

District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Pabst Pure Extract Co., Inc., a corporation, Harrisonburg, Va., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about January 25, 1917, from the State of Virginia into the State of North Carolina, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Pabst's Pure Vanilla * * * Extract * * * Manufactured and Guaranteed by Pabst Pure Extract Co., Inc., Harrisonburg, Va.," 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)_____	22.14
Solids (per cent by weight)_____	23.43
Sucrose (per cent by weight)_____	20.72
Reducing sugar (per cent by weight)_____	1.75
Nonsugar solids (per cent by weight)_____	0.96
Ash (per cent by weight)_____	0.22
Vanillin (per cent by weight)_____	1.12
Lead number _____	0.34

This analysis indicates that the extract had been diluted with water.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower or reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in whole or in part for pure vanilla extract, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Pure Vanilla * * * Extract," borne on the label of the bottles containing the article, regarding it and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was pure vanilla extract, 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 pure vanilla extract, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not pure vanilla extract, but was a product composed in part of added water.

On February 10, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6913. Adulteration of milk. U. S. * * * v. H. P. Hood & Sons, a corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$500. (F. & D. No. 8711. I. S. Nos. 114-m, 471-m, 472-m, 474-m, 909-m, 2236-p.)

On July 17, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of Vermont, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against H. P. Hood & Sons, a corporation, doing business at East Fairfield, Vt., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about July 18, 1916, July 19, 1916, August 21, 1916, August 22, 1916, August 23, 1916, and August 16, 1917, from the State of Vermont into the State of Massachusetts, of quantities of milk which was adulterated.

Examination of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed organisms per cc. developing on plain agar after 2 days at 37° C. as follows:

Sample No.	Shipment of July 18, 1916.	Shipment of July 19, 1916.	Shipment of Aug. 21, 1916.	Shipment of Aug. 22, 1916.	Shipment of Aug. 23, 1916.	Shipment of Aug. 16, 1917.
A.....	13,000,000	1,000,000	30,000	80,000,000	1,250,000	1,900,000
B.....	4,600,000	300,000	20,850,000	55,000,000	1,550,000	2,400,000
C.....	2,400,000	300,000	420,000	25,750,000	151,500,000	1,000,000
D.....	7,400,000	1,000,000	80,000	43,000,000	1,350,000	34,000,000
E.....	5,400,000	600,000	15,100,000	15,550,000	3,400,000	4,600,000
F.....	2,550,000	100,000	11,550,000	169,500,000	9,050,000	1,100,000
G.....	3,500,000	600,000	17,450,000	3,200,000	18,600,000	2,500,000
H.....	2,200,000	500,000	14,200,000	1,715,000	36,000,000	1,400,000
I.....	9,450,000	800,000	39,250,000	3,950,000	77,500,000	28,000,000
J.....	10,000,000	2,900,000	54,500,000	19,150,000	4,700,000	4,200,000
K.....	11,000,000	6,000,000	7,600,000
L.....	10,000,000	3,500,000	19,000,000
M.....	9,000,000	1,100,000	1,200,000
N.....	10,000,000	500,000	600,000
O.....	10,000,000	900,000	2,200,000
P.....	6,000,000	2,400,000
Q.....	4,500,000	2,300,000
R.....	12,000,000	1,600,000

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On June 9, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$500.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6914. Adulteration and misbranding of condensed milk. U. S. * * * v. 1,000 Cases * * * of Condensed Milk. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 8837. I. S. No. 1355-p. S. No. E-984.)

On February 28, 1918, the United States attorney for the Eastern 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 a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 1,000 cases, each containing 48 cans of condensed milk, consigned on November 14, 1917, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by T. M. Stevens, Amity, Ore., and transported from the State of Oregon into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Holly Unsweetened Condensed Milk Manufactured by Holly Milk & Cereal Co. Portland, Oregon."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a partially condensed milk had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for the article.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, condensed milk, and for the further reason that the statement, to wit, "Condensed Milk," was false and misleading, and deceived and misled the purchaser into the belief that it was condensed milk, whereas examination showed that it was partially condensed milk.

On October 3, 1918, Austin, Nichols & Co., a corporation, Brooklyn, N. Y., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should