

“Pioneer Brand Cocoanut Manufactured by Pacific Cocoanut Co. San Francisco, Calif. U. S. A. L. and Co. Portland.”

Adulteration and misbranding of the product were alleged in the libel for the reason that glucose had been mixed therewith and packed with it so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and for the further reason that glucose had been substituted in part for cocoanut.

On October 9, 1912, the case having come on for hearing, it was ordered by the court that the product should be released and delivered to the Pacific Cocoanut Co., claimant, upon payment of the costs of the proceedings, amounting to \$15.74, and the execution of bond in the sum of \$200 in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

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

2930. Adulteration and misbranding of cordials. U. S. v. Pure Food Distilling Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4605. I. S. Nos. 18839-d, 18840-d.)

On June 13, 1913, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, 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 Pure Food Distilling Co., a corporation, St. Louis, Mo., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about March 13, 1912, from the State of Missouri into the State of Tennessee, of two brands of cordial which was adulterated and misbranded. The first brand was labeled: “Family Trade Cognac Flavored Cordial artificially flavored. Pure Food Distilling Co. St. Louis, Mo.” and “Aged in U. S. Bonded Warehouse.”

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

Specific gravity at 15.56° C.....	0.96044
Proof (degrees).....	73.6
Solids (per cent).....	0.98
Reducing sugars as invert:	
Direct (per cent).....	0.02
After inversion (per cent).....	0.84
Sucrose (by copper) (per cent).....	0.78
Ash (per cent).....	0.006
Alkalinity of ash (cc N/10 acid per 100 cc).....	0.36
Aldehydes as acetic (parts per 100,000, 100° proof).....	0.65
Esters (parts per 100,000, 100° proof).....	4.78
Fusel oil (parts per 100,000, 100° proof).....	7.18
Furfural (parts per 100,000, 100° proof).....	None.
Acidity (parts per 100,000, 100° proof).....	9.77
Color insoluble amyl alcohol (per cent).....	75

Adulteration of this product was alleged in the information for the reason that it was labeled and sold as cognac flavored cordial and another substance, to wit, neutral spirits artificially colored and flavored, had been substituted wholly or in large part for the article, to wit, cognac flavored cordial. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements contained on the labels, to wit, “Cognac Flavored Cordial” and “Aged in U. S. Bonded Warehouse,” were false and misleading, because, in truth and in fact, the product was not a cordial and was not a cognac flavored cordial, but was essentially neutral spirits artificially colored and flavored and was not aged in a United States bonded warehouse, and was further misbranded in that it was an imitation of cognac flavored cordial and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of that article, that is, cognac flavored cordial, and was further misbranded in that it was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser thereof in that the

labels, set forth above, misled and deceived the purchaser into the belief that the product was cognac flavored cordial and was aged in a United States bonded warehouse, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not a genuine cognac flavored cordial but was an imitation of cognac flavored cordial and was not aged in a United States bonded warehouse as claimed on said labels.

The second brand was labeled: (Main label) "Family Trade Banana Flavored Cordial artificially colored. Pure Food Distilling Co. St. Louis, Mo." (Neck label) "Aged in U. S. Bonded Warehouse."

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

Specific gravity at 15.56° C.....	1.0323
Proof (degrees).....	68.54
Solids (per cent).....	18.74
Reducing sugars as invert:	
Direct (per cent).....	3.96
After inversion (per cent).....	18.93
Sucrose (by copper) (per cent).....	14.22
Polarization, invert at 87° C. (°V.).....	0
Glucose.....	None.
Ash (per cent).....	0.011
Alkalinity of ash (cc N/10 acid per 100 cc).....	1.04
Aldehydes as acetic (parts per 100,000 100° proof).....	9.5
Esters (parts per 100,000 100° proof).....	27.84
Fusel oil (parts per 100,000 100° proof).....	16.13
Furfural (parts per 100,000 100° proof).....	0.24
Acidity (parts per 100,000 100° proof).....	42.36
Color insoluble amyl alcohol (per cent).....	80

Adulteration of this product was alleged in the information for the reason that it was labeled and sold as banana flavored cordial and another substance, to wit, neutral spirits artificially colored and flavored, had been substituted wholly or in large part for the article, to wit, banana flavored cordial. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Banana Flavored Cordial" and "Aged in U. S. Bonded Warehouse," which appeared on the labels, were false and misleading because the product was not a genuine banana flavored cordial but was an imitation cordial prepared essentially from neutral spirits artificially colored and flavored, and was not aged in a United States bonded warehouse, and was further misbranded in that it was an imitation of banana flavored cordial and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, banana flavored cordial, and was further misbranded in that it was so labeled and branded as to mislead the purchaser thereof, being labeled and branded as set forth above, which form of labeling misled and deceived the purchaser because the product was not a genuine banana flavored cordial, but was an imitation cordial composed essentially of neutral spirits artificially colored and flavored, and, furthermore, was not aged in a United States bonded warehouse.

On October 21, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$100 with costs of \$21.68.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 30, 1914.*

2931. Adulteration and misbranding of beer. U. S. v. Eastern Oregon Brewing Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 4607. I. S. No. 15991-d.)

On October 21, 1912, 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 an information against the Eastern Oregon Brewing Co., a cor-