

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Last year, the Conservancy Association made a submission entitled “Putting Sustainable Development into Practice” to HKSAR Chief Executive Mr Tung Chee Hwa, in which we put forth a range of ideas and suggestions on the government’s environmental policy. While there is evident improvement in some areas, in many others there has been a woeful lack of progress.
- 1.2 On many points, therefore, our submission of 2000 still stands. Much as we are tempted to re-iterate and update our comments of last year, we believe it more fruitful to engender a systemic move forward in public policy making on the environment. We are, therefore, contributing our views this year from another level, through a perspective that seeks to drive long-term and sustainable public policy making. Our submission is thus built around the theme of “institution building”.
- 1.3 We shall first review briefly each of the policy areas on which we commented last year, before moving on to the main points of this submission.

-

2. Our submission last year: Review of progress

Our comment/proposal	<i>Current situation</i>
<i>Sustainable development</i>	
We urged the CE to establish the Sustainable Development Council as a matter of priority.	The Council is not yet established.
There should be a sustainable development strategy.	There is no such strategy, not even a general policy statement.
The Sustainability Impact Assessment process should be given legal status through a sustainable development bill.	There is no mechanism for SusIA, not to speak of a Susdev Bill.
The Sustainable development Unit should be formed under the Chief Secretary, to ensure that susdev is not just a vision but a practice.	The Susdev unit has indeed been established under the CS.
<i>Waste management</i>	
Government expenditure in waste management should be re-allocated towards reduction and avoidance at source, as well as recycling.	There is no marked change in government practice.
Government should implement fees and charges on waste disposal and treatment.	A landfill charge is being planned but there is no sign of implementation yet.
Government should invest substantially more resources into publicity and education about recycling.	More is being done but we do not consider it enough, nor is the result effective.

Producer responsibility should be introduced, possibly with some financial involvement from the government.	This does not appear to be seriously considered.
Recycling targets and a trip ticket system should be introduced for construction wastes.	We understand this is being considered though it is not yet implemented.
<i>Nature and heritage conservation</i>	
There should be a strong government policy on conservation.	It is being developed but no policy has been announced yet.
The definition of “conservation areas” should be broadened to cover places of ecological value, landscape value, coastal areas, historical value, rural character and cultural values.	This has not happened.
A Nature Conservation Trust should be set up with a grant from the government.	No progress.
Government should effect transfer of development rights through land-swap, transfer of plot ratio or monetising development rights.	We are not aware of any movement.
Review of the small house policy.	The review has been promised but there is no information from the government on any progress.
Conduct a study to identify our inventory of natural and cultural heritage.	Other than a landscape mapping study and the list of buildings kept by the Antiquities and Monuments Office, no similar study has been planned as far as we know.
Energy conservation	
Interconnection of the grids should be implemented and transmission separated	This is precluded by the lack of an energy policy.

from generation.	
There should be a competition policy for the power sector.	No such policy is being developed.
Government should consider setting up a permanent Energy Authority.	No such body. The institutional structure for energy is under-developed.
The potential for integration of the Hong Kong and Guangdong power grids should be examined.	We are not aware if this is being discussed by the two sides.
<i>Sustainable living: water and sewage</i>	
There should be an open debate on privatisation of water supplies.	There is no information for the public to be engaged in a meaningful discussion.
Establish a Pearl River Delta Mayor's Council to coordinate and prioritize projects of great environmental concern to Hong Kong and to the region.	We are not aware if this is brought up at all in the discussion between the Hong Kong and Guangdong authorities.
The SSDS review should be conducted in a fair and independent manner. The process should be open and transparent.	The review has been conducted and the process has indeed been open and transparent.
<i>Sustainable living: Clean air</i>	
Lower land premium for new LPG stations and subsidise training and operation for maintenance workshop.	There are still not enough LPG stations or maintenance workshops.
Set up targets of particulate levels and promote widespread use of particulate traps and catalytic converters.	The latter is being promoted, although targets have yet to be set.
Extend the LPG programme to public light	We understand a scheme is being developed

