

Adulteration of the article in these shipments was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, a product which contained added sulphuric acid, had been substituted in part for pure, condensed, modified buttermilk which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Milkoline is pure condensed modified buttermilk," "Milkoline, made from pure buttermilk," and "Milkoline being made from pure buttermilk," borne on the labels attached to the barrels, "Milkoline is pure condensed buttermilk concentrated and modified" and "Milkoline is pure buttermilk condensed and modified," borne on the labels attached to the bottles, and "Milkoline is pure condensed buttermilk concentrated and modified" and "Milkoline is pure buttermilk condensed and modified," borne on the labels attached to the jugs containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was a product composed wholly of pure condensed modified buttermilk, and that said product was made from pure buttermilk, 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 a product composed wholly of pure, condensed, modified buttermilk, and that said product was made from buttermilk, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article was not a product composed wholly of pure condensed modified buttermilk, but was composed in part of added sulphuric acid. Misbranding was alleged in substance for the further reason that said statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic or curative effects of the article, borne on the labels of the bottles, barrels, and jugs containing it, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective (in case of the article in barrels) to clean out the bowels and intestines of all dead matter and to eliminate the possibility of a disease epidemic, and (in case of the article in bottles and jugs) as a quick and certain death to all disease germs to be found in the large intestines of the fowl, to cleanse the bowels of all dead matter and disease and to prevent most disease common to poultry and hogs, as a treatment for sickly poultry and hogs, and as a preventive against a disease epidemic, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective for the purposes named.

On June 3, 1920, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant firm, and the court imposed a fine of \$120 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**S249. Misbranding of Black Beauty Scratch Feed. U. S. \* \* \* v. Superior Feed Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25 and costs.**  
(F. & D. No. 11209. I. S. No. 16268-r.)

On November 7, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western 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 Superior Feed Co., a corporation doing business at Memphis, Tenn., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about October 31, 1918, from the State of Tennessee into the State of Georgia, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Black Beauty Scratch Feed," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained 8.62 per cent of protein and 2.54 per cent of ether extract.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the following statements, appearing on the label thereof, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis: Protein 10.00 per cent, Fat 3.00 per cent," were false and misleading in that they represented to purchasers of the article that the same contained not