

United States Department of Agriculture,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

NOTICE OF JUDGMENT NO. 2093.

(Given pursuant to section 4 of the Food and Drugs Act.)

ADULTERATION AND MISBRANDING OF VINEGAR.

On June 8, 1912, the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Iowa, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information in six counts against the Haarmann Vinegar & Pickle Co., a corporation, Sioux City, Iowa, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act—

(1) On or about November 9, 1910, from the State of Iowa into the State of South Dakota of a quantity of vinegar which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: "Haarmann Vinegar & Pickling Co. 4½% Acetic Acid. Cider Vinegar 48 gals. Sioux City, Iowa."

Analysis of a sample of this product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this Department showed the following results: Alcohol by volume, 0.27 per cent; total solids (grams per 100 cc), 2.39; reducing sugars direct (grams per 100 cc), 0.99; reducing sugars after evaporation (grams per 100 cc), 0.96; non-sugars (grams per 100 cc), 1.43; per cent of sugar in solids, 41.00; glycerol (grams per 100 cc), 0.09; polarization direct at 20° C., -2.0° V.; ash (grams per 100 cc), 0.25; alkalinity soluble ash (cc N/10 alkali per 100 cc), 14.0; total acids (grams per 100 cc), 4.79; fixed acids, as malic (grams per 100 cc), 0.04; total color, 6.0° on brewer's scale; lead precipitate, very heavy; P₂O₅ water soluble (mg per 100 cc), 30.99; P₂O₅ water insoluble (mg per 100 cc), 23.8; alcohol precipitate (grams per 100 cc), 0.10; per cent of ash in non-sugars, 17.5.

(2) On or about April 7, 1911, from the State of Iowa into the State of South Dakota of a quantity of vinegar which was adulterated and misbranded. This product was labeled: "Jewetts High Grade Brand 4½ acetic 48 gals. Pure Cider Vinegar. Mfg. for Jewett Bros. & Jewett, Sioux Falls, S. D."

Analysis of a sample of this product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this Department showed the following results: Alcohol, per cent

by volume, 2.07; glycerol, 0.06 per cent; solids (grams per 100 cc), 2.34; nonsugar solids (grams per 100 cc), 1.70; reducing sugar invert before inversion after evaporation (grams per 100 cc), 0.64; per cent sugar in solids, 27.3; polarization direct at 22° C., -1.4° V.; ash (grams per 100 cc), 0.30; ash, insoluble in water (grams per 100 cc), 0.09; alkalinity soluble ash (cc N/10 acid per 100 cc), 11.8; total phosphoric acid (mg per 100 cc), 80.1; acid, as acetic (grams per 100 cc), 4.46; volatile acid, as acetic (grams per 100 cc), 4.41; fixed acid, as malic (grams per 100 cc), 0.05; lead precipitate, heavy; color, degrees, brewer's scale 0.5 in., 5 of 52 series; 3 of 50 series; pentosans, 0.07; ratio ash to nonsugar solids, 1:5.7. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted of cider vinegar and the same had been adulterated by reason of the fact that other substances, to wit, a dilute solution of acetic acid or distilled vinegar and a product high in reducing sugars and certain mineral matter, had been mixed with the product so as to reduce and lower or injuriously affect its quality and strength, and for the further reason that other substances, to wit, a dilute solution of acetic acid or distilled vinegar and a product high in reducing sugars, and the certain mineral matter, had been substituted wholly or in part for cider vinegar. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the product bore the label set forth above regarding it or the substances contained therein, which said label, brand, and statement was false and misleading, in that the product was not cider vinegar but, on the contrary, consisted in whole or in part of a dilute solution of acetic acid or distilled vinegar, and a product high in reducing sugars and added mineral matter.

On October 18, 1912, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to counts 1 and 4 of the information charging adulteration and the court imposed a fine of \$25 upon each of said counts with costs. Counts 2, 3, 5, and 6 of the information charging adulteration and misbranding of the product were dismissed.

W. M. HAYS,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 11, 1912.*