buses and small goods vehicles.	but it is not yet implemented.
Organise a quadrilateral effort of officials, academics, green groups and the business sector to get to the bottom of the problem of cross boundary air pollution.	The Business Environment Council will be focusing on air pollution in its annual conference later in the year, but that is not a government initiative.
<i>Sustainable planning</i>	
In new development areas and urban renewal schemes, a pedestrian strategy should be established.	We have not seen this happening.
Provide safe access for the blind and the disabled in our road design.	We notice that some improvement measures are being undertaken by public transport operators but few have been done on the road.
Re-introduce the Town Planning Bill.	This should be on the government agenda but it has yet to happen.
The Town Planning Ordinance and the Roads and Railways Ordinances should be revamped and rationalised.	This is not even on the government agenda.
A moratorium on the Lok Ma Chau spur line, the Lantau section of Route Ten (the north-south link), the Pokfulam section of Route Seven, and the Lung Wui Road extension in front of City Hall.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●● Spur line: the EIA Appeal Board has rejected KCRC's appeal. ●● Lantau north-south link: a solution has been developed which is more agreeable to the environment. ●● Route Seven: soon to be discussed by LegCo. ●● Lung Wui Road: plan suspended
<i>Sustainable community building</i>	
Government should examine the possibility of subventing green groups.	Government seems to be moving in the opposite direction, of undercutting green groups' resources.

Establish a “Green Community Chest”.	There is no response from the government to this proposed concept.
Government should help every district establish at least one nature trail and one cultural heritage trail.	No reaction from government.

3. Our perspective: institution building

Institution building as solution to structural problems

- 3.1 There is no doubt a stronger sense of awareness of environmental problems, and a greater readiness to deal with them, both on the part of the government and the community. The environmental agenda is no longer in the margins but is now part of the mainstream of government policy making. Accordingly, there have been an increasing number of environmental activities - a campaign of one kind or another, a policy here or there. While these should be welcomed, there seems still a very long way to go before we achieve any significant results. This is because many problems are structural in nature; however much we do, our effort is circumscribed by structural barriers or deficiencies.
- 3.2 While the Conservancy Association is a champion for action, we would like, in this submission, to focus on an approach that deals with the more fundamental basis in policy making, namely, that of institution building. As a constructive green group committed to Hong Kong, our perspective is a simple one. We believe there must be the right structure within the government in the making of environmental policies, and that structure must be one that is firmly based on a constructive interaction between the Administration and the community. This should, where appropriate, be supplemented by a stronger legal framework and an effort to strengthen the community's stake in the environment.

Three key value orientations

- 3.3 Before applying this perspective to the major environmental issues, we would first like to name a few value-orientations which should guide us in the institution building for sustainable environment.
- 3.4 Firstly, we should value our environmental effort as an investment in our social capital. The environment is worth us spending more, even HKSAR's fiscal reserves. In this regard we agree wholeheartedly with the Financial Secretary Mr Antony Leung that our reserves should be invested into the SAR's future, not spent away. Environment is one such investment which the market itself cannot provide. Spending the reserves on conservation,

for instance, will be an investment into Hong Kong's social capital which will benefit both the present and all future generations.

3.5 Secondly, we see Hong Kong as a community to which we belong and in which we take pride. But one does not take the community for granted. Instead both the government and social groups need to devote more to community building and empowerment.

3.6 Thirdly, as part of the community that is Hong Kong, we all have a stake in our environment. Consequently, every sector and individual has a responsibility, and if that means we should all contribute, then so we should. Whether this is in the form of adhering to the polluter pay or user pay principle, or paying a green tax, environment is everybody's business, hence every citizen's responsibility.

4. Sustainable development

4.1 We urge the Chief Executive to make a strong statement in his October Policy Address to strengthen the institutional structure for sustainable development.

A transparent and effective SusIA process

4.2 Currently, the only structure within the Administration in charge of sustainable development is the newly created Sustainable Development Unit. If the result of the much criticised Susdev21 Study were to be followed, it would appear that an important task of the Susdev Unit would be to conduct sustainability impact assessment (SusIA) using the Computer Aided Sustainability Evaluation Tool (CASET). While the Conservancy Association is not against the use of CASET, we have more than once pointed out that it is an inadequate tool for an incomplete task using a flawed process.

