

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that maltose and saccharin had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article; for the further reason that it had been mixed in a manner whereby its inferiority was concealed; and for the further reason that the said article contained an added poisonous and deleterious ingredient, to wit, saccharin, which might render it injurious to health.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Blend Syrup," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser in that the said article was not a blend sirup, but was, in truth and in fact, a composition consisting of maltose sirup, containing saccharin. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, to wit, "Blend Syrup."

On July 2, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**10231. Adulteration of coal-tar color. U. S. \* \* \* v. 2 Pounds of Coal-Tar Color. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 14801. I. S. No. 7868-t. S. No. E-3214.)**

On April 18, 1921, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, 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 2 pounds of coal-tar color, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at York, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped by the W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., on or about April 10, 1921, and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., \* \* \* Red."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that sodium sulphate and sodium chlorid had been mixed and packed with, and substituted wholly or in part for, the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article contained an added poisonous and deleterious ingredient, to wit, arsenic, which might render it injurious to health.

On October 1, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**10232. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. \* \* \* v. Maine Pickling Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 14926. I. S. No. 13210-r.)**

On August 18, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Maine, 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 Maine Pickling Co., a corporation, Portland, Me., alleging shipment by said company, on or about January 14, 1920, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Maine into the State of New Hampshire, of a quantity of vinegar which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part, "Maine Brand Sugar Vinegar \* \* \* Maine Pickling Co., Portland, Me. \* \* \*"

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of distilled vinegar colored with caramel.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, distilled vinegar, 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 sugar vinegar, which the said article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article was a product inferior to sugar vinegar, to wit, a mixture composed in part of distilled vinegar, and was colored with caramel so as to simulate the appearance of sugar vinegar and in a manner whereby its inferiority to said sugar vinegar was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Sugar Vinegar," borne on the labels attached to the bottles containing the article, regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein,