

As already stated, 29 samples show carelessness in weighing, by which phrase is implied that different powders (blue or white) from the same package are found to differ by more than 10 per cent in weight. This fact should constitute adulteration, inasmuch as pharmacopœal requirements are quite definite. Where, however, no other reason for holding the sample to be adulterated exists, I have not considered it necessary to charge adulteration, on the ground of careless weighing only. Twelve samples which indicate carelessness in weighing are nevertheless not judged to be adulterated. Adulteration is charged on the following grounds:—

(a) Deficiency of weight, where the weight of either blue or white paper falls 10 grains below the prescribed weight of 160 grains for contents of the blue; or 38 grains for the contents of the white, paper:—

	Samples.
Blue paper.	42
White paper.	5
	—
	47

(b) Excess of weight, where the weight of either blue or white paper exceeds by 10 grains the prescribed weight:—21 samples.

(c) Where, while the total weight of each paper falls within the limits indicated above, the proportion of the ingredients is decidedly abnormal:—5 samples. Total samples judged adulterated for reasons given—73.

RÉSUMÉ.

Passed as genuine.	82
Adulteration charged.	73
Carelessness in weighing.	12
	—
Total.	167

The foregoing report shows an unexpected degree of carelessness or of fraud, in the manufacture of Seidlitz Powders. This may be partly due to the impression that a Seidlitz Powder is in use merely as a cooling beverage or a mild aperient, having no very definite composition. This is not the understanding of physicians, nor does it accord with the definitions of the pharmacopœia, and it should be finally dispelled if it exist. The fact that the ingredients of these powders are frequently measured, instead of being weighed, into their respective papers, does not justify such irregularity of weight as is above recorded. Measuring can only be tolerated so long as it does not give results materially different from those attained by use of the balance.

Some druggists have complained that, owing to the sharp competition among manufacturers, they cannot afford to give great care to the preparation of Seidlitz Powders. This consideration cannot be permitted any eogeny under the Act, the article known as Seidlitz Powder is a perfectly well-defined drug, and must be judged by the definition given in the pharmacopœia.

I am of opinion that the limits of variability which I have assumed as possible, are quite ample. Nevertheless, it must be confessed that we have no established authority in this matter of limits of variation. For this reason, and because at the first general inspection of Seidlitz Powders under the Act, I would respectfully suggest that this report be published rather for the information and the warning of the trade than employed as the basis of prosecutions; and that it be printed as Bulletin No. 265.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

A. MCGILL,
Chief Analyst.