4.3 As a computer model, the CASET is little more than a tool to re-arrange information. The worth of the assessment by CASET cannot be determined without first finding answers to the following questions:

- What items will go into the SusIA process, and how are these items chosen? Are they limited to major development projects such as designated projects under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance, or will they include public policies, e.g. the small house policy for indigenous villagers?
- For each item to go through the CASET system, what information will be provided as input, by whom, and what are the best practices to ensure that enough information is fed into the system?
- The CASET is a neutral tool and for any assessment to take place, some criteria have to be given. How are these criteria determined?
- How does the actual assessment take place and is there a way to benchmark against best practices?
- How transparent is the whole SusIA process? Will the information mentioned above be open to the public?

4.4 Put simply, CASET is an inadequate tool for SusIA if there is no clear definition of what it should cover and of the values through which the assessment is driven. The SusIA task is incomplete if there is no quality control over the input of information. And the process is flawed if it is not transparent and there is no way to ensure best practices prevail. At worst, the whole SusIA process could well become just any bureaucratic layer to justify earmarked development projects.

The Susdev Council and Susdev Bill

4.5 For SusIA to work would therefore require much more than just a Susdev Unit plus a computer model. A strong Susdev Council with a meaningful terms of reference should be part of the structure. As we suggested in our last Policy Address submission, the first task of the Susdev Council should be to deliver a sound sustainable development strategy for Hong Kong. Such a strategy should not only reflect, but guide the community's aspirations for a sustainable quality of life. It will also provide the basis for developing the criteria for the SusIA process mentioned above.

4.6 In addition, we would like to continue to make the call for a Sustainable Development Bill, to provide the legal basis for sustainability impact assessment. On these points the proposals in our last Policy Address submission still stand.

5. Conservation

The conservation policy in the making

- 5.1 The Conservancy Association published a position paper on conservation policy last year entitled “Achieving Conservation – a Positive Conservation Policy for Hong Kong”. We are heartened that the paper has been extensively discussed both by green groups and by the related business sectors, the Real Estate Developers Association having indicated to us their support of the principles we outlined. The Association’s policy paper also provides the framework to guide the ongoing discussion between green groups and the Heung Yee Kuk. We feel particularly encouraged by the fact that there is a striking level of consensus among the community towards conservation. We believe there is now a very sound basis upon which a good conservation policy can be built.
- 5.2 A review of the government’s conservation policy was promised in the 1999 Policy Address and signs about the policy being unveiled before the end of this year have been signaled. With the high level of public consensus over conservation, we urge the Chief Executive to seize the opportunity now to make a strong statement in the Policy Address, so as to render more effective the actual announcement of the policy.
- 5.3 As to the substance of the policy, the Association’s position paper already contains a range of recommendations on a more effective conservation framework and implementation options, such as government buy-out, transfer of development rights and conservation-oriented development. Upon implementation, these will either require or bring about corresponding legal and institutional changes. We trust that with the high level of support our paper has gained in the community, it should provide a kind of benchmark for the policy making by the Administration.

Nature Conservation Trust and Nature Conservation Bill

- 5.4 In this submission, we would like to reinforce our recommendation for a Nature Conservation Trust and a Nature Conservation Bill as crucial elements in the institution

building for conservation. We shall also make another case for the integration of nature and heritage conservation.

- 5.5 We believe it is now the right time to establish a Nature Conservation Trust. A community-based body to act as owner and guardian of our natural heritage will be supported by political parties, business sector and the man-in-the-street alike. It will be a powerful tool to forge community spirit and partnership.
- 5.6 In addition, we believe conservation of our natural heritage is of such importance that it merits a legal statement, in the form of a Nature Conservation Bill, to provide for the legal basis of society's efforts in conservation. This will establish firmly the value of our natural heritage as "public asset", and hence provide a legal justification for the investment of public resources, such as the HKSAR's reserves, into conservation.

Integration of jurisdiction

- 5.7 While the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department is doing admirable work as a conservation authority, its role is limited to nature conservation by the very nature of the artificial constraints in the conservation policy. Conservation of cultural heritage, an equally important action area, nevertheless falls under the purview of the Antiquities and Monuments Office. This separation of nature from heritage conservation is a major institutional flaw. In practice, the two cannot be separated from each other, such as in many villages of the New Territories.
- 5.8 We believe the current structure for conservation within the government should be reviewed. While this does not necessarily mean a merging of different departments, it does mean closer and better coordination among different departments is badly needed. Above all, the departments concerned should take on a more assertive role as advocates for conservation within the Administration.
- 5.9 In sum, since nature and culture are integral parts of our quality of life and give identity to the people in the community, their conservation should not merely be one task amongst plenty, to be delegated to a division in the government, but a priority for the whole government.

