



二〇〇九年六月十五日

各款衛生紙重量及質量差異大

挑選日用品例如衛生紙的準則是品質、紙量、衛生程度？還是全部各項？

但衛生紙的外觀幾乎一樣，包裝上的資料亦不多，消費者實難以比較。

消費者委員會最新測試 25 款卷裝衛生紙，大部分屬 3 層紙，只有 3 款為 2 層紙，測試結果發現差異頗大。

着重物有所值的消費者會特別留意到，測試樣本間的淨重量（減去包裝和紙筒）、格數和每卷售價都分別很大。

在淨重和格數方面，每卷由 68 至 186 克，及由 125 至 364 格，差距都接近 2 倍。

以每 10 克淨重的售價計算，由 \$0.136 至 \$0.288，差距超過 1 倍。

測試顯示售價與重量和格數都沒有直接關係。最貴的樣本每卷售價 \$3.69，淨重 128 克和有 195 格；但另一款售價每卷 \$3.09，淨重達 162 克和有 274 格。

消委會呼籲衛生紙供應商標示詳細產品資料，方便消費者比較。

供應商的推銷手法亦得消費者留意。

有些品牌供應 10 卷裝以外，還同時供應同型號 10+2 裝或 10 送 2 裝（即 12 卷）。

消費者可能以為額外得到兩卷衛生紙，但原來未必如此，測試顯示一款 12 卷裝的每卷淨重，比 10 卷裝的每卷淨重為輕。

舉例說，一款 12 卷裝衛生紙的淨總重量是 1,764 克，同牌子的 10 卷裝卻重 1,800 克，原因是 12 卷裝內每卷的淨重原來只有 147 克，比 10 卷裝的淨重少了 33 克。

但另一牌子的「10 送 2」裝淨總重 1,536 克，比同牌子 10 卷裝的 1,250 克，是真正多得 2 卷。

另一個值得關注的是衛生程度，每型號檢測兩批樣本，其中 4 個型號在兩批檢測中都發現每克含超過 600 個菌落，超出內地衛生紙標準 GB 20810 的規定。另外一個型號在其中一批樣本檢測有超逾 600 個菌落。

但所有樣本都沒有檢出大腸菌群和兩種致病菌 — 金黃葡萄球菌和溶血性鏈球菌。

樣本的菌落水平可能受較差的儲存環境所影響，故應存放在乾燥清潔的地方，避免受污染。

此外，測試亦檢測樣本的可遷移熒光物質。

雖然目前未有證據證明熒光增白劑會損害人體健康，但可能會導致部分人士皮膚過敏。5 個樣本被驗出含有該物質。

第三是測定樣本的撕裂強度(乾濕紙拉力強度)、吸濕功能(速度和量)、水中分解速度和粉塵量，以評估其品質。

試用者就樣本的柔軟度和氣味，與及紙張瑕疵評分。

測試的詳細結果，消費者可參考 6 月分《選擇》月刊。

測試瓶裝水衛生程度

不少人認為瓶裝水必定純淨衛生，但如將它們進行化合物和微生物檢測的話，結果會如何？

炎夏將至，消費者委員會進行了 40 款瓶裝水的大型測試，包括 11 款蒸餾水、4 款礦物質飲品和 25 款天然礦泉水。

測試主要檢定有否含有無機化合物、重金屬、除害劑污染物、消毒劑殘餘，與及微生物質素。測試結果主要發現：

第一，8 款天然礦泉水發現含菌，異養菌平皿計數介乎每毫升 2 個至 550 個菌落。異養菌平皿計數檢測的微生物菌譜範圍廣泛，包括細菌和真菌，有可能在自然環境的水源中存在。

根據世界衛生組織的《飲用水水質準則》，異養菌平皿計數不能直接顯示致病菌的存在，但可作為水處理或消毒操作監測的指示菌，應盡可能保持在低水平。

世衛的《飲用水水質準則》和食品法典委員會的《天然礦泉水標準》均沒有設定異養菌平皿計數的限值；而本港的《即食食品微生物含量指引補充資料》，亦沒有包括瓶裝水的異養菌平皿計數的準則。

