and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, for the further reason that a product containing excessive moisture and deficient in milk fat had been substituted for butter, which the article purported to be, 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, and for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, milk fat, had been in part abstracted.

On April 2, 1925, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $125.

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

13265. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. Alaska Consolidated Canneries. Plea of guilty. Fine, $100. (F. & D. No. 19350. I. S. Nos. 7760-v, 7763-v, 7765-v.)

On March 14, 1925, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, 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 Alaska Consolidated Canneries, a corporation, Seattle, Wash., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act, in two consignments, namely, on or about June 20, 1924, and July 22, 1924, respectively, from the Territory of Alaska into the State of Washington, of quantities of canned salmon which was adulterated. The article was labeled in part: (Can) "Target Brand Alaska Pink Salmon" or "Surf Brand Choice Alaska Pink Salmon."

Examination by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of a sample consisting of 192 cans from the first consignment showed that 49 cans, or 25.5 per cent, contained decomposed fish. Examination by said bureau of a sample consisting of 384 cans from the second consignment showed that 95 cans, or 24.7 per cent, contained decomposed fish.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a portion of the said article consisted in part of a filthy and decomposed animal substance, and the remainder thereof consisted in part of a filthy and decomposed and putrid animal substance.

On April 8, 1925, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $100.

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

13266. Adulteration and misbranding of chocolate concentrate. U. S. v. 5 Gallons of Chocolate Concentrate. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 18546. I. S. No. 21703-v. S. No. E-4798.)

On April 10, 1924, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georg a, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel, and on April 11, 1924, an amendment thereto, praying the seizure and condemnation of 5 gallons of chocolate concentrate, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Atlanta, Ga., alleging that the article had been sh pped by Jack Beverages, Inc., from New York, N. Y., on or about March 8, 1923 [1924], and transported from the State of New York into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Five Gals. Real Chocolate Concentrate * * * Jack Beverages, Inc. Manufacturing Chemists New York City."

Adulteration of the art cle was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance, to wit, glucose, had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly and in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that it contained an added poisonous and other added deleterious ingredient, to wit, salicylic ac d, which might have rendered it injurious to health.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement in the labeling "Real Chocolate Concentrate" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser to believe that the article was real chocolate concentrate, whereas it was not.

On Apr 1 8, 1925, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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