5.10 An important part in this recognition to have a proper sense of value of the worth of our natural and cultural assets. In this regard we would like to call for a sense of proportion in the Administration's consideration of conservation in relation to other infrastructure such as transport. By way of example, the money required for resumption of either Long Valley or Sha Lo Tung would, according to our calculation, amount to a magnitude of \$0.8 to \$1 billion. The planned Route 9 tunnel link between Shatin and Shamshuipo will cost \$8 billion. While mobility between Shatin and Shamshuipo is important, for a fraction of that cost, the government could have saved all of Long Valley, Sha Lo Tung, Tai Long Wan and perhaps a few more areas for posterity, and in perpetuity.

6. Sustainable transport

Systemic problems in the making of transport policy

- 6.1 The Association has been involved in a number of controversial transport issues such as the Kowloon and Canton Railway Corporation's planned spur line to Lok Ma Chau, and the temporary road link for Lung Wui Road in front of City Hall. We believe there are important lessons to be learnt from these episodes.
- 6.2 In the case of the spur line, now that the EIA Appeal Board has made its ruling, we urge all parties to work together to find a win-win solution to both conserve our valuable heritage in Long Valley as well as alleviate congestion in Lo Wu. The government should seriously consider buying out the agricultural land and leasing it back for farming in a way regulated by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department; while at the same time pursue a vigorous reform of the immigration logistics in Lo Wu. If the latter is demonstrably not feasible – even with the opening of West Rail in a few years' time – then the spur line option may be re-considered but only with an alignment that does not cut through Long Valley.
- 6.3 Now that the Appeal Board has ruled on the Long Valley, we cannot emphasise enough the importance of maintaining the integrity of the EIA process. In this regard, it seems highly ironic that the biggest threat so far has come from a body which is totally part of the public sector. In pointing out this, we are not trying to apportion blame on individuals; instead we see that as a reflection of a systemic problem within the Administration which results in government departments undoing the work of each other.
- 6.4 One of the important recommendations in the verdict is that communication between the regulatory authority and the stakeholders should be strengthened. While we agree to this, we have a strong feeling that there is no forum in the EIA process for the stakeholders to negotiate and make compromise. We strongly recommend the Administration to introduce a mechanism of mediation, which has proved to be effectively in achieving reconciliation in the construction industry and similar EIA process elsewhere, for example, in Canada and U.S..

Building sustainability into transport planning

- 6.5 For the record, the Association supports rail as the more environmentally friendly mode of transport, even though the KCRC has chosen to fight an environmental battle with the community. By the same token, our transport infrastructure should be built to serve the community, yet the reality is that the public seems compelled to serve the needs of roads rather than the other way round.
- 6.6 The problem, in a nutshell, is that there is no sustainability consideration in our transport policy regime. There is no valid reason why, for instance, all roads and railway plans which are drawn by transport planners have to be deemed approved on outline zoning plans. While transport is a very important aspect in planning, it is not the most important. We believe the relationship between transport and land use planning – currently governed independently by the Railway and Roads Ordinances and the Town Planning Ordinance – must be changed fundamentally. Transport planning must be integrated into land use planning, both of which should be governed by sustainability considerations. There is an opportunity to resolve this through the Town Planning Bill and we urge the Chief Executive to give direction to that in his Policy Address.
- 6.7 Indeed, what is needed for our transport policy regime is nothing less than a shift in paradigm. If transport were really to serve people, we should see more of the following:
- A bigger network of more efficient rail system in areas having proven travel demands, such as Sai Kung and Island South;
 - Safer and more comprehensive cycle track systems throughout the territory and in all new towns;
 - Use of cleaner transport modes such as electric driven or gas driven buses;
 - Providing more comfortable walkway systems so as to reduce the necessity to drive;
 - More pervasive use of low noise transport infrastructure, such as depressed roads, low noise pavements, more buffer between the roads/railways and sensitive receivers.
- 6.8 A good test of the Transport Bureau's resolve in embracing the sustainability principle, is how far it is ready to develop Electronic Road Pricing to alleviate traffic congestion and the resulting degradation in living quality in the urban areas. In the last Policy Address this was

a task given, curiously, to the Environmental Protection Department which, unfortunately, has not delivered. We urge the government to expedite the ERP system as a matter of priority.

