1116/08-09 — Letter from Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yea regarding noise pollution from large commercial television screen

**III Items for discussion at the next meeting and matters arising**

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1123/08-09(01) — List of follow-up actions  
LC Paper No. CB(1) 1123/08-09(02) — List of outstanding items for discussion)

3. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 27 April 2009, at 2:30 pm -

(a) Update on the progress of the key initiatives in the "Policy Framework for the Management of Municipal Solid Waste (2005-2014)";

- (b) 4236DS - Tai Po sewage treatment works, stage 5 phase 2B; and
- (c) Buildings Energy Efficiency Funding Schemes under the Environment and Conservation Fund.

4. The Chairman drew members' attention to the decision of the House Committee that Directors of Bureaux were required to explain to the relevant Panels the reasons for the delay in introducing certain Bills into the Legislative Council (LegCo). As the Administration was not able to introduce the Buildings Energy Efficiency Bill (the Bill) as scheduled, the Secretary for the Environment (SEN) was invited to explain to members the reasons for the delay. SEN said that the purposes of the Bill were to provide for the legal framework for mandatory implementation of Building Energy Codes (BECs) in new and existing buildings, and the guidelines for the conduct of energy audits. In the course of public consultation on the Bill, the Administration noted that while there was general support for the implementation of BECs in new buildings, there were also concerns on the liability of owners in conducting energy audits, particularly in the event of a change in property ownership. To address these concerns, there was a need for the Administration to make some adjustments to the proposal and further consult the public and hence the delay in introducing the Bill into LegCo within the current legislative session as originally scheduled. He nevertheless undertook that the Administration would introduce the Bill within 2009 upon completion of consultation with affected parties.

5. Given that buildings accounted for 89% of the total power consumption in Hong Kong, Mr LEE Wing-tat agreed that there was a need to improve the energy efficiency of buildings with a view to reducing power consumption and global warming. He was disappointed at the delay in the introduction of the Bill, which in his view should have been avoided if matters relating to owners' responsibility in complying with BECs had been dealt with earlier. He hoped that the Bill could be introduced as soon as possible in the beginning of the next legislative session in October 2009. The Chairman agreed to the need for early introduction of the Bill into LegCo. Consideration should be given to using a phased approach such that BECs could be applied to new buildings as a start, to be followed by existing buildings under renovation after issues relating to owners' responsibility were resolved. SEN said that it would be more desirable to formulate a Bill to deal with the energy efficiency of buildings in one go. He promised that the Bill would be introduced into LegCo as soon as practicable when further consultation was completed.

6. Ms Cyd HO considered it necessary that members should be given the opportunity to participate in the formulation of the Bill before it was introduced into LegCo. The Chairman advised that the Administration had already consulted the Panel on the Bill in 2008 during which members had indicated support for the Bill. SEN agreed to look into the time frame for consultation on the Bill and revert to the Panel on the need for a further meeting.

**IV. 233DS - Sludge Treatment Facilities**

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1123/08-09(03) — Administration's paper on 233DS – Sludge Treatment Facilities)

7. SEN briefed members on the Administration's proposal to upgrade the Sludge Treatment Facilities (STF) to Category A by highlighting the salient points in the information paper. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure) (ADEP(EI)) then gave a power-point presentation on the proposal.

*(Post-meeting note: The power-point presentation materials were circulated to members under LC Paper No. CB(1) 1219/08-09(01).)*

8. Mr LEE Wing-tat noted that the Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) had expressed grave concern about the environmental impacts arising from the incineration of a large amount of sludge each day at STF. TMDC also considered it unfair to place many perceivingly unwelcomed public facilities in Tuen Mun, and requested a meeting with the relevant Directors of Bureaux to discuss the overall planning and development of Tuen Mun. He was disappointed that the Administration had decided to push ahead with the proposed STF despite the strong objection. Mr Albert CHAN also enquired about the stance of TMDC on the proposed STF and whether the proposal had been voted on during discussion. SEN said that STF was a designated project under the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance (Cap. 499) and the relevant EIA report was already approved. The project would comply with the established emission standards in line with the European Union. According to his understanding, TMDC had discussed the proposed STF at two of its meetings. Motions objecting to the provision of STF at Tuen Mun were passed at one of the meetings. SEN stressed that the Administration was fully committed to forging a close working relationship with TMDC to map out strategies and measures to promote the development of Tuen Mun. In response to TMDC's request, the Environment Bureau had taken the lead to set up a working group comprising representatives from relevant bureaux and departments as well as TMDC. A partnership arrangement with TMDC would be adopted in formulating the design of STF to include various green design concepts to make STF an environment-friendly facility. The working group held its first meeting in March 2009. Continued efforts would be made to address the concerns of TMDC on the planning and development of Tuen Mun.

9. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming said that during the public consultation on the proposed STF, most TMDC members and some political parties had expressed reservation at and objection to the proposal. He recalled that contrary to SEN's statement, not much progress had been made on the development of Tuen Mun when the subject was discussed at the first meeting of the working group on 27 March 2009. To facilitate members' understanding on the proposal, Mr CHEUNG considered it necessary for the Administration to include the outcome of discussion with TMDC in the paper to be submitted to Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC). Mr CHAN Hak-kan echoed that the minutes of meetings of the working group should

Admin be provided for members' reference. SEN said that some constructive ideas were raised at the meeting with TMDC on 27 March 2009. He agreed to include the latest development on the discussion with TMDC in the paper to be submitted to PWSC.

10. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that TMDC was concerned that the Administration would not live up to its promise of promoting the development of Tuen Mun after approval was given for the provision of STF. He said that he could not support the proposed STF at this stage until a consensus had been reached between the Administration and TMDC on the development of Tuen Mun. Expressing similar concern, Mr CHAN Hak-kan asked if there was a limited time frame for the working group and whether it would be disbanded afterwards. SEN said that the planning and development of Tuen Mun was a long-term issue which would require continued follow-up. The Environment Bureau together with other relevant bureaux and departments would maintain dialogue with TMDC on the development of Tuen Mun. He nevertheless stressed that STF was an essential and integral part of the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS). It was neither technically nor environmentally acceptable for HATS Stage 2A to proceed without a dedicated and sustainable outlet for the treatment of sludge from the Scheme, given that the three existing landfills could no longer be able to cope with the increased amounts of sludge from HATS Stage 2A. As such, any delay in the provision of STF might give rise to unacceptable environmental impacts on the community. He hoped that members would lend their support to the proposed provision of STF.

11. While acknowledging the scarcity in landfill space, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming considered it necessary for the Administration to explain how the proposed STF could help extend the service lives of existing landfills. He opined that the benefits of the proposed STF should be quantified in order to gain support from the community. He also enquired whether the proposed STF could handle all the sludge generated from HATS Stage 2A. SEN confirmed that the proposed STF would be able to treat all the sludge generated from HATS Stage 2A as well as other sewage treatment works. Without the proposed provision of STF, the large quantity of sludge would have to be deposited at landfills. Apart from occupying the precious landfill space, the increased amount of sludge would undermine the capacity of landfills to handle sludge safely, leading to slope failure at the landfills.

12. Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that apart from the sludge generated from HATS, there were other sources of sludge such as those found in the polluted seabed of some beaches in Hong Kong. He enquired if STF could be able to deal with all kinds of sludge. ADEP(EI) clarified that sludge generated from HATS, other sewage treatment works and mud found in the seabed were dealt with in a different manner. Separate dumping arrangements were applied to mud dredged from at the seabed which would not undergo the incineration process. Mr CHAN emphasized the need to deal with the overall 'sludge/mud' problem in Hong Kong as disposal of dredged mud at sea would not be sustainable in the long run.

13. Mr WONG Yung-kan was still concerned about the environmental and traffic impacts arising from marine transport of sludge from the Stonecutters Island to STF.

He also enquired about the use of sludge residues after incineration. ADEP(EI) said that the construction of STF at the ash lagoon at Tsang Tsui, Tuen Mun would not cause any unacceptable impact on the surrounding environment. In particular, there would be no reclamation works involved. Moreover, no new pier would be required for the transport of sludge which could use the existing pier at the West New Territories Landfill. The environmental impact assessment study on the site also confirmed that the project would not have much impact on the terrestrial habitat since the site was indeed an ash lagoon with little ecological value. Consideration would be given to re-using the ash after incineration, for example, in the manufacture of construction materials. As for marine traffic, ADEP(EI) advised that about two barge loads of sludge were expected to be delivered to STF each day. More detailed information on the arrangements for the marine transport of sludge for treatment at STF would be provided to the Panel in due course.

Admin

14. Ir Dr Raymond HO concurred that the proposed STF was an integral part of the HATS programme and without the provision of STF, the existing landfills would have to be extended, leading to the encroachment of country park area which was much to the dislike of the community. Referring to the submission from the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers, Ir Dr HO noted that the Institution supported the proposed provision of STF, which would be a crucial infrastructure to improve the environment and the living standard of Hong Kong. As overseas experience had proved that advanced incineration facilities would have very little impact on the surrounding community, more efforts should be made to ease the concerns of the relevant district councils.

