

a compound of molasses vinegar and distilled vinegar, but was a mixture composed in large part of added water.

On May 4, 1922, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

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

10435. Misbranding of Irish potatoes. U. S. * * * v. Winn-Parker Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 13177. I. S. No. 631-r.)

On January 28, 1921, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, 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 Winn-Parker Co., a corporation, Norfolk, Va., alleging shipment by said company, on or about January 10, 1920, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Virginia into the State of Georgia, of a quantity of an article of food, to wit, Irish potatoes in bags, which was misbranded. The bags containing the potatoes bore no statement as to weight or contents.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the 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 4, 1922, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

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

10436. Adulteration of turpentine. U. S. * * * v. General Naval Stores Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 14548. I. S. No. 161-r.)

On September 30, 1920, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, 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 General Naval Stores Co., a corporation, doing business at Norfolk, Va., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about March 6, 1920, from the State of Virginia into the State of North Carolina, of a quantity of turpentine which was adulterated. The article was labeled in part: "Pure Turpentine."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was wood turpentine obtained by steam distillation.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and then and there differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation of said article, in that said article was a product distilled from pine wood, whereas said pharmacopœia provides that turpentine, to wit, turpentine oil or spirits of turpentine, shall be distilled from the concrete oleoresin obtained from *Pinus palustris* or from other species of *Pinus*; and the standard of the strength, quality, and purity of said article was not stated on the container thereof.

On May 4, 1922, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

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

10437. Misbranding of crab meat. U. S. * * * v. E. Vernon Cartwright (Consolidated Crab Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. No. 15442. I. S. Nos. 8484-t, 8746-t, 8748-t.)

On March 23, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against E. Vernon Cartwright, trading as the Consolidated Crab Co., Hampton, Va., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about May 24, 1921, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, and on or about May 23, 1921, from the State of Virginia into the State of Maryland, of quantities of crab meat which was in each shipment misbranded.

Examination, by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department, of 10 cans from each of the shipments of May 24 showed an average weight of 4 pounds 7 ounces and 4 pounds 10 ounces, respectively; examination of 6 cans from the shipment of May 23 showed an average weight of 4 pounds 12 ounces.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Contents 5 Lbs Net," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it, was false and misleading in that it represented that each of the cans contained 5 pounds net of the article and for the further reason that said article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that each of the cans contained 5 pounds net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of the cans did not contain 5 pounds net of the article but did contain a less amount. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article 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 3, 1922, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

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

10438. Misbranding of Surety Brand cottonseed meal. U. S. * * * v. American Cotton Oil Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 15574. I. S. Nos. 12416-t, 12417-t.)

On January 21, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, 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 American Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, doing business at Little Rock, Ark., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about October 22 and 29, 1920, from the State of Arkansas into the State of Ohio, of quantities of an article labeled in part, "Surety Brand Cottonseed Meal," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the product involved in the shipment of October 22 contained 32.22 per cent of protein, 6.28 per cent of ammonia, and 15 per cent of crude fiber, and that the product involved in the shipment of October 29 contained 34.71 per cent of protein and 6.74 per cent of ammonia.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Cotton Seed Meal" and "Guarantee Protein Not less than 36.00 per cent, Equivalent to Ammonia 7.00 per cent * * *," and in the case of one of the shipments, "Fibre Not more than 14.00 per cent," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article consisted wholly of cottonseed meal and that said article contained not less than 36 per cent of protein and not less than 7 per cent of ammonia, and in the case of one of the shipments not more than 14 per cent of fiber, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it consisted wholly of cottonseed meal, that it contained not less than 36 per cent of protein and not less than 7 per cent of ammonia, and in the case of one of the shipments not more than 14 per cent of fiber, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article did not consist wholly of cottonseed meal but did consist of a product which contained less than 36 per cent of protein, the normal content of genuine cottonseed meal, and said article did contain less than 36 per cent of protein, to wit, approximately 32.22 per cent or 34.71 per cent of protein, as the case might be, said article did contain less than 7 per cent of ammonia, to wit, 6.28 per cent or 6.74 per cent of ammonia, as the case might be, and in one of the shipments said article did contain more than 14 per cent of fiber, to wit, 15.04 per cent of fiber.

On April 10, 1922, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

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

10439. Misbranding of crab meat. U. S. * * * v. Nonnenbacher & Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No 15580. I. S. No. 6662-t.)

On March 23, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Nonnenbacher & Co., Inc., a corporation, Hampton, Va., alleging shipment by said company, on or about May 24, 1921, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Virginia into the State of New York, of a quantity of crab meat which was misbranded. The article was labeled, "Contents 1-Lb. Net."