

"Howard Elias"

To: <samuel\_hk\_chui@etwb.gov.hk>  
Subject: RE: Mail Forward from HATS mailbox  
02.08.2004 04:00 PM

Dear Samuel,

I appreciate your getting back to me.

I have read Consultation Document and I still have two concerns:

1. It appears that I am correct in my assertion that sewage from the IFC complex is going straight into the harbour. Yes, it's going into the sewage system but then the system is dumping it into the harbour. That's all well and good as long as the marine ecosystem can handle it but, as the Document states, it can't handle all of it and almost a half a million cubic metres of sewage are ending up in the harbour each day.

I understand that Stage 2 of HATS would involve connecting up the IFC to an underground pipeline but what I fail to understand is that in the absence of such a pipeline, why haven't the developers been levied a fee so that when the buildings do get connected, the public doesn't have to pay for it all? In my mind, if someone wants a prime view, they've got to pay for it.

2. My second concern is that the Consultation Document does not address the effluent that is coming down from the Pearl River in China. We could spend \$20 billion and end up right where we are today. What is being done to control the pollution from upstream?

I would like a clean harbour as much as the next person but I am not satisfied that you have solved the problem.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Howard Elias

When I first heard that the government was considering spending \$20 billion to clean up the harbour, I thought it was a good investment.? I have since found out that the IFC2 dumps its raw sewage into the harbour every day.? How dare you ask the public to subsidise the developers!

So my short answer is this: I am NOT in favour of spending another penny to clean up the harbour until the government first passes legislation making it mandatory for new buildings to be connected to the sewer system PRIOR to their opening.

Sincerely,

Howard Elias