

**Supplementary Information provided by the Administration  
in response to members' requests raised at previous meetings of  
the Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene**

Members' requests raised at the Panel meeting on 14 November 2006

- (a) Information on the details of the exemption of drinks with alcoholic strength in respect of the labelling requirements when the Amendment Regulation comes into operation in July 2007

*The Administration's response -*

Labelling requirements of prepackaged food, including name or designation of the food, the list of ingredients, indication of best before or use by date, statement of special conditions for storage or instructions for use, name and address of manufacturer or packer, count, weight or volume and the use of language are stipulated in the Schedule 3 of the Food and Drugs (Composition and Labelling) Regulations (Cap. 132W).

2. Food exempted from the labelling requirements of the Schedule 3 of Cap. 132W are stipulated in the Schedule 4 of the Regulations. The exemptions for drinks with alcoholic strength are as follow -

- (a) drinks with an alcoholic strength by volume of more than 1.2% but less than 10% as determined under section 53 of the Dutiable Commodities Ordinance is exempted from the labelling requirement stated above except indication of best before or use by date; and
- (b) Wines, liqueur wines, sparkling wines, aromatized wines, fruit wines, sparkling fruit strength drinks with alcoholic strength by volume of 10% or more as determined under section 53 of the Dutiable Commodities Ordinance from all the requirements stated above.

3. It should be note that if any drinks with alcoholic strength by volume of more than 1.2% or above, is marked or labelled with a list of ingredients even though it is exempted from the requirement, such list will need to conform in all respects with the requirements of Schedule 3.

- (b) Information on the details of the amount of malachite green contained in the 61 samples that were found to contain malachite green between August 2005 and October 2006

*The Administration's response -*

4. Results of the 61 fish and aquatic food product samples with malachite green detected between August 2005 and October 2006 had levels ranging from 0.0015 parts per million to a maximum of 16 parts per million.

Members' request raised at the Panel meeting on 9 January 2007

- Information on the number of poultry egg samples taken for testing in 2006

*The Administration's response -*

5. The FEHD has taken a total of 620 samples of poultry egg for chemical and microbiological testing in 2006.

Members' request raised at the Panel meeting on 13 October 2006

- Information on the number of professional staff recruited by the Centre for Food Safety (CFS) in respect of their fields of disciplines and number of years of professional experience

*The Administration's response -*

6. Staff of the Centre for Food Safety (CFS) comprises about 40 professionals in the disciplines of public health medicine, food chemistry, veterinary medicine and food science in areas including food toxicology, biotechnology and nutrition, etc. All possess relevant job-related professional experience, ranging from a few years to over 20 years. Besides possessing a bachelor degree of the relevant discipline, 8 of these professionals are holders of Doctorate Degree, 23 have Masters Degrees, and 6 possess relevant post-graduate professional qualifications such as specialist, fellowship, etc.

Members' request raised at the Panel meeting on 2 February 2007  
- Information on the number of CFS's front line staff appointed before February 2007 and after February 2007, and the percentage of front line staff in CFS's staff establishment

*The Administration's response -*

7. Number of front line health inspectors in the CFS increased from 114 as at 31 December 2006 to 147 as at 28 February 2007, representing an increase of 29% during the same period.

Members' requests raised at the Panel meeting on 13 February 2007

(a) Information on the penalties for breaching the provision on trade descriptions under the Trade Descriptions Ordinance

*The Administration's response -*

8. A maximum penalty of a fine of \$500,000 and imprisonment for five years will be imposed for any offence relating to false trade descriptions.

(b) Information on the source/supplier of the two oilfish samples bought by the Chinese University of Hong Kong after the trade agreed to stop selling oilfish

*The Administration's response -*

9. According to the media reports, the samples were purchased by the Chinese University of Hong Kong from Shatin, Tai Po and Tuen Mun respectively. The CFS took a total of six samples of fish from the three districts respectively and all of them were found not to be "oilfish".

- (c) Information on the quantity of oilfish stock returned to the suppliers and destroyed by the trade

*The Administration's response -*

10. Over 4 700 kg of "oilfish" were surrendered to the CFS and disposed of. The trade has reported that they have returned some 18 000 kg of "oilfish" to the country of origin and destroyed about 70 kg of stock.