

tions of and offered for sale under the distinctive names of other articles, for the further reason that they contained added tartaric acid, and for the further reason that they were food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the packages.

On March 4, 1925, the Goodwin Preserving Co., Louisville, Ky., having appeared as claimant for the property 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 products be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that they be relabeled to show their true contents.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13499. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. Sherman White & Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$75 and costs. (F. & D. No. 18476 I. S. No. 8876-v.)

On May 15, 1925, the grand jurors of the United States within and for the District of Indiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, upon presentment by the United States attorney for said district, returned in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an indictment against Sherman White & Co., a corporation, Fort Wayne, Ind., charging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, on July 20, 1923, from the State of Indiana into the State of Ohio, of a quantity of butter which was adulterated. The article was labeled in part: "Delft Fancy Creamery Butter * * * Manufactured by Sherman White & Co. Ft. Wayne, Ind."

Analysis of 3 samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed an average of 16.38 per cent of moisture and 78.99 per cent of milk fat.

Adulteration of the article was charged in the indictment for the reason that a product deficient in milk fat and containing an excessive amount of moisture had been substituted for butter, which the article purported to be, and for the further reason that a product which contained less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, as prescribed by the act of March 4, 1923.

On June 3, 1925, a plea of guilty to the indictment was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$75 and costs.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13500. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. Schlosser Bros. Pleas of guilty. Fines, \$225 and costs. (F. & D. Nos. 18475, 19608. I. S. Nos. 1056-v, 12657-v, 12661-v.)

On May 15, 1925, the grand jurors of the United States within and for the District of Indiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, upon presentment by the United States attorney for said district, returned in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid two indictments against Schlosser Bros. (Inc.), a corporation, Frankfort, Ind., charging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, in various consignments, namely, on June 12, 1923, and August 5, 1924, respectively, from the State of Indiana into the State of Maryland, of quantities of butter which was adulterated.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was deficient in milk fat and in one shipment it also contained excessive moisture.

Adulteration of the article was charged in substance in the indictments for the reason that a substance containing less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, as prescribed by the act of March 4, 1923. Adulteration was further charged in one of the indictments for the reason that a product containing an excessive amount of moisture had been substituted for butter, which the said article purported to be.

On June 3, 1925, pleas of guilty to the indictments were entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed fines in the aggregate sum of \$225, together with the costs.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*