

APPLE INSPECTION AGAIN.

THIS is a perplexing question, and no wonder we get so many opinions concerning its practicability. Parker* of Berwick, N.S., says "This is a question that has engaged the attention of this (N.S.) Association more or less for ten years, and is yet unsolved." In his paper before the Society he proposes XXX to denote the standard grade, to include "only perfect fruit, well developed, averaging in size, good in color, sound, free from blemishes such as rot, bruise or spot, possessing its own variety. The second quality "he says" shall be known as XX grade, which shall consist of good, well natured sound fruit, not worm eaten, though in size, form and color, it may fall below the standard grade" A grade above XXX he would denote as extra XXX.

These grades closely correspond with the grades proposed by us, under different marks our A No. 1 corresponding with his XXX; No. 1 to his XX, and extra A No. 1 to his extra XXX. We think the marks we propose better because such marks as XXX have been so much abused, and the use of the grade marks proposed by us will not prevent any packer adding as many X's or other private marks as he chooses in addition.

So far then we all practically agree, but the President of the Nova Scotia Association objects to a minimum specific size for each grade, as applied to all varieties. He thinks No. 1 Spy and No. 1 Fameuse would be quite different True, but should *any* apple be called No. 1 that falls below $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches in diameter? And if no Crab, Lady apple or Swazie Pomme Grise would ever reach grade A No. 1, $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches in diameter, why not denote its excellencies

with X's or some other special mark as is done at present? It would be very easy to make exception in the case of the three or four varieties to which the proposed grade sizes would not apply.

However, we might possibly yield in this, providing it be a rule to add a size mark to the grade mark, so that the buyer may know what he is buying. This would accomplish the same purpose, viz., of preventing fraudulent packing, giving a basis for inspection; and it would enable a distant buyer to purchase with confidence at a given price. Already for example, the writer has made a contract with an English buyer for a shipment of Northern Spys in this way, making certain prices for apples $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches in diameter or over, and a higher price for those $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches or over in diameter.

There is no difficulty in sizing apples, for if it is not convenient to use a Wartman grader, which is the first Canadian machine for sizing apples, one can get a number of sheets of heavy card board, and have holes of various diameters cut in the same. All apples that will *not* go through a $2\frac{1}{4}$ inch hole, for example, would go for size $2\frac{1}{4}$ or upwards.

We have just received from Ottawa some copies of the general inspection act, and find that sections 109 and 110 refer to apples, but in a way that makes the provisions quite a dead letter. The following is the text:—

FROM GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

7. The said Act is hereby further amended by adding the following sections thereto:—

"APPLES.

109. In the inspection of closed packages of apples, the inspector shall open not less than one package in every five; and if the manner of packing is found to be fraudulent

See report N.S., F.G.A. Association 1899, p. 121.