

vanillin and coumarin colored with caramel and the Bottler's vanilla was a hydroalcoholic solution of vanillin colored with caramel.

Adulteration of the strawberry oil and raspberry oil was alleged in the information for the reason that imitation products artificially colored had been substituted for strawberry oil, or raspberry oil, as the case might be, which the said articles purported to be.

Misbranding of the said strawberry oil and raspberry oil was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Oil Strawberry" and "Oil Raspberry," borne on the labels attached to the bottles containing the respective articles, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the articles were oil strawberry or oil raspberry, as the case might be, and for the further reason that the said articles were labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that they were oil strawberry or oil raspberry, as the case might be, whereas they were not but were imitation products which consisted of alcoholic solutions of aromatic oils artificially colored. Misbranding was alleged with respect to the said strawberry oil and raspberry oil for the further reason that they were imitations of and offered for sale under the distinctive names of other articles, 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.

Adulteration of the vanilla flavors was alleged for the reason that an imitation product of dilute alcoholic solution of vanillin and coumarin artificially colored, in the case of the so-called "Vanilla Compound," and an imitation product which consisted of a dilute alcoholic solution of vanillin artificially colored, in the case of the so-called "Bottler's Vanilla," 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 the said article.

Misbranding of the vanilla flavors was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Vanilla Compound," with respect to a portion of the product and the statement "Bottler's Vanilla," with respect to the remainder thereof, borne on the labels, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the article consisted of vanilla compound or flavor vanilla, as the case might be, 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 of vanilla compound or flavor vanilla, as the case might be, whereas it did not but a portion of the article consisted in large part of an imitation product composed of a dilute alcoholic solution of vanillin and coumarin artificially colored, and the remainder thereof was an imitation flavor vanilla consisting of a dilute alcoholic solution of vanillin artificially colored.

On May 28, 1925, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13543. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 50 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 20196. I. S. No. 24620-v. S. No. C-4753.)

On June 19, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 50 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Phillips Creamery Co., from Phillips, Wis., June 12, 1925, and transported from the State of Wisconsin into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, excessive water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, for the further reason that a substance deficient in milk fat and high in moisture had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, butterfat, had been in part abstracted therefrom.

On June 30, 1925, C. J. Stenger & Co., Chicago, Ill., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel 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 released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that it be reprocessed under the supervision of this department so that it contain not less than 80 per cent of butterfat.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13544. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 30 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond.
(F. & D. No. 20201. I. S. No. 22331-v. S. No. C-4757.)

On June 24, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 30 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Dell Cooperative Creamery Co., from Westby, Wis., June 20, 1925, and transported from the State of Wisconsin into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, excessive water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, for the further reason that a substance deficient in milk fat and high in moisture had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent, to wit, butterfat, had been in part abstracted therefrom.

On June 30, 1925, the Dell Cooperative Creamery Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel 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 released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the adulterated portion be reprocessed under the supervision of this department so that it contain not less than 80 per cent of butterfat and not more than 16 per cent of moisture.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

13545. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 60 Tubs of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond.
(F. & D. No. 20208. I. S. No. 22425-v. S. No. C-4765.)

On June 29, 1925, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 60 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by W. C. Krueger, from Bruce, S. D., June 22, 1925, and transported from the State of South Dakota into the State of Illinois, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, excessive water, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, for the further reason that a substance deficient in milk fat and high in moisture had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article, for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, butterfat, had been in part abstracted therefrom, and for the further reason that it contained less than 80 per cent of butterfat.

On July 3, 1925, W. C. Krueger, Bruce, S. D., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel 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 released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the adulterated portion be reprocessed so as to contain not less than 80 per cent of butterfat and not more than 16 per cent of water, and that said reprocessing be done under the supervision of this department.

R. W. DUNLAP, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*