and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On April 6, 1926, 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.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14661. Adulteration of canned salmon. U. S. v. 500 Cases of Salmon. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21279. I. S. No. 10707-x. S. No. W-2008.)

On or about September 2, 1926, 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 a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 500 cases of salmon, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Alaska Year Round Canneries, from Seldovia, Alaska, July 26, 1926, and transported from the Territory of Alaska into the State of Washington, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On September 24, 1926, the Alaska Year Round Canneries Co., Inc., Seattle, Wash., 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 $2,000, said bond providing that the product be reconditioned by separating the good portion from the bad.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14662. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. West Coast Grocery Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $15 and costs. (F. & D. No. 19695. I. S. No. 23409-v.)

On September 11, 1926, 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 West Coast Grocery Co., a corporation, Tacoma, Wash., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on or about May 4, 1925, from the State of Washington into the Territory of Alaska, of a quantity of butter which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Creamery Butter This Can Contains Two Pounds Of Bradner's Jersey Creamery Butter."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance containing less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, a product which must contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat as prescribed by the act of March 4, 1923, which the said article purported to be. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, to wit, milk fat, had been in part abstracted.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Creamery Butter," and "This Can Contains Two Pounds of Bradner's Jersey Creamery Butter," borne on the tins containing the article, were false and misleading, in that the said statements represented that the article was butter, to wit, a product containing not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat as prescribed by law, and that each of said tins contained 2 pounds of butter, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that each of the said tins contained butter, to wit, a product containing not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat, and that each of the said tins contained 2 pounds of butter, whereas the said article contained less than 80 per cent of milk fat and each of a number of said tins contained less than 2 pounds of butter. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was an imitation of and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, and for the further reason that it was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On October 1, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $15 and costs.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*