

Invert, at 26°C (°V.)	5. 8
Sucrose (Clerget)	None.
Ash (per cent)	0. 32
Water-soluble ash (per cent)	0. 26
Water-insoluble ash (per cent)	0. 06
Alkalinity of soluble ash (cc N/10 acid per 100 grams)	0. 22
Total tartrates (grams per 100 cc)	0. 05
Total P ₂ O ₅ (mg per 100 grams)	50. 2

Misbranding of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that the statements and words "Port Wine," so appearing on the label and upon the keg, were false and misleading because they misled and deceived the purchaser into the belief that the product was genuine port wine—that is to say, a product of Portugal—whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not a genuine port wine nor a product of Portugal, but was a domestic article and product; and was further misbranded in that it purported to be a foreign product, when it was not, and the words and statement "Port Wine," appearing on the label thereof, conveyed the impression that the product was a product of Portugal, when, in truth and in fact, it was a product of the United States.

On July 10, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$5 and costs.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2903. Adulteration and misbranding of turpentine. U. S. v. George J. Fox (Carolina Pine Products Co.). Plea of *nolo contendere*. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4432. I. S. No. 3479-d.)

On January 20, 1913, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court of the United States for said district an information against George J. Fox, trading as the Carolina Pine Products Co., Cleveland, Ohio, alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about November 18, 1911, from the State of Ohio into the State of Missouri, of a quantity of turpentine, which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: (On one end of barrel) "St. Louis Transfer Co., St. Louis, Mo. St. Louis Co. For % Carolina Pine Products Co., Gross 407, Tare 60." (Other end) "Carolina Pine Products Co., St. Louis. Turpentine. S. L. Not for medicinal use. The standard of quality and purity of the turpentine contained in this package is guaranteed and sold in accordance with the following chemical analysis: Specific gravity, 862 or 32½° B.; distillation percentage under 300° F., none; distillation percentage under 363° F., 80 to 90 per cent; percentage unpolymerizable, 25 to 35 per cent; flash point, 100° F. Warning: This label must be defaced or destroyed before this package is again used. Any disregard of this warning will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. Carolina Pine Products Co."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Unpolymerized oil (per cent)	29. 6
Refractive index of oil at 20° C.	1. 442
Mineral oil present (per cent) not less than	. 30

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia official at the time of the investigation, and it differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia in that it contained a large proportion of mineral oil, and neither was its own standard of strength, quality, or purity plainly stated upon the container. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label, "Turpentine," was false and misleading, as the product was not turpentine, but a mixture of turpentine and mineral oil.

On May 21, 1913, the defendant entered a plea of *nolo contendere* to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2904. Misbranding of maple sirup. U. S. v. Five Cases So-called Maple Syrup. Decree of condemnation by default. Product ordered sold. (F. & D. No. 4434. S. No. 1482.)

On August 19, 1912, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of five cases of so-called maple sirup remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Central Wharf, Boston, Mass., alleging that the product had been shipped by Dugue & Co., New Orleans, La., and transported from the State of Louisiana into the State of Massachusetts, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Du-Gay Yankee Doodle Maple Syrup. Packed by Dugue & Co., Incorporated. New Orleans, La., U. S. A. Made of Purest Sugar Cane Juice. Imitation Maple Flavor. Contains sulphur dioxide. Wholesome. Digestible. Nutritious. Packed for Fancy Family Trade."

Misbranding of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that certain retail packages of said product bore a statement, design, and device regarding the ingredients and substances contained in the food, that is to say, the words "Du-Gay Yankee Doodle Maple Syrup," printed in a conspicuous manner upon each of the retail packages and labels, and the words "Made of Purest Sugar Cane Juice. Imitation Maple Flavor," printed in an inconspicuous manner upon each of the retail packages and labels, which said statement, design, and device was false and misleading in that it would lead a purchaser to believe that the food was a product known to the trade as maple sirup, whereas, in truth and in fact, said food was not such a product.

On November 5, 1912, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be sold by the United States marshal after striking out the word "maple" wherever it appeared on the label.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2905. Adulteration and misbranding of mincemeat. U. S. v. W. H. Marvin Co. Plea of *nolo contendere*. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4473. I. S. No. 17433-d.)

On November 8, 1912, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the W. H. Marvin Co., a corporation, Urbana, Ohio, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on September 21, 1911, from the State of Ohio into the State of Iowa, of a quantity of so-called mincemeat which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: "'Mistle' Oak Brand (picture of oak tree) Mincemeat—Bohart & Co., Distributors, Clinton, Iowa. Fruit Pudding * * * Guarantee—This Mince Meat is guaranteed to meet the requirements of the National Pure Food Law enacted June 30, 1906, and is composed of the following articles: Meat, Raisins, Currants, Apples Sugar, Salt, Spices, and fruit juices. The meat contained herein has been inspected and passed at an establishment where Federal inspection is maintained."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results: Approximately 0.1 per cent of meat present; no suet found. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, a food product containing but a trace of meat, that is to say, 0.1 per cent of meat, was substituted for what the article of food, by its label and brand, purported to be, namely, mincemeat containing a substantial amount of meat. Misbranding was alleged for the reasons: (1) That the label and brand on the product bore statements regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, which