15. Ms Miriam LAU expressed support for the proposed STF since incineration of waste seemed to be the ultimate solution for waste treatment in the long run. She recalled that some Panel members had conducted two overseas visits some years ago they had seen for themselves that the use of incineration technology in the treatment of waste had very little impact on the surrounding environment. In fact, many overseas incineration facilities were situated in close proximity to recreational facilities and residential developments. As TMDC members would need to be convinced of the acceptability of the STF project, it might be necessary for the Administration to arrange an overseas visit for them so that they could see for themselves how clean and environment-friendly the incineration facilities were nowadays, and present the actual case to residents. Meanwhile, Panel members who had participated in the overseas visits could also do their part by sharing their experience with TMDC. SEN agreed that the idea of arranging an overseas visit for TMDC members was worth considering.

16. Mr Albert CHAN said that when identifying sites for public facilities, the Administration should have regard to the overall planning of the districts. From what it appeared, the Administration had placed too many obnoxious facilities which were highly polluting in Tuen Mun West. These activities had adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding, in particular, the nearby Lung Kwu Tan where a number of villages were located. In compensation for these unwanted facilities in Tuen Mun West, the Administration should consider providing more wanted facilities in Tuen Mun East and Tuen Mun North for the betterment of Tuen Mun residents.

Mr KAM Nai-wai also enquired about the time frame for the provision of facilities for the betterment of Tuen Mun residents. SEN said that the Administration was well aware of the sentiment of Tuen Mun residents. Therefore, the proposed STF would be located at a site which was far from residential areas. Concerted efforts would be made in the planning and development of Tuen Mun.

17. Noting that the STF project would include the provision of environmental education and associated facilities, Mr CHAN Hak-kan enquired if these facilities would include an environmental resource centre and a spa, as recently reported in the press. SEN said that while environmental education facilities would most likely be included in the project to enhance public education on waste management, the Administration would be open to the type of facilities, including recreational facilities, to be provided in consultation with the TMDC. Consideration would be given to soliciting public views on how the electricity generated by the incineration facilities at STF could be used through a public engagement process on the use of waste to energy. TMDC would also be consulted on the facilities to be included in the STF project.

18. Mr CHAN Kin-por supported the early implementation of STF which could reduce the volume of sludge by 90% through incineration. Any delay in implementation would result in deprivation of precious landfill space. While supporting the need to work out measures to address the concerns raised by TMDC, he was concerned about the cost implications if STF was to be built in an environment-friendly and aesthetic manner.

19. Mr KAM Nai-wai enquired about the emission standards for the proposed STF as he was concerned about the cumulative impacts of the different polluting activities in Tuen Mun West. ADEP(EI) said that both odour and pollutant emissions from the proposed STF would be subject to control. In addition to meeting stringent odour standards, an air modeling study on pollutant emissions had been conducted to ascertain their effect on air quality taking into account factors such as wind direction and cumulative impacts of other neighbouring facilities. It was expected that the amount of pollutant emissions from the proposed STF would be considerably reduced with the advancement in incineration and emission control technologies. Besides, online monitoring of pollutant emissions, similar to that at the Chemical Waste Treatment Centre at Tsing Yi, would be provided for the proposed STF. SEN added that monitoring stations would be set up near the proposed STF to provide real time monitoring of air quality. At members' request, the Administration undertook to provide the emission standards for STF and the parameters used in setting the standards.

Admin

20. Given that the proposal to upgrade STF would be submitted for consideration by PWSC at its meeting in April 2009, the Chairman urged the Administration to provide the information as requested by members before the PWSC meeting.

**V. Proposed extension of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to Hong Kong**

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1123/08-09(04) — Administration's paper on proposed extension of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to Hong Kong

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1123/08-09(05) — Paper on application of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to Hong Kong prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (updated background brief))

21. The Under Secretary for the Environment (USEN) explained that the proposed extension of the Convention on Biological Diversity (the Convention) and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (the Protocol) to Hong Kong was meant to provide for better protection of the biological diversity in Hong Kong by controlling the trans-boundary movement of living modified organisms (LMOs) intended for release into the environment.

22. The Chairman enquired about the parties which would be affected by the proposed extension and whether they had been consulted on the proposal. USEN said that importers of LMOs would need to comply with the Advance Informed Agreement (AIA) procedures for the intentional release of LMOs into the environment. Relevant stakeholders, including green groups, relevant academics, biotechnology companies, trade associations, food and beverage traders, local chain stores, seed and vegetable traders, flower and aquarium fish traders, and organic farms, had been consulted.

