

false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the baskets labeled "1- $\frac{3}{4}$ In. Min." contained peaches of less than 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches minimum, and the baskets labeled, "1 $\frac{5}{8}$ In. Min." contained peaches of less than 1 $\frac{5}{8}$ inches minimum.

On June 26, 1934, the defendant entered a plea of guilty and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

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

22696. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. North American Creameries, Inc. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. no. 31508. Sample no. 34523-A.)

This case was based on an interstate shipment of butter, samples of which were found to contain less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat.

On May 24, 1934, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the North American Creameries, Inc., a corporation, trading at Paynesville, Minn., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about April 5, 1933, from the State of Minnesota into the State of Massachusetts, of a quantity of butter which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Silverbrook A. & P. Butter * * * Packed for Or By New England Butter Whse. Springfield, Massachusetts."

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that a product which contained less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, as prescribed by the act of March 4, 1923, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label, "Butter", was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the said statement represented that it was butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, whereas it was not butter, in that it contained less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat.

On June 25, 1934, a plea of nolo contendere was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

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

22697. Adulteration of strawberry preserves. U. S. v. Pacific Manufacturing Co., Inc. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$250 and costs. (F. & D. no. 31514. Sample no. 22951-A.)

This case was based on a shipment of strawberry preserves which had been made from berries which were in part moldy.

On May 19, 1934, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information (amended June 5, 1934), against the Pacific Manufacturing Co., Inc., a corporation, Seattle, Wash., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about January 14, 1933, from the State of Washington into the State of California, of a quantity of strawberry preserves which were adulterated. The article was labeled in part: "Sun Blest * * * Strawberry Preserves * * * Jacobson Shealy Co., Inc. San Francisco, Calif."

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

On June 14, 1934, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$250 and costs.

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

22698. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 420 Cartons, et al., of Canned Salmon. Consent decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. nos. 31534, 31535, 31543, 31580. Sample nos. 55797-A, 55798-A, 55799-A, 64126-A.)

These cases involved various lots of canned salmon that was in part decomposed.

On November 3, November 7, and November 14, 1933, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court libels praying seizure and condemnation of 550 cartons or cases of canned salmon at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article

had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about May 29, 1933, by the Salmon Exchange, Inc., from Astoria, Oreg., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. A portion of the article was labeled in part: "Oceanic Brand Columbia River Spring Chinook Salmon * * * Packed By Union Fishermens Coop. Pkg. Co., Astoria, Ore." The remainder was labeled in part: "Blue Seal Brand Chinook Salmon."

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

On July 12, 1934, the intervenor having withdrawn its claim for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

22699. Adulteration and misbranding of linseed meal. U. S. v. 200 Sacks of Linseed Meal. Consent decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 31655. Sample no. 50457-A.)

This case involved a shipment of linseed meal which contained ground mustard seed in sufficient amount to make it unfit for animal feeding.

On November 28, 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 a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 200 sacks of linseed meal at Hamilton, Ohio, consigned by the Iowa Milling Co., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about October 26, 1933, from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Old Process Linseed Meal with Cooked Oil Feed Screenings Superior Linseed Works, Cedar Rapids, Iowa."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that ground mustard seed had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength, and had been substituted in part for the article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label, "Old Process Linseed Meal with Cooked Oilfeed Screenings", was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser when applied to a product containing ground mustard seed. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On June 15, 1934, the sole intervenor having withdrawn its claim and answer and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

22700. Adulteration of apple chops. U. S. v. 1,000 Bags, et al., of Apple Chops. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond to be cleaned. (F. & D. nos. 31702, 31707, 31719. Sample nos. 61654-A, 61655-A, 61657-A.)

These cases involved shipments of apple chops which were found to be insect-infested, decomposed, and dirty.

On December 9, 11, and 13, 1933, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court libels praying seizure and condemnation of 4,600 bags of apple chops at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce in various shipments on or about September 11, October 14, and November 24, 1933, by the Royal Evaporating Co., from Front Royal, Va., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

It was alleged in the libels that the article was adulterated in that it consisted wholly or in part of filthy and decomposed vegetable substances.

On July 24, 1934, the Royal Evaporating Co., having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of decrees, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of bonds totaling \$1,500, conditioned that it be disposed of in compliance with the law. On August 7, 1934, the product having been washed and inspected by this Department and found to be satisfactory, the bonds were canceled.

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