labeled to indicate that it was substandard and was not properly labeled to show

that it was water-packed cherries.

On June 4, 1934, the United States attorney for the District of Idaho, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 19 cases of canned cherries at Moscow, Idaho, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 30, 1934, by the Puyallup & Sumner Fruit Growers Association, from Portland Oreg., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "Porto Brand, Packed in water fruit * * sour pitted cherries, Mason Ehrman and Co., Portland, Oregon."

The libel alleged that the article was adulterated in that it consisted wholly

or in part of a filthy vegetable substance.

Misbranding was alleged in that the article was canned food and fell below the standard of quality and condition promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture and failed to bear a statement indicating that it fell below such standard, examination having shown that the cherries contained maggots and excessive pits and that the statement "packed in water" was not on the main panel and was not in direct conjunction with the name of the product.

On August 9, 1934, no claimant having appeared, judgment of forfeiture was

entered and destruction of the product was ordered.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

22934. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. McKenzie Milk Products Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100. (F. & D. no. 32874. Sample no. 66073-A.)

This case was based on an interstate shipment of butter that contained less

than 80 percent of milk fat.

On September 6, 1934, the United States attorney for the Western District of Tennessee, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the McKenzie Milk Products Co., a corporation, McKenzie, Tenn., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act on or about January 30, 1934, from the State of Tennessee into the State of New York of a quantity of butter that was adulterated.

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

On September 25, 1934, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendnt company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100 in lieu of fines and costs.

M. L. Wilson, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

22935. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 6 Cubes and 1 Cube of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. no. 32922. Sample no. 71822-A.)

This case involved a shipment of butter, samples of which were found to

contain less than 80 percent of milk fat.

On May 26, 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 a libel praying seizure and condemnation of seven cubes of butter at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about May 23, 1934, by the North Star Dairy, from Kalispell, Mont., and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a product containing less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 percent of milk

fat as provided by the act of Congress of March 4, 1923.

On June 2, 1934, the North Star Dairy, having appeared as claimant, and having paid costs of the proceedings, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the claimant upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$200, conditioned that it should not be sold or disposed of contrary to the provisions of the Federal Food and Drugs Act and all other laws.