From attitude change to institutional change

6.9 The changes we are seeking are structural and a lot needs to be done, but we do acknowledge that some progress has been made. In the case of the proposed temporary road link cutting through Edinburgh Place, for instance, the government has the good sense to withdraw the plan after receiving the Association's objection. The North South link on Lantau Island is also being resolved after a spirited dialogue between the government and green groups, and in the same spirit, Route 10's alignment on North Lantau was improved. We welcome the change in attitude but again, we would like to see this firmly reflected in the institutional structure. We urge the Chief Executive to give a further push towards such institutional change in his Policy Address.

7. A sustainable sewage treatment strategy

Structural change needed for HATS

- 7.1 The appointment of the International Review Panel on the Strategic Sewage Disposal Scheme (SSDS) has been a major step forward in tackling the ever mounting problems posed by the failed SSDS, and we commend the Chief Executive for taking that decision. Now that the SSDS is formally replaced by the HATS (Harbour Area Treatment System), we see a great opportunity to work towards a sustainable solution for cleaning up our harbour waters.
- 7.2 Whilst the Association agrees that HATS is moving in the right direction in terms of the process chosen and the treatment options to be considered, we consider it deficient in one key aspect. We have, time and again, emphasised the importance of establishing the right institutional mechanism for the design and implementation of such huge infrastructure projects as the SSDS. Unfortunately, it seems that the HATS is being implemented by the same institutional framework and delivery mechanism which has given rise to the failed SSDS.
- 7.3 In our view, without a fundamental change in the institutional structure, the HATS runs the risk of repeating the disasters of SSDS. The institutional set-up for SSDS has suffered from three fundamental flaws, namely:
- confused lines of responsibilities with too many government departments involved from concept planning, design, engineering, contract letting, project management, execution, operation to monitoring, with the result that no single unit in the Government took responsibility for the entire scheme;
 - conflict of roles between a regulator and an executing agency, with the EPD taking on the dual roles of implementing an environmental improvement project and specifying environmental standards and monitoring outcome at the same time;
 - lack of transparency and public accountability, making it difficult to build consensus among the community, which is necessary for a project of such scale and with such high level of public attention.

7.4 The institutional deficiencies have, sadly, resulted in much public distrust of the government and eventually in a total loss of confidence in the entire scheme. While the Administration seems to have acknowledged some of the institutional problems and has established a Monitoring Group accordingly, we do not believe that group alone could fix all the institutional defects.

Reforming the institutional structure for HATS

7.5 We would like to make a case to the Chief Executive that the HATS employs the delivery model that has been used in the construction of the new airport. At the policy level there should be a Steering Committee headed by the Chief Secretary. It should be supported by a new agency, such as a Clean Harbour Authority (CHA), which should be an integrated executing agency for HATS from design to commissioning. In order to increase public participation and transparency of the policy-making process, the CHA should have an independent board and chairman, with members comprising green group representatives, local IRP members and relevant professionals and academics. EPD can remain as the regulatory authority to provide the necessary checks and balance.

7.6 The structural changes we proposed may be drastic. But cleaning up the waters of the 'Fragrant Harbour' is a big task, and it is also a task we must succeed, if the Chief Executive's vision of Hong Kong as a world city is to be realised. We would close by pointing out that one thing Parisians were most grateful to Napoleon was to have the city's sewerage system built.

8. Sustainable community building

A community environmental policy

- 8.1 The environmental agenda is also a community agenda. There are few subjects that affect all members of the community to the same extent as the air that we breathe, the water we drink, the streets we walk every day, the landscape we enjoy, or the way of life which we are all part of.
- 8.2 Since “quality of life” is everybody’s concern, the environmental agenda should also be an agenda of community building: getting the public involved and giving them a bigger stake will not only improve the quality of the environment but also contribute to the building of the “Hong Kong community”. Needless to say, the best way to achieve community building is to bring it about in the institutional arena, rather than organising sporadic campaigns here and there.
- 8.3 The Association urges the Chief Executive to consider a formal and comprehensive community policy to steer the SAR towards a sustainable orientation and to guide the relationship between community groups and the government. Such a community environmental policy should comprise a few aspects as follows.

