in the district court an information against Libby, McNeill & Libby, a corporation, having a place of business at Seattle, Wash., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about July 24, July 25, and August 23, 1932, from Alaska into the State of Washington, of quantities of salmon which was adulterated.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in part of a decomposed and putrid animal substance.

On March 19, 1934, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $450 and costs.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22229. Misbranding of cottonseed meal and cake. U. S. v. Sweetwater Cotton Oil Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $50. (F. & D. no. 31466. Sample nos. 28154-A, 35927-A.)

This case was based on interstate shipments of cottonseed meal and cake which contained less protein than declared on the label.

On March 9, 1934, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Sweetwater Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Sweetwater, Tex., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about January 10, 1933, in the name of the Rotan Cotton Oil Mill, Rotan Tex., from the State of Texas into the State of Colorado, and on or about February 8, 1933, in its own name from the State of Texas into the State of New Mexico, of quantities of cottonseed meal and cottonseed cake which were misbranded. The articles were labeled in part: (Tags) "43.00 per cent Protein Cottonseed Meal [or "Sweetco Quality 43 per cent Protein Cottonseed Cake or Meal"] Prime Quality Manufactured For Sweetwater Cotton Oil Company Sweetwater, Texas Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein not less than 43.00 per cent."

It was alleged in the information that the article was misbranded in that the statements, "43.00 per cent Protein Cottonseed Meal [or "43 per cent Protein Cottonseed Cake or Meal"] Guaranteed Analysis Crude Protein not less than 43.00 per cent", borne on the tags, were false and misleading, and for the further reason that the articles were labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since they contained less than 43 percent of protein.

On April 5, 1934, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $50.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22230. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. v. The Banner Vinegar Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $50. (F. & D. no. 31476. I.S. no. 47807.)

This case was based on an interstate shipment of a product sold as cider vinegar, but which was found to consist of evaporated apple products vinegar. Examination also showed that the acidity was lower than represented.

On December 22, 1933, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Banner Vinegar Co., a corporation, Cincinnati, Ohio, alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about November 20, 1931, from the State of Ohio into the State of Kentucky, of a quantity of vinegar which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was invoiced as "4100 gals. 48 Gr. Pure Cider Vinegar."

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that evaporated apple products vinegar had been substituted for pure cider vinegar; and for the further reason that a product containing less than 48 grains of acid had been substituted for pure cider vinegar containing 48 grains acid, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On April 11, 1934, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $50.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*