雖然樣本檢出較高的異養菌平皿計數並不直接反映是否含有致病菌，但醫生建議幼童、懷孕婦女、長者和免疫力較差的人士應小心選擇飲用水。如要飲用天然礦泉水，宜先把它煮沸後才飲用。

第二，一款天然礦泉水樣本檢出亞硝酸鹽，含量為每升 **0.40** 毫克，超出食品法典委員會的《天然礦泉水標準》所定的含量上限（每升 **0.1** 毫克）。

根據聯合國糧食及農業組織/世界衛生組織聯合食物添加劑專家委員會的評估，亞硝酸鹽的每日可攝入量為每公斤體重計 **0-0.07** 毫克。

以一個重 **60** 公斤的成人計，要每天飲用 **10** 升以上的上述樣本，攝入的亞硝酸鹽才會超出每日可攝入量。

食物安全中心表示，目前沒有特定法例規管瓶裝水的亞硝酸鹽含量，但所有在港出售的食物須適宜供人食用。

第三，2 個天然礦泉水樣本驗出含有銻（一種有毒重金屬），含量為每升 **0.001** 毫克，遠低於《天然礦泉水標準》所定的銻含量上限（每升 **0.005** 毫克）。

本港的《食物攙雜（金屬雜質含量）規例》，為某幾類指明食物的銻含量訂立了最高准許濃度，但瓶裝水並不是其中一類指明的食物。

整體來說，所有樣本都檢測不到除毒劑污染物、消毒劑殘餘和致病菌。

愛美一族注意：你的化妝用粉底安全嗎？

根據消費者委員會測試結果，愛美一族可放心使用化妝用粉底。

消委會測試的粉底樣本全部合乎衛生標準。

雖然有 6 款樣本發現微量重金屬鉛，但含量由 **0.5ppm** 至 **1.5ppm**，日常使用不足以影響健康。

內地衛生部《化妝品衛生規範》規定一般化妝品的鉛含量上限為 **40ppm**，上述含鉛樣本的含鉛量遠低於上限規定。

所有樣本亦沒有檢出糞大腸菌群、銅綠假單胞菌和金黃葡萄球菌等致病菌，菌落總數、霉菌及酵母菌量則全低於檢測下限。

這是消委會首次進行粉底測試，共 **30** 個品牌的樣本購自不同零售點，測試其重金屬（水銀、鉛和砷）和微生物含量。

雖然樣本可放心使用，但消委會並不滿意產品缺乏全面的標籤資料。

在 30 個樣本中，只有 3 個清楚標示有效日期或保質日期，其中一個同時列出生產日期。

另外有 2 個樣本只標示生產日期，欠缺有效日期或保質期。

其餘樣本（25 個）仍採用消費者難以解讀的密碼來標示生產日期。

其中 15 個樣本同時標註開封後使用期，由 12 個月至 2 年不等。

21 個樣本以英文詳細列明產品成分，有助消費者合適選擇型號，特別是皮膚容易敏感人士，宜避免接觸酒精、香料和防腐劑等成分。

消費者購買粉底前，應先試用（例如在手腕內側），看看會否有過敏反應。

皮膚科專家亦強調正確卸妝的重要，否則化妝品殘餘可能會堵塞毛孔，容易引致粉刺、暗瘡等問題，影響皮膚狀況及外觀。

消費者必須使用合適的卸妝用品，將化妝品完全溶解才能徹底卸妝，時間和耐性都不可少。

首次測試麵包機

試想像自製喜愛的麵包和感受新鮮出爐的香味。

若以全自動麵包機焗製，會否達到消費者的期望？

消費者委員會首次測試麵包機，3 款樣本售價分別為 \$638、\$780 及 \$928。

測試比較樣本焗製出來的麵包質素、運作速度、能源效率、安全程度、耐用程度和使用方便程度。

麵包機實際上是麵粉攪拌機加電焗爐，以一系列的預設程序和模式操作。

使用麵包機非常簡易，只須將材料量好或使用預先包裝麵包材料（**bread mix**），然後揀選程序，麵包機即會自動操作 — 攪拌、發起麵團、焗製新鮮麵包。

