

**4350. Adulteration and misbranding of "Crystallized Peach & Honey."
U. S. v. The Francis Cropper Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty.
Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 5845. I. S. No. 4932-e.)**

On June 5, 1915, the United States attorney for the Northern 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 Francis Cropper Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on October 8, 1912, from the State of Illinois into the State of Minnesota, of a quantity of "Crystallized Peach & Honey" which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled, in part: (Principal label) "Crystallized Peach & Honey Purity Guaranteed." (Paster on neck of bottle) "Absolutely Pure." (On capsule over cork) "The Francis Cropper Co., Chicago, Ill." (On shipping package) "Peach & Honey Compound 28068-C. M. & St. P.-St. Paul-10-12-12." (On address tag tacked to shipping case) "-12 qts.- From the Francis Cropper Co., Cased Liquors, originators and sole producers of many specialties, 59 Michigan Street, West, Chicago."

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

The product consists of a liqueur and rock candy crystals.

Liqueur (grams) 570 (per cent by weight)-----	59.4
Drained crystals (grams) 390 (per cent by weight)-	40.6

Analysis of liqueur.

Alcohol (per cent by volume)-----	15.3
Reducing sugars, as invert, before inversion (per cent) less than-----	0.2
Reducing sugars, as invert, after inversion (per cent)	58.1
Sucrose, by copper (per cent)-----	55.0
Sucrose, Clerget (per cent)-----	56.8
Solids (per cent)-----	57.4
Acidity, as acetic, (grams, per 100 cc)-----	0.03
Polarization, direct, at 20°C. (°V.)-----	+57.0
Polarization, invert, at 20°C. (°V.)-----	-18.4
Polarization, invert, at 87°C. (°V.)-----	0.0
Ash (per cent)-----	0.014

Color: Caramel.

Flavor: No indication of peach or honey.

Glucose, saccharin, benzoic acid, salicylic acid: None.

Tartaric acid, citric acid: None detected.

Analysis of drained crystals.

390 grams drained crystals dissolved to 1,000 cc.

Specific gravity of solution, at 19°C., 1.1332=30.84 per cent

solids in solution calculated to drained crystals=349.5 grams

solids or 89.6 per cent solids present.

Polarization of solution of drained crystals, 26 grams to 100 cc:

Direct, at 20°C. (°V.)-----	+31.5
Invert, at 20°C. (°V.)-----	-10.0
Invert, at 87° C. (°V)-----	0.0
Sucrose, Clerget, in solution of crystals (per cent)---	31.3
Sucrose, Clerget, in drained crystals (per cent)-----	90.9

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that an imitation product artificially colored had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in whole or in part for genuine crystallized peach and honey, which the article purported to be, and for the further reason that said article was colored in a manner whereby its inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, "Crystallized Peach & Honey," whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not crystallized peach and honey, but was an imitation product, artificially colored and flavored. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the statement, "Crystallized Peach & Honey," borne on the label, was false and misleading, in that it purported and represented the article to be composed of peaches and honey, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was an imitation thereof as aforesaid. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was labeled "Crystallized Peach and Honey," so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser thereof into the belief that it was a genuine crystallized peach and honey, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was an imitation product as aforesaid.

On December 2, 1915, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and on December 10, 1915, the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

CARL VROOMAN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*