



Letter of petition and support for ivory trade ban
Cynthia Chung to: bc_06_16

06/09/2017 12:12

Dear Hon Kenneth Leung,

Public Hearing on September 6th 2017: Cap 586 Amendment Bill

I am Cynthia Chung from Hong Kong, I've been living for 20 years. . I am writing to express my support for the Hong Kong Government's proposed Cap 586 Amendment Bill because Hong Kong can save elephants from going extinct.

Therefore, Hong Kong should go abreast with international law concerning to combat the illegal ivory trade. Our city has been used as a major trading hub because of the proximity of the neighbouring markets and other Asian countries.

Hong Kong must show to other nations that we're taking the lead to end ivory trade. Everything is so nicely protected but there's a big hole. We have the obligations and duty to be a gatekeeper, the only effective way is through using Cap 586.

I fully support the government's three-step plan to ban the Hong Kong ivory trade; and its proposals to increase maximum penalties under the Protection of Endangered Species Ordinance (Cap 586). However, I am strongly against any proposition to compensate traders or buy out their stocks. My reasons are as stated:-

- Providing any form of compensation will signal that Hong Kong is 'buying' ivory, likely triggering a surge of poaching in Africa.
- Compensation would establish a dangerous global precedent for other countries working to ban the trade.
- The Hong Kong Government is not depriving ivory owners of all use of property.
- Traders and others who have speculated on ivory have done so, knowing the risks of a shrinking legal market.
- The heritage value and traditional skills of carvers are not a reason to continue the trade.
- Carvers and traders have had over two decades since the international ban, to diversify and/or switch trades. Most have done so. The Hong Kong government have already provided financial subsidies and re-training programs for them in the 1990s.
- The proposed draft law does not infringe the traders' "right to compensation of... property" as protected by Article 105 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong SAR (Appendix B: Legal study on an ivory ban)
-
- Compensation will send the wrong educational message to society if it is granted to an industry where there are known elements of illegality. This includes the poaching crisis in Africa, smuggling via criminal gangs, laundering, and illegal selling in Asia. - The Hong Kong Government had developed a licensing control system for the local ivory trade, with the intention being that ivory traders could liquidate their remaining stocks. It never suggested that the trade and the licenses should be sustained indefinitely. Hong Kong ivory traders

should know full well that remaining in the ivory industry during these 27 years bears greater risk over time. Furthermore, statistics show that Hong Kong traders had been purchasing and importing small amounts of pre-Convention ivory in recent years. They took an illfated business risk to build up their stocks in this way, at a time when ivory prices were high, hoping that this was a good investment. It was not a wise business strategy, and should certainly not be compensated now with taxpayers' money for having taken this business

Regards, Cynthia Chung