Adulteration was alleged in the information for the reason that a valuable constituent of the article of food had been left out and abstracted in whole and in part.

On August 25, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of $10.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 13, 1914.*

3492. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. Luther Cleveland. Plea of guilty. Fine, $10. (F. & D. No. 255-c.)

On August 25, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the health officer of said District, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against Luther Cleveland, Washington, D. C., alleging the sale by said defendant, on July 22, 1914, at the District aforesaid, in violation of the Food and Drug Act, of a quantity of milk which was adulterated.

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality and strength.

On August 25, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of $10.

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 13, 1914.*

3493. Misbranding of so-called champagne. U. S. v. Ernest Schraubstadter et al. (A. Finke's Widow). Pleas of guilty. Fine, $35. (F. & D. Nos. 1873, 2013, 2268, 2327, 2352. I. S. Nos. 18710-b, 14078-b, 3113-c, 2800-c, 3108-c.)

At a stated term of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California the grand jurors of the United States within and for said district, after presentation by the United States attorney for the district aforesaid, upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, returned two indictments against Ernest Schraubstadter and Emile A. Groezinger, doing business under the firm name and style of A. Finke's Widow, San Francisco, Cal., charging:

(1) The shipment by said defendants, on April 6, 1910, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, from the State of California into the State of New Mexico, of a quantity of so-called champagne which was misbranded.

Investigation of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was an artificially carbonated wine of domestic manufacture.

It was charged in the first count of one of the indictments that the product was misbranded for the reason that each of said bottles had three labels thereon regarding said so-called champagne, one label being made of tin foil which said label covered the mouth and neck of the bottle on which were stamped the words in blue type, "Extra Dry"; around the neck of the bottle and at the bottom of said tin foil label as a neck label was a second label containing the words "Extra Dry Champagne" and containing the impression of a circular star, crown and shield upon which shield was a monogram consisting of the letters "A. F. W."; and upon the main label of the bottle was an impression of a crown and shield upon which shield was a monogram consisting of the letters "A. F. W.", the word "Trade" being on the left side of said shield and the word "Mark" being on the right side of said shield, and said label contained the words: "Grand Vin Royal Extra Dry Dufleur Fils & Cie. Guaranteed under the Pure Food and Drugs Act June 30th 1906 Serial No. 7016"; and on the bottom of the cork of said bottle were the words "Champagne Mousseux"; that said labels and the words and impressions thereon and the words on said cork gave and would give to the purchaser, as defendant then and there well knew, the impression that the product contained in each of said bottles was a foreign product, to wit, champagne, which is, as defendants then and there well knew, a high-class wine made in France, and that said