23. Mr WONG Yung-kan expressed support for more control on the release of LMOs into the environment. He enquired if the Administration had conducted any studies on the growing and breeding of LMOs in local vegetable and fish farms, such as aquarium fish. He also asked whether genetically modified food would be subject to control, and whether more information on such food could be made available to the public. USEN clarified that the AIA procedures did not apply to the trans-boundary movement of LMOs intended for direct use as food or feed, for processing or for contained use. Laboratory studies on LMOs and the breeding of aquarium fish would not be subject to control of the AIA procedure as long as the LMOs concerned were not released into the environment. As regards the control on genetically modified food and requirement for food labelling, USEN said that these subjects fell under the purview of the Food and Health Bureau. The Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (Conservation) (ADAFC(C)) added that according to available information, growing and breeding of LMOs in local vegetable and fish farms was rare, except for some papayas grown in Hong Kong which might be

genetically modified.

24. Mr WONG Yung-kan enquired whether fish traders engaged in the breeding of genetically modified fish for contained use would be caught under the proposed legislation if they had inadvertently released the fish into the environment. ADAF(C) said that the regulatory control would be on intentional release into the environment, and accidental release would not be an offence under the proposed legislation.

#### **VI. Latest progress of implementation of the New Nature Conservation Policy**

- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| (LC Paper No. CB(1) 822/08-09(01) | — Referral on Public-private Partnership Scheme under the new nature conservation policy raised at the meeting between Legislative Council Members and Councillors of Heung Yee Kuk on 8 January 2009 |
| LC Paper No. CB(1) 1123/08-09(06) | — Administration's paper on latest progress of implementation of the New Nature Conservation Policy   |
| LC Paper No. CB(1) 1123/08-09(07) | — Paper on nature conservation prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (updated background brief)   |
| LC Paper No. CB(1) 1163/08-09(01) | — Submission from Mr Ruy BARRETTO S.C. (English version only)   |
| LC Paper No. CB(1) 1163/08-09(02) | — Submission from Designing Hong Kong Limited (English version only)  |

25. USEN briefed members on the latest progress of implementation of the New Nature Conservation Policy (NNCP) by highlighting the salient points in the information paper.

26. Mr KAM Nai-wai said that there had been much controversy over the Public-private Partnership (PPP) Pilot Scheme under NNCP, which allowed for the development of an agreed scale at the ecologically less sensitive portion of the 12 priority sites identified for enhanced conservation areas. Given the incompatibility between development and conservation, he was concerned that property developers might exploit the scheme to further their interest under the guise of conservation. He enquired about the measures to be taken to ensure proper implementation of the PPP Pilot scheme, and compliance with the conservation requirements by project proponents. USEN said that under the PPP Pilot Scheme, developments at an agreed scale would be allowed at the less ecologically sensitive portion of a site provided that

the developer undertook to conserve and manage the rest of the site that was ecologically more sensitive on a long-term basis. In considering applications under the PPP Pilot Scheme, the Administration would have regard to the environmental impacts of the proposed development and the conservation measures to be adopted by the project proponents. An inter-department task force had been set up to scrutinize the proposals in accordance with the assessment criteria set out in the Guide to Application. ADEP(CI) supplemented that Guide was made available to the public when NNCP was launched in 2004. Approved projects under the PPP Pilot Scheme would be taken forward jointly by the Administration, project proponents as well as green groups.

27. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that the Administration had to be very cautious in scrutinizing the development proposals within conservation areas of high ecological significance. He was concerned that some landowners might try to destroy the ecological value of their land through land filling and tree felling activities, in an attempt to pave the way for development. There was a need to protect these sites to ensure that their ecological importance would not be compromised by development.

#### Sha Lo Tung Project

28. The Chairman drew members' attention to the submission from Mr Ruy BARRETTO (LC Paper No. CB(1) 1163/08-09(01)) attaching his letters dated 2 October 2008 and 26 March 2009 to the Administration regarding the non-inclusion of the Sha Lo Tung Project as a Designated Project (DP) under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap.499) (EIAO). She noted that the Administration had yet to respond to Mr BARRETTO's letters. USEN said that the Administration had just issued a reply to Mr BARRETTO explaining the situation. Despite that the scope of works as originally proposed under the Sha Lo Tung Project did not make the project a DP under EIAO, the project proponent had submitted an environmental assessment report which was subsequently endorsed with conditions by the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE). The project proponent had recently revised his earlier proposal in respect of the conservation and development plan. The proposed changes would likely warrant the project to become a DP under EIAO according to the Environmental Protection Department (EPD)'s preliminary assessment. EPD was seeking further information from the project proponent on the revised proposal. Should the revisions warrant a DP, the project proponent would be required to conduct an environmental impact assessment (EIA) in accordance with EIAO. ACE and its EIA Sub-committee would be duly consulted as appropriate.

29. The Chairman sought the Administration's response to Mr BARRETTO's allegation that the PPP Pilot Scheme was flawed because there was a conflict of interest on the part of the Government to approve PPP projects on the one hand and facilitate the development of the projects from conservation angle on the other. This might undermine the role of EPD as the regulator to uphold the law relating to the protection of the environment. Given that the Sha Lo Tung Project would involve the construction of road, sewage, columbarium and ecological reserve within conservation area, Mr BARRETTO held the view that it should be regarded as a DP

under EIAO in the first place. USEN said that the question of conflict of interest would not arise as there were established guidelines under EIAO which the Administration and other concerned parties had to adhere to. The Administration had been very careful in scrutinizing all the proposals under the PPP Pilot Scheme. Of the six applications received, only the Sha Lo Tung Project was considered worth supporting. Under the Sha Lo Tung Project, only a small part of the land would be developed while most of the land with high ecological value would be conserved. ADEP(CI) supplemented that the proposed Sha Lo Tung Project would consist of three parts, namely a multi-cultural education cum columbarium development, an ecological reserve and road widening works for Sha Lo Tung Road. As regards Mr BARRETTO's concern about possible encroachment of the Pat Sin Leng Country Park as a result of the road widening works, ADEP(CI) said that this would not be the case since the project proponent had already clarified that the road concerned for widening work fell outside the boundary of the country park.

30. The Chairman said that the Panel received a number of submissions requesting for a review of NNCP, particularly the "no net loss" policy for country parks. She enquired if the Administration had any plan to review NNCP. USEN said that the Administration would prefer to conduct a review of the PPP Pilot Scheme upon completion of the Sha Lo Tung Project, the very first project under the Scheme, which would provide useful reference for the review. As for the Management Agreement (MA) Scheme under NNCP, USEN said that a review had already been conducted in 2007 and the outcome had been reported to the Nature Conservation Subcommittee of ACE. It was concluded that the MA Scheme was effective in enhancing the conservation value of the sites and was worth supporting. On the "no net loss" policy, USEN said that the Administration would identify suitable places for designation as country parks having regard to established policy.

## **VII. Any other business**

### Proposed setting up of the Subcommittee on Combating Fly-tipping

31. The Chairman said that pursuant to the decision made at the Panel meeting on 23 February 2009, a circular was issued on 4 March 2009 to solicit members' views on the proposed setting up of the Subcommittee on Combating Fly-tipping as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1) 971/08-09. As some members did not agree to the setting up of the subcommittee, the proposal had to be further discussed by the Panel at the current meeting.

32. Mr LEE Wing-tat stressed the need for a dedicated subcommittee to study issues relating to the enhancement of enforcement actions against fly-tipping and other destructive activities, such as tree felling, which had become rampant in many rural areas in Hong Kong. As concerted efforts from different bureaux/departments were necessary to combat the problem, the subcommittee would ensure better coordination among these bureaux/departments. It was expected that the subcommittee would need to hold four to five meetings within the current legislative

session to complete its work.

33. Ms Miriam LAU said that she did have reservation on the setting up of more than one subcommittee under the Panel. However, as the majority of members were in favour of setting up the subcommittee which was expected to complete its work within the current legislative session, she was prepared to support the proposal but emphasized the need for more focused discussion on the subject of fly-tipping. Expressing similar concern, Mr CHAN Hak-kan said that the subject of tree felling should be dealt with separately lest the Subcommittee might not be able to complete its work within the current legislative session. Mr WONG Yung-kan echoed that there was existing legislation to deal with illegal tree felling activities. Ms Cyd HO however held a different view. She opined that illegal tree felling was indeed part of the problem and hence should be dealt with concurrently by the subcommittee. She would not mind holding more meetings in the next few months in order to complete the work of the subcommittee within the current legislative session. Mr James TO said that the subcommittee should report back to the Panel at the end of the current legislative session even if it could not complete its work.

34. After deliberation, members agreed to set up the Subcommittee on Combating Fly-tipping with terms of reference as set out in LC Paper No. CB(1) 971/08-09, and that it should complete its work by mid-July 2009.

35. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:30 pm.