視乎不同型號，不少樣本甚至備有果醬及蛋糕模式，讓用家自製果醬和蛋糕底。

測試麵包質素時，所用樣本跟據食譜焗製相同或接近重量的白麵包和全麥麵包，然後比較麵包外貌、麵包皮厚度和鬆脆度；切開麵包後，再比較麵包心的顏色及烤焗均勻程度。

耗電量方面，2款樣本的耗電量較低。麵包機操作時機面的溫度不算很高，但用家應避免經常觸摸或干擾操作。

又進行耐用測試，模擬每天使用一次，評估運作2年後的狀況。一款樣本在操作700次後，馬達及攪拌頭的轉動不如原先般暢順。

對一些消費者來說，自製比購買麵包較健康，因為可控制材料及為麵包添加風味和營養材料，和有更多享受家庭活動的時間。

但對支出較關注人士來說，究竟自製還是購買麵包較便宜？

測試比較了自製和在超市買麵包的支出。

要自製約700克白麵包，有關主要材料（麵粉、牛油和酵母）和電力的成本等開支已超過\$15，而這尚未計算麵包機售價和製作功夫在內。

以此價錢已足夠在超市買2包總重量相若的普通8片裝方包。

如選用預先包裝麵包材料（大約\$20至\$30）焗製，成本會更高。

若平貴是最重要的考慮，按上述數據比較，麵包機自製麵包不比買麵包便宜。

且讓我們一聽試驗人員的意見：測試時用了不同牌子、型號的麵粉或預先包裝麵包材料焗製麵包，結果是麵包味道和質素分別不大，故此不一定要使用最貴價的材料。

留意免費防火講座陷阱

防範以虛假聲稱推銷防火設備。

消費者委員會收到投訴有關以虛假聲稱銷售防火設備例如滅火器、面罩和維修服務後，特別提出警示。

誤導手法包括自稱獲得消防處認可，提供免費防火知識講座。

他們以防火組織、關注中心、消防學術研究社、防火互助社，甚至非牟利機構為名，以博取社區組織、大廈業主立案法團、酒樓、戲院及學校等

的信任。

《選擇》月刊刊登的一個消費者投訴指出，有社會團體誤信一間防火關注中心為消防處認可，遂邀請對方舉辦免費防火講座。

於講座後簽訂了購買滅火筒及保養合約，事後才發覺費用大大高於市價，且買入過多滅火筒。

消防處及消委會亦曾收過類似的投訴。

消防處表示從來沒有將防火講座的工作外判予私人機構。

市民遇到任何團體假借消防處名義進行推銷，應致電 2170 9630 向該處社區關係組查詢。如懷疑事件涉及刑事罪行，應報警求助。

《選擇》月刊現已上網，網址為<http://choice.yip.com.hk>，同時可透過電訊盈科固網及流動電話服務接收。

今日（六月十五日）《選擇》月刊記者招待會主持為消委會宣傳及社區關係小組主席何沛謙先生。

歡迎被邀出席新聞發布會的傳媒引用新聞稿的內容。

消費者委員會保留所有關於《選擇》月刊及網上《選擇》的權利（包括版權）。



Vast variations exist in quantity and quality toilet rolls

What criteria do you use to choose a daily necessity used in great abundance such as the toilet rolls – quality, quantity, hygiene, or all rolled into one?

The plight is that they all look pretty much the same, and there is precious little product information on their packaging for comparative shopping.

