

Samples weighing less than 15 ounces are as follows:—

	Samples.
Currants.....	7
Raisins.....	7
Dates.....	9
Prunes.....	1
Total.....	24

The Adulteration Act does not specify short weight as constituting Adulteration; nor are manufacturers required to declare the net weight of Packaged goods. This I regard as a weak point and I would advise that if a package is sold by weight, any purchaser finding that short weight has been delivered may seek redress under the provisions of the weights and measures act.

The packaging of fruit, spices, and very many widely used foods, is a comparatively modern innovation. It has much to recommend it as conducing to cleanliness; but it is open to abuse; and the packages should be required to be either multiples or sub-multiples of one pound; or the actual net weight should be printed upon the package. This however cannot be enforced as there is no Act on the Statute Books establishing the weight of packages of food.

Section 3 (e) declares an article of food to be adulterated, "If it consists wholly or in part of a diseased or decomposed or putrid or rotten animal or vegetable substance, whether manufactured or not." Under this definition I am compelled to classify the samples now reported, as below:—

	Samples.
Satisfactory.....	138
Doubtful.....	20
Adulterated.....	17
Collected by mistake.....	1
Total.....	176

The adulterated samples comprise:—

	Samples.
Figs.....	9
Prunes.....	5
Apples.....	1
Apricots.....	1
Pers.....	1
Total.....	17

In the case of perishable food, such as fruit, it is reasonable to hold the vendor strictly responsible for the character of the article as sold by him.

It is indeed doubtful whether the packer could be expected to furnish a warranty for goods of this class, once they have left his hands. Many of the cartons are fly-specked, and discoloured in such a way as to suggest that they have been a long time in the dealer's possession, and exposed to light.

I have used the word "Doubtful" to indicate presence of unsoundness, worms or dirt, but in a degree less well marked than might be held to be required by Section 3 (e) of the Act, as constituting adulteration.

I beg to recommend publication of this report as Bulletin No. 269.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

A. McGILL,  
Chief Analyst.