

**6023. Adulteration and misbranding of terpeneless extract of lemon.
U. S. * * * v. Gray-McLean & Percy, a corporation. Plea of
guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 8517. I. S. No. 21167-m.)**

On December 15, 1917, 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 Gray-McLean & Percy, a corporation, Portland, Oreg., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about October 20, 1916, from the State of Oregon into the State of Idaho, of a quantity of an article labeled in part, "Terpeneless Extract of Lemon * * * Gray-McLean & Percy, 113-115 Fourth Street, North, Portland, Oregon," which was adulterated and misbranded.

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

Ethyl alcohol (per cent by volume)-----	31.20
Coloring matter: Naphthol yellow S, S & J 4.	
Citral (Hiltner) (per cent)-----	0.04
Oil by polarization: None.	
Oil by precipitation: None.	

Analysis shows product to be dilute terpeneless lemon extract of not more than one-fifth standard strength.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a diluted hydroalcoholic solution of citral had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower or reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted wholly or in part for terpeneless extract of lemon, which the article purported to be, and for the further reason that it was a diluted hydroalcoholic solution of citral, a product inferior to terpeneless extract of lemon, and was artificially colored by certain coal-tar dyes, to wit, naphthol yellow S and S & J 4, so as to simulate the appearance of terpeneless extract of lemon in a manner whereby its inferiority to terpeneless extract of lemon was concealed.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Terpeneless Extract of Lemon," borne on the label of the bottle, regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was terpeneless extract of lemon, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was terpeneless extract of lemon, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was a product composed of diluted hydroalcoholic solution of citral, artificially colored.

On December 28, 1917, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

CARL VROOMAN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*