Empowering the community in environmental policy making

- 8.4 A major barrier to community building is the rigid and insular nature of government policy-making, which does not take enough account of public views or social and technological changes. To rectify that, we urge the Chief Executive to institute a campaign for greater transparency in the policy making process. In this regard the International Review Panel (IRP) for the SSDS has provided a good starting point. The review process has been held in an open and transparent manner, with the active and constructive participation of green groups and professional bodies. For the first time, the community has been able to partake in the making of a crucial policy that affects their everyday life. This openness should be followed through in the working of the HATS – hence our call for further institutional changes in an earlier section of this paper. It should also be built into

other parts of the legal and institutional structure, such as in the passage of the Town Planning Bill.

- 8.5 In addition to improving transparency, we believe the community should be entrusted with a bigger stake in environmental policy making. There should be a mechanism for providing public resources to concerned groups so as to enable them to build up their own expertise and capacity. For instance, bona fide green groups which seek to develop viable alternatives in complex environmental projects should be able to do so with assistance from public resources. They should also receive assistance for their advocacy work, such as zoning applications for sites of specific conservation interests, or developing project proposals for sustainable development.
- 8.6 Furthermore, the composition of statutory bodies with substantial environmental bearings should be strengthened by the addition of more professional representatives from non-governmental environmental groups. Already some green groups are participating in some statutory bodies, but we think it appropriate for the government to make it imperative to use the community's assets – for instance, specifying that at least one-third of the members of such bodies should be community representatives from green groups, academics or professionals.

Capacity building for community environmental groups

- 8.7 We would like to reflect a concern of all major green groups over the lack of government support in their community building activities. That would have been just a disappointment, not a feeling of let-down as regarded by some of our friendly associations, if not for the promises which green groups perceived to have been repeatedly made by the Administration. When the Environment and Conservation Fund was established in 1994, for instance, its explicit aim was to assist green groups and community groups, yet many groups now perceive the Fund as a means of undermining, rather than building up, their capacity. In the 1999 Policy Address a fund for environmental education was alluded to, but nothing has been said about it thus far. We urge the Chief Executive to use the 2001 Policy Address to effect the necessary structural changes.

Environmental education policy

8.8 At present, most students in Hong Kong can only learn about environmentally related concepts and issues from core subjects, such as geography and biology in a marginal way since there is no stand alone compulsory environmental subject in our school curricula. To make matter worse, the availability of extra-curricular environmental activities is very much at the discretion of the school administration. Thus, there is no guarantee that an average matriculated student in Hong Kong is equipped with adequate environmental knowledge, let alone awareness and sympathetic attitudes. This explains why it is so difficult to implement environmentally beneficial measures that would have an initial adverse impact on the community, such as charges and setting up a waste-to-energy plant in Hong Kong. Thus, there is an urgent need to formally incorporate environmental subjects as compulsory elements in both the school curricula and the programme of extra-curricular activities. The purpose is to make future generations in Hong Kong environmentally sympathetic. Needless to say, this will further increase the stock of our social capital.

9. Conclusion

Efficient institution building

- 9.1 We have highlighted the importance of institutional changes. In this concluding paragraphs we would emphasise that our support for institutional changes do not imply our endorsement for bigger government or more cumbersome bureaucracy. On the contrary, we believe strongly that institutional defects are the cause of inefficiencies. In our previous submission, we have alluded to privatisation of water and introduction of more competition into electricity supply; we believe these are institutional changes that would simplify and make the bureaucracy more efficient, rather than the other way round.
- 9.2 By the same token, it is a fallacy that more community participation raises cost and lowers efficiency. By contrast, a community that has a sense of ownership will have much to contribute in the making of the right policies and decisions, which will be conducive to greater efficiency.

Environment – belonging to the community

- 9.3 Finally, we appreciate that the concern of most people now is on livelihood issues. We share this concern deeply and we would support the government taking appropriate measures to revive the economy and create jobs. In our view, the present economical difficulties reflects precisely the importance of a sense of community among us. It is such a sense of community that would carry us through eventually.
- 9.4 For this reason, it is important for us, as a community, not to squander our social capital – our environment and heritage - which is a crucial part of the sustainable development of our economy and society. Only when there is a sense of community will the polluter pay principle, the user pay principle, and that same principle underlying the sales tax, be supported by the public. Our

environmental quality is worth investing in, both in itself and as a tool to a greater civic sense.