The latest Consumer Council test has shown up some vast variations amongst 25 models of toilet rolls. The majority were 3-ply samples and only 3 were 2-ply.

First and foremost, of particular significance to the consumers intent on value for money, the results revealed considerable variations in relation to the net weight (less packaging and the core), number of sheets, and cost per roll.

On net weight and number of sheets, the samples varied from 68 g to 186 g and from 125 to 364 per roll respectively. In both cases, the variations were nearly 3 times.

On cost for 10 g paper, they differed from \$0.136 to \$0.288, a variation of more than double.

The test could establish no correlation between the price and quantity. The most pricey toilet roll at \$3.69 each was found with 128 g in net weight and 195 in number of sheets while another sample priced at \$3.09 had 162 g and 274 sheets.

Toilet roll suppliers are urged to label their products with comprehensive information to facilitate comparison by consumers.

The attention of consumers is also drawn to the promotional sale practice of some suppliers.

The tactic involved the sale of promotional 12-roll packs – 2 rolls more than the usual 10-roll packs – with claims of “buy 10 get 2 free” or “10+2”.

But, contrary to consumers’ expectation of gaining 2 additional rolls, it transpired that the net weight per roll in a 12-roll pack might actually be less than the net weight per roll in a 10-roll pack.

For instance, in one case, a 12-roll pack weighed a total of 1,764 g net whereas a 10-roll pack of the same brand weighed 1,800 g. This was because the net weight per roll of the 12-roll pack was only 147 g, 33 g less than one in the 10-roll pack.

In another case, however, consumers stand to benefit with a 12-roll pack

weighing 1,536 g net compared to 1,250 g in a 10-roll pack of the same brand.

Secondly, of particular concern to the health-conscious is that some samples were found to contain bacteria in excess of the standard of the Mainland – the National Standards of the People's Republic of China-Bathroom Tissue GB20810-2006.

The models were tested in 2 batches for their Total Bacterial Count (TBC). 4 models, in both batches, were found to have a TBC exceeding 600 cfu/g (colony forming units per gram) while 1 model was found with the problem in only 1 batch.

However, no pathogen bacteria of *Staphylococcus aureus* and Hemolytic streptococci nor total coliform were detected in any of the samples.

The level of TBC may be affected by poor storage conditions of the products. So, always store in a clean dry place to avoid contamination.

In addition, the samples were subjected to tests for the presence of migratable fluorescent substances.

5 samples were detected with such substances. Although there is no concrete proof that fluorescent substances are harmful, some people might be allergic to them.

Thirdly, to assess their quality, the samples were tested for paper strength (tear resistance, wet and dry tensile strength), water absorbency (rate and capacity), resistance to disintegration in water, particles or loose fibre content.

The samples were rated also by users' panels for their softness and odour, and by visual inspection for creases and stains.

For details, consumers are urged to refer to the test result in this (June) issue of CHOICE.

Hygiene of bottled waters under scrutiny in Council's test

Most people would take the purity and hygiene of bottled waters for granted.

But just do they fare when put to laboratory tests for a host of chemicals and micro-organisms that may exist in bottled waters.

With the hot summer months just around the corner, the Consumer Council has conducted a massive test on 40 samples comprising 11 distilled waters, 4 mineralized waters and 25 natural mineral waters.

It sought to detect the presence of inorganic chemicals, heavy metals, pesticides, residual disinfectants, as well as to assess their microbiological quality. Highlights of the test results include:

First, 8 natural mineral water samples were detected with Heterotrophic Plate Count (HPC) in the range of 2 cfu/ml to 550 cfu/ml. HPC is a measurement of a wide spectrum of micro-organisms, including bacteria and fungi, which may occur in large numbers in raw water sources.

According to WHO Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality, HPC has little value as an index of pathogen presence but can be useful in operational monitoring as a treatment and disinfectant indicator in order to keep the numbers as low as possible.

