that the article was food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On May 1, 1929, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of $100.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16473. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. 15 Cases of Eggs. Default order of destruction entered. (F. & D. No. 23613. I. S. No. 01309. S. No. 1813.)

On March 2, 1929, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota, 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 15 cases of eggs at Minneapolis, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped by George Berzel, from Dickinson, N. Dak., on or about February 15, 1929, and transported from the State of North Dakota into the State of Minnesota, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a decomposed animal substance.

On April 12, 1929, no claimant having appeared for the property, upon the execution of an affidavit by the assistant United States attorney that the product was wholly unfit for consumption as food, it was ordered by the court that the said product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16474. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 15 Cubes of Butter. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23806. I. S. No. 07797. S. No. 1929.)

On April 22, 1929, 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 15 cubes of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Stillwater County Creamery Co., Columbus, Mont., and transported from the State of Montana into the State of Washington, arriving at Seattle on or about April 18, 1929, 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 per cent of milk fat had been substituted for butter.

On May 7, 1929, the Stillwater County Creamery Co., Columbus, Mont., 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 costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of $300, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned to conform with the Federal food and drugs act.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

16475. Adulteration and misbranding of Chickfalfa. U. S. v. 500 Sacks of Chickfalfa. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23208. I. S. No. 0168. S. No. 1311.)

On or about December 8, 1928, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of New York, 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 sacks of Chickfalfa, remaining in the original packages at Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by Russel & Macaulay, Sacramento, Calif., on or about November 10, 1928, and transported from the State of California into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Chickfalfa * * * Manufactured by Russel & Macaulay, Sacramento, Calif., Guaranteed Analysis: Crude Protein, not less than 20%, * * * Crude Fiber, not more than 18%."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance deficient in protein and containing an excessive amount of fiber had been substituted in part for the said article and had been mixed and packed with it so as to reduce and lower its quality and strength.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements "Crude Protein, not less than 20%," "Crude Fiber, not more than 18%," borne on the label,