(On cans) "Lotta Brand Peas Packed by the John Boyle Co., Baltimore, Md. Lotta Brand Peas." (In small type on side of label) "Soaked."

Examination of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results: Macroscopic examination: Peas well developed, rather hard, tasteless. Radicle prominent. Some peas boiled to pieces. Liquor milky. Microscopical examination: Starch grains and tissues of hull well matured. Evidently a soaked pea. Misbranding of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that the labels on each of the cans containing the product bore the statement in substance and effect that the product consisted of "Lotta Brand Peas," which statement was false and misleading, in that the term "Lotta Brand Peas" imported that the peas were green peas, whereas, in truth and in fact, they were not green but soaked peas. The word "soaked," although appearing on the labels, was disconnected from the word "peas," and was in such small type as to render it insufficient to correct the false impression created by the use of the word "peas." Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the product was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, because the labels on each of the cans containing the product bore the statement in substance and effect that the contents of the cans were "Lotta Brand Peas," which said statement was deceptive and misleading, in that the term "Lotta Brand Peas" imported that the peas were green peas, whereas, in truth and in fact, they were not green peas but soaked peas. The word "soaked," although appearing on the labels, was disconnected from the word "peas," and was in such small type as to render it insufficient to correct the false impression created by the use of the word "peas."

On October 9, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of $10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2918. Adulteration and misbranding of vermouth. U. S. v. The Nectar Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $50. (F. & D. No. 4548. I. S. No. 13100-d.)

On March 7, 1913, 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 The Nectar Co., a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on December 9, 1911, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of vermouth which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: "Casagallo Qualita Superiore Il Verro Vermouth. Della Casagallo. Guaranteed by The Nectar Co., N. Y., under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30th, 1906, Serial No. 26497."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was not a genuine vermouth, for the reason that it did not consist in greater part of wine. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that there was substituted in part for the genuine article vermouth other substances, to wit, water and alcohol, and for the further reason that other substances, to wit, water and alcohol, were mixed and packed with the article in such a way as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the product was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser thereof, in that said label would indicate that the article was a genuine vermouth, whereas, in truth and in fact, the said article was not a genuine vermouth, but was an imitation vermouth, consisting for the most part of water and alcohol and a small amount of wine. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the product was an imitation of and offered for sale under the distinctive name of vermouth, whereas it was not vermouth, but was another article, to wit, an imitation of vermouth, consisting for the most part of water and alcohol,

and a little wine. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article purported to be a foreign product, to wit, a product of Italy, when it was not so, but was a product of the United States.

On November 10, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of $50.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2919. Adulteration of boiled cider. U. S. v. Benham & Griffith Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4549. I. S. No. 19138-d.)

On January 27, 1913, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Washington, 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 Benham & Griffith Co., a corporation, Spokane, Wash., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about November 23, 1911, from the State of Washington into the State of Idaho, of a quantity of boiled cider which was adulterated. The product was labeled: "Boiled Cider Inland Cider and Jell. Co., Spokane, Wash."

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

Analysis of 20 per cent solution of sample.

Solids (grams per 100 cc)	10.12
Nonsugar solids (grams per 100 cc)	1.84
Reducing sugar as invert before inversion (grams per 100 cc)	7.44
Reducing sugar as invert after inversion (grams per 100 cc)	8.32
Sucrose by copper (grams per 100 cc)	0.84
Polarization direct 20° C. (°V.)	16.40
Ash (nearly all soluble)	0.24
Alkalinity of water-soluble ash (cc N/10 acid per 100 cc)	26.00
Soluble phosphoric acid (mg per 100 cc)	8.00
Insoluble phosphoric acid (mg per 100 cc)	6.00
Acid total as sulphuric (grams per 100 cc)	0.33
Lead precipitate: Copious.	
Color: No evidence of added color.	
Benzoic acid as benzoate in original (undiluted) (per cent by weight)	0.065
Alcohol	Trace.

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it contained, in addition to cider and as an adulteration thereof, 0.065 per cent benzoic acid as sodium benzoate, without having the presence of said benzoic acid stamped, marked, or printed upon the package or label containing said cider.

On September 30, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of $25, with costs of $22.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2920. Adulteration and misbranding of vanilla flavor. U. S. v. The William Haigh Co. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, $5. (F. & D. No. 4550. I. S. No. 14924-d.)

On July 16, 1913, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against William Haigh, doing business under the firm name and style of The William Haigh Co., Baltimore, Md., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on March 1, 1912, from the State of Maryland into the State of New York, of a quantity of so-called vanilla