There is no limit for HPC stipulated in the WHO Guidelines for Drinking Water Quality and Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters. In addition, HPC is not included as one of the microbiological criteria for bottled water stipulated in the Supplementary Information to Microbiological Guidelines for Ready-to-eat Food.

Although a higher HPC level could not directly indicate the presence of pathogens, doctors do suggest that young children, pregnant women, elderly and people with weaker immunity to choose drinking water carefully. Or, to boil natural mineral waters before consumption.

Second, 1 natural mineral water sample was found to contain nitrite in the amount of 0.4 mg/L, which was in excess of the limit (0.1 mg/L) set in the Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters.

According to the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additive (JECFA), the acceptable daily intake (ADI) of nitrite is 0 – 0.07 mg/kg body weight.

This means an adult of 60 kg would have to drink more than 10 L of the sample per day to exceed the ADI of nitrite.

According to the Centre for Food Safety (CFS), there is currently no specific legislation to govern the level of nitrite in bottled waters. However, food sold in Hong Kong must be fit for human consumption.

Third, 2 natural mineral water samples were found to contain antimony, a

toxic heavy metal, at concentration of 0.001 mg/L, which was well below the limit (0.005 mg/L) set in the Codex Standard for Natural Mineral Waters.

In the Food Adulteration (Metallic Contamination) Regulations, the maximum permitted concentration of antimony present in certain foods is specified. But bottled water is not listed as one of the specified foods.

Overall, all bottled water samples were not detected with pesticides, residual disinfectants and pathogens.

Attention beauty-conscious: How safe is your makeup foundation

Consumers can put their heart at ease in the use of makeup foundation.

All samples in a test of the Consumer Council were found to be satisfactory in hygiene.

Only trace amount of lead was detected in 6 foundation samples but the amount, in concentration of 0.5 ppm to 1.5 ppm, was not significant enough to pose any risk of safety.

The Hygienic Standard for Cosmetics of the Mainland allows a maximum limit of 40 ppm lead in cosmetics. The amount of lead in the products in question was therefore well within the safety limit.

The samples were also found to be free of any pathogens *Fecal coliform*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and of the presence of aerobic bacteria, molds and yeast.

The test was the first by the Council on a total of 30 branded samples sourced from retail stores, to assess their heavy metal content (mercury, lead and arsenic) and microbial content.

While, the safety of the foundation samples was not a matter of concern, the Council, however, is much less satisfied with the lack of comprehensive product information on the label.

Out of the 30 foundation samples, only 3 were labelled clearly with the expiry date; 1 had additionally the production date.

2 other samples were labelled with the production date only, without indication of the expiry date or the shelf life.

The rest (25 out of 30 samples) used code number which is indecipherable to consumers as to their production date.

15 samples were labelled with the Period After Opening (PAO), but although PAO indicates how long the product can be used safely after opening, it may vary anything from 12 months to 2 years.

21 samples, however, were labelled with detailed ingredient list in English which is useful to consumers for making suitable choice, particularly to people with sensitive skin who should try to avoid ingredients such as alcohol, fragrance and preservatives.

Consumers are advised to try out (on the inner wrist) a foundation first before purchase to see if it will cause allergy to them.

Dermatologists also stress the importance of removing makeup with appropriate method. Otherwise, makeup residue may block the pores causing the problem of acnes or worsening of skin condition and appearance.

Removing makeup thoroughly is a time-consuming task, but consumers should have the patience and take the time for the makeup remover to completely dissolve the makeup.

First-ever test on breadmakers

Imagine the tantalizing sight and smell of freshly baked homemade bread of your own creation to suit your taste and preference.

Exactly how well does a fully automatic breadmaker perform in measuring up to the expectations of the consumers?

The Consumer Council has conducted its first-ever test on 3 models of bread machines priced at \$638, \$780 and \$928 respectively.

The appliances were put to tests for evaluation of their baking performance in terms of quality of bread, operation speed, energy consumption and safety, as well as durability and ease of use.

Essentially, a breadmaker is a flour mixer cum electric oven, with a range of programmes, settings and features.

Its operation is easy. All you need to do is weigh up the ingredients (or, even easier, buy a premix), select the right programme and the breadmaker will do the rest for you – mix, knead, raise and bake the bread for you.

Depending on the models, a breadmaker can also be programmed to produce cake, jam and to make dough and bake it in a conventional oven.

In the quality-of-bread test, the samples were set to produce similar quantities of white and wholemeal bread with specified recipe. The test assessors then compared the appearance, colour, crispness of the bread and evenness of baking, and rated their performance accordingly.

2 of the models were found to be more energy efficient using less electricity to make bread. Though the surface temperatures of the machines were not very high, users should avoid touching or disturbing the machines whilst in operation.

In the endurance test, a daily operation for two years was simulated. At the end of 700 runs, it was found that the motor of 1 sample did not run as smoothly as previously.

For some consumers making their own bread may be more healthy (they can control the quality of the ingredients and to introduce flavors and nutrients into the bread) and enjoyable (as a get-together family activity) than buying it from the shop.

But for the budget-conscious, the big consideration is which is cheaper: home made or shop bought?

In the test, the cost of making bread is compared with buying bread in the supermarkets.

To make about 700 g of bread, the cost for major ingredients (flour, butter and quick yeast) and electricity amounted to more than \$15, without taking into account the cost of the machine and labour.

This was enough to buy 2 loaves of 8-sliced sandwich bread of about the same total weight.

To make a loaf using bread mix (costing from about \$24 to \$30) the cost will go up even higher.

It seems that, by such comparison, a breadmaker may not offer the alternative to cost savings on bread – if cost is the major consideration.

A word of advice from some test assessors: in their experience, all flour or bread mix could produce bread of similar taste and quality. So it's probably wasteful for consumers making their own bread to try to find the best flour or bread mix.

Beware of bogus offer of free fire-prevention lecture

Beware of the con men peddling fire prevention equipment under false pretenses.

The warning was issued by the Consumer Council in the light of complaints involving the deceptive sale of fire fighting appliances such as extinguishers, gas masks, and maintenance service.

Their modus operandi involved falsely representing themselves as agents contracted by the Fire Services Department (FSD) to organize free talks on fire prevention.

They claimed to be representatives of organizations of a non-profit making nature using names such as Fire Prevention Concern Centre, Fire Prevention Co-operative, Fire Research Institute, or the like.

Under such false pretenses, they were able to gain the trust of their targets involving usually community groups, building owners' associations, restaurants, cinemas, schools, etc.

In one complaint, highlighted in CHOICE, a community group believing that they were authorized agents of the FSD agreed to their offer to give a free talk on fire prevention.

In the end, the group signed a contract for the purchase of a quantity of fire extinguishers and maintenance service at a price which turned out to be far higher than that in the market.

The hapless victim was also duped into holding an excess stock of unnecessary fire fighting equipment.

Similar complaints have been received by both the FSD and the Consumer Council in the past.

The FSD stressed that the Department had never outsourced the work of fire prevention to private organizations.

Any organizations conducting sales in the name of the FSD should be reported to the Department's Community Relations Section at 2170 9630. Or the Police, if any criminal element is suspected.

CHOICE magazine is now also available online (at <http://choice.yp.com.hk>) and via fixed-line and mobile services of PCCW.

Chairing the press conference today (June 15) on the publication of CHOICE issue number 392 is Mr. Ambrose HO, Chairman of Publicity and Community Relations Committee of the Consumer Council.

Members from the media who are invited by this Council to the Press Conference may quote the content of this Press Statement.

The Consumer Council reserves all its right (including copyright) in respect of CHOICE Magazine and Online CHOICE (<http://choice.yp.com.hk>).

Issued by
Consumer Council
15 June 2009