

thereof from the State of Ohio into the State of Pennsylvania. The product was labeled: "Wm. Edwards Co., Clifton Brand Pure Cider Vinegar, Cleveland, O. 49 Sugrue & Sons."

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

Alcohol (grams per 100 cc).....	0. 42
Glycerol (grams per 100 cc).....	0. 10
Solids (grams per 100 cc).....	1. 61
Nonsugar solids (grams per 100 cc).....	1. 45
Reducing sugars (grams per 100 cc).....	0. 16
Ash (grams per 100 cc).....	0. 62
Alkalinity of soluble ash (cc N/10 acid per 100 cc).....	73. 8
Total P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> (mg per 100 cc).....	13. 9
Total acid (grams per 100 cc).....	4. 02
Ash in nonsugar solids (per cent).....	42. 8

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that other substances, namely, a dilute solution of acetic acid or distilled vinegar and mineral matter, prepared in imitation of cider vinegar, had been substituted in whole or in part for cider vinegar, which said article purported to be. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "Pure Cider Vinegar," borne on the package in which said article was sold and delivered, was false and misleading because, as a matter of fact, said article was not pure cider vinegar but was a substance consisting in whole or in part of a dilute solution of acetic acid or distilled vinegar and mineral matter mixed and prepared in imitation of cider vinegar. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that said article was an imitation of cider vinegar, prepared wholly or in part from dilute acetic acid or distilled vinegar and mineral matter, and said article was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of cider vinegar. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser thereof into the belief that it was pure cider vinegar when not so; that is to say, said article was labeled and branded with the words "Pure Cider Vinegar," when, as a matter of fact, it was not pure cider vinegar but was an imitation cider vinegar, prepared from dilute acetic acid or distilled vinegar and mineral matter.

On April 30, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$10 and costs.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture*.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 28, 1914.*

**3463. Adulteration and misbranding of cheese. U. S. v. 50 Boxes of Misbranded and Adulterated Whey Cheese. Consent decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.**  
(F. & D. No. 5599. I. S. No. 8109-h. S. No. 2122.)

On February 23, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, 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 50 boxes, each containing 30 pounds of whey cheese, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Portland, Oreg., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about January 23, 1914, by the Lake Zurich Creamery Co., Palatine, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Oregon, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Lake Zurich Creamery Company, 'Primost' Palatine, Illinois," and "Whey Cheese, Lake Zurich Brand, 'Primost,' 1 pound when packed."

It was alleged in the libel that the product was adulterated in that there had been mixed and packed with said cheese a substance, to wit, saccharin, which substance reduced, lowered, and injuriously affected the quality and strength of said whey

cheese. It was further alleged in the libel that the product contained and had added thereto a certain deleterious ingredient, to wit, saccharin, which rendered said cheese injurious to the health of the consumers thereof. It was further alleged that the whey cheese was misbranded in that a product, sweetened with saccharin, had been substituted in part for whey cheese. On April 6, 1914, the said Lake Zurich Creamery Co., claimant, having theretofore by stipulation admitted the allegations in the libel and consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered and it was ordered that the product should be dealt with or destroyed, in conformity with the instructions of the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, as is usual in such cases. (When this case was reported for action no claim was made by this department that the product was misbranded.)

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 28, 1914.*

**3464. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. v. 60 Barrels, More or Less, of So-Called Pure Sugar Vinegar. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond.** (F. & D. No. 5614. I. S. No. 8814-h. S. No. C-2.)

On or about March 9, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, 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 60 barrels, each containing about 49 gallons, of so-called pure sugar vinegar, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages, at Kansas City, Kans., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about December 5, 1913, by the Monarch Vinegar Works, Kansas City, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Kansas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Distributed by the B. C. Twenhofel Mfg. Co., Pure Sugar Vinegar; 49 (?) gallons, Kansas City, Kansas."

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of distilled vinegar or dilute acetic acid, which had been mixed and packed with and substituted for the pure product in such a manner as to reduce or injuriously affect its quality and strength. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that to each of the barrels there was attached a brand or label in the words and figures as set forth above, which said label was misleading and false and calculated to induce the purchaser to believe that said so-called sugar vinegar was pure, when, in truth and in fact, the same was adulterated as hereinabove set forth, and that by reason of said false and misleading brand or label said barrels and the product therein were subject to seizure and confiscation under section 10 of the Food and Drugs Act as aforesaid.

On April 15, 1914, 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. On May 11, 1914, the case having come on for final hearing, it appearing that the said Monarch Vinegar Works, Kansas City, Mo., claimant, had executed a good and sufficient bond in the sum of \$250 in conformity with section 10 of the act and that all the costs of the proceedings had been paid, it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 28, 1914.*

**3465. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. v. 25 Barrels, More or Less, of So-Called Pure Apple Cider Vinegar. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond.** (F. & D. No. 5615. I. S. No. 8815-h. S. No. C-3.)

On March 9, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, 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 25 barrels, each containing from 45 to 50 gallons, of a product purporting to be pure apple cider vinegar, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Kansas City, Kans., alleging