Bacteriological examination of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed an excessive number of organisms on plain agar after two days, at different temperatures.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On April 20, 1922, a plea of nolo contendere 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.*

10433. Misbranding of Char-Med-Sal. U. S. * * * v. The Blackman Stock Remedy Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, $100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 11042. I. S. Nos. 10013–p, 10023–p, 6370–r.)

On September 14, 1920, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Tennessee, 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 Blackman Stock Remedy Co., a corporation, Chattanooga, Tenn., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about June 4 and May 17, 1918, from the State of Tennessee into the State of Illinois, of quantities of an article labeled in part "Char-Med-Sal," which was misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of sodium chlorid, iron oxid, charcoal, sulphur, iron sulphate, magnesium sulphate, and a small amount of strychnine.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic and curative effects of said article, appearing on the labels of the boxes containing it, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and preventive of hog cholera and effective to protect hogs against cholera, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On December 27, 1921, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $100 and costs.

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

10434. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. * * * v. Twin City Mfg. Co., Inc., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, $50. (F. & D. No. 12106. I. S. Nos. 15573–r, 16552–r.)

On June 26, 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 Twin City Mfg. Co., Inc., a corporation, Norfolk, Va., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about September 10, 1918, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, and on or about March 21, 1919, from the State of Virginia into the State of North Carolina, of quantities of vinegar which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "California Brand Natural Color Vinegar * * * Manufactured By Twin City Manufacturing Co., Inc. Norfolk, Virginia. * * *."

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it had been diluted excessively with water and that it was deficient in acid strength.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in part for vinegar, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Natural Color Vinegar A compound of Molasses Vinegar and Distilled Vinegar," borne on the labels attached to the bottles containing the article, regarding it and the substances and ingredients contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that said article was natural color vinegar, a compound of molasses vinegar and distilled vinegar, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was natural color vinegar, a compound of molasses vinegar and distilled vinegar, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not natural color vinegar,