

leged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

Adulteration of the vanilla flavoring was alleged for the reason that a substance, to wit, an aqueous solution of vanillin and coumarin artificially colored, had been substituted in whole or in part for vanilla flavor, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Vanilla Flavoring" and "Contents 1½ Fl. Ozs.," borne on the labels attached to the bottles containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that said article was vanilla flavoring; that each of said bottles contained 1½ fluid ounces of the article, 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 vanilla flavoring, and that each of said bottles contained 1½ fluid ounces of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not vanilla flavoring, but was an aqueous solution of vanillin and coumarin artificially colored, and each of said bottles did not contain 1½ fluid ounces of the article, but contained a less amount; and for the further reason that the article was an aqueous solution of vanillin and coumarin artificially colored, prepared in imitation of vanilla flavoring, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, vanilla flavoring. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On April 30, 1919, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

E. D. BALL,

Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7053. Adulteration and misbranding of brandy (cognac type). U. S. v. Mrs. Fannie Wolf (Milton Whiskey Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10.
(F. & D. No. 9603. I. S. No. 6571-p.)

On April 29, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Mrs. Fannie Wolf, trading as the Milton Whiskey Co., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on May 15, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Connecticut, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Brandy Dermont Freres Brand D F Cognac Type," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results, expressed as grams per 100 liters proof spirit unless otherwise specified:

Proof (degrees) -----	73.9
Fusel oil -----	32.8
Esters, as acetic -----	19.0
Acidity, as acetic -----	17.8
Aldehydes, as acetic -----	4.0
Furfural -----	0.8

This analysis shows the sample to contain added neutral spirits.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, neutral spirits, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and

strength, and had been substituted in part for brandy and for brandy cognac type, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "brandy" and "cognac type," together with the design and device borne on the labels attached to the bottle, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was brandy, and that it was brandy cognac type, 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 brandy, and that it was brandy cognac type, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not brandy, and was not brandy cognac type, but was a mixture which contained neutral spirits. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On May 14, 1919, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

E. D. BALL,

Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

7054. Adulteration and misbranding of condensed milk. U. S. * * * v. Illinois Condensed Milk Company, a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 9604. I. S. No. 12156-p.)

On May 1, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Illinois, 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 Illinois Condensed Milk Co., a corporation, Whitehall, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about June 13, 1918, from the State of Illinois into the State of Missouri, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Plain Condensed," and invoiced by the defendant company as "Pln. Cond. Milk," which was adulterated and misbranded.

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

	Per cent.
Fat by Roesse-Gottlieb-----	4.42
Total solids by drying-----	29.92

This analysis shows the product to have been prepared from partially skimmed milk and to be low in fat.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a product prepared from partially skimmed milk had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for condensed milk, which the article purported to be, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, butter fat, had been in part abstracted.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Plain condensed," borne on the tags attached to the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that said article consisted wholly of condensed milk, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it consisted wholly of condensed milk, whereas, in truth and in fact, it did not so consist, but consisted of a mixture prepared from partially skimmed milk, and for the further reason that it was a product prepared from partially skimmed milk in