

Analyses of samples of the products by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Determination.	Blackberry-apple.	Raspberry-apple.
Solids in vacuo at 70° C. (per cent).....	48.04	42.86
Nonsugar solids (per cent).....	11.22	9.59
Sucrose, Clerget (per cent).....	8.05	9.42
Reducing sugars as invert before inversion (per cent).....	29.77	23.85
Commercial glucose (factor 163).....	None.	None.
Polarization, direct, at 22° C. (°V.).....	- 1.4	+ 1.6
Polarization, invert, at 22° C. (°V.).....	-12.0	-10.8
Ash (per cent).....	0.54	0.54
Soluble solids by evaporation (per cent).....	40.26	34.69
Insoluble solids by difference (per cent).....	7.78	8.17
Insoluble solids direct (per cent).....	8.54	9.05
Sodium benzoate (from benzoic acid, gravimetrically) (per cent).....	0.21	0.05
Sodium benzoate (by titration of above) (per cent).....	0.19	.....
Artificial color detected.....	None.	None.
Yeasts, spores, and bacteria (microscopic examination).....	Abundant.	Abundant.
Net weight:		
Actual weight (ounces).....	17.85	31.9
Excess (per cent).....	27.5	14.0

Adulteration of both brands was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, a jam made from dried fruit, had been substituted wholly or in part for the genuine article; and, further, in that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, the water soluble portion of the fruit, had been wholly or in part abstracted or left out. Misbranding of the blackberry-apple jam was alleged for the reason that the statement "Blackberry-Apple Jam," borne on the label, was false and misleading because it conveyed the impression that the product was a jam made from fresh fruit, whereas, in fact, it was made from dried fruit, which fact was not stated upon the label. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the product was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, being labeled "Blackberry-Apple Jam," thereby conveying the impression that it was made from fresh fruit, when, as a matter of fact, it was made from dried fruit, which fact was not stated upon the label. Misbranding of the raspberry-apple jam was alleged for the reason that the statement "Raspberry-Apple Jam," borne on the label, was false and misleading because it conveyed the impression that the product was a jam prepared from fresh fruit, whereas, in fact, it was prepared from dried fruit, which fact was not stated on the label. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the product was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, being labeled "Raspberry-Apple Jam," thereby creating the impression that the product was a jam prepared from fresh fruit, when, as a matter of fact, it was prepared from dried fruit, which fact was not stated upon the label.

On May 18, 1914, the defendant company 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., *October 13, 1914.*

**3500. Adulteration of grape juice. U. S. v. 5 Cases of Sparkling Grape Juice. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 4330. I. S. No. 21407-d. S. No. 1465.)**

On July 19, 1912, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, 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 5 cases of grape juice remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Oshkosh, Wis., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about June 15, 1912, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Wisconsin, and charging adulteration in

violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: (On cases) "50 1/4 Bottles Sparkling Wines Keep Dry Unfermented Catawba Grape Juice." (On bottles, neck label) "Preserved with Sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) being about .028 of one per cent due to the burning of sulphur in the Storage Casks." (Principal label) "Serve Cold. Teo Nett Non-Alcoholic Sparkling Grape Juice."

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed with and packed with said grape juice so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and, further, in that certain substances, to wit, sugar and water, had been in part substituted for the said article, grape juice.

On March 3, 1914, no claimant having appeared for the product, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 31, 1914.*