

It is regrettable that the term *adulterated* must apply to samples sold as genuine, but found to contain less than the minimum amount of citral. Section 3 (g) of the Act, defines as adulteration any failure to reach a standard prescribed by Order in Council. To the ordinary reader, the word implies purposeful addition of a fraudulent kind. This meaning must not be read into the word as used in this report. It is certain that the large number of failures to meet our standards are mainly due to faulty methods of manufacture, and not to intentional fraud. As I have already pointed out, the attempt to get into solution a proper amount of citral by use of a weak alcohol (less than 50 per cent. strength) makes demands that can only be successfully met by much experience and acquired skill. That the great majority of these extracts are intended to be trepeneless, is shown by the following facts:—

Out of 223 samples, only 10 samples contain above 5 per cent lemon oil, only 15 samples above 4 per cent, only 23 samples above 3 per cent, and only 40 samples above 2 per cent. All samples containing as much as 3 per cent lemon oil are found to contain the required minimum amount of citral. It is also noteworthy that, with exception of three or four samples, all those found to contain less than the standard minimum amount of citral are made with alcohol of less than 50 per cent strength.

The results of this inspection may be summarized as follows:—

Samples found to meet standard.	83
“ sold as compound	68
“ sold mistakenly.	3
“ adulterated under the Act.	69
	<hr/>
Total.	223
	<hr/>

I beg to recommend publication of this report as Bulletin No. 337; and I would further respectfully suggest that for this first inspection of Lemon Extract since legalization of Standards, the presence of 0.10 per cent of citral be recognized as proving good faith on the part of the manufacturer. This without prejudice to later inspections.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

A. MCGILL,

Chief Analyst.