

**CALLS IT A FRAUD.**

**A Dairyman's View of the Butterine Business.**

To the Editor of The Journal: The Journal of the 6th inst. presents only facts in the butterine controversy. The dairymen are not opposed to legitimate manufacture and sale of butterine, but they are opposed to it's making under a fraudulent imitation of butter. These innocent dealers who have the hardihood to say they never sell the stuff, calling it butter, only need to be referred to the late detective move when sixty-two out of seventy-five samples of butter, or goods purchased for butter in Chicago, proved on analysis to be oleomargarine. Nine-tenths of the oleomargarine retailed the country over goes to the consumer as pure butter. Why not make it and put it on the market in its natural color?

There is no virtue or flavor in the coloring matter, and butter makers only incorporate the color to make the natural, uniform June appearance, which is a standard butter color.

Every effort to warn the people that restaurants and hotels are using butterine has failed. Laws have been made requiring the dining room to be placarded, but this legislation has been a dismal failure and has never been enforced. The friends of pure butter have at last struck, in the anti-color law, which is declared to be constitutional, a remedy for the matter which cannot be a failure, and it does not work any unjust hardship on the manufacturer or seller, although it is admitted that bringing the butterine business down to an honest basis is a hardship, but a just one. The people who eat the butterine are the ones who pay for the goods; they are the

ones who are imposed upon. The question now is: Shall the people have butterine palmed off upon them when they want butter, when the former product can as well be made so that any person of average intelligence can discover its identity, and that, too, without injuring its quality as a food?

Those lawbreakers you quote in Milwaukee need not lie awake nights for fear the officer of the law will not be looking after them. He will call on them in due time. They say that the coloring simply makes the butterine look like butter and taste like butter and that the people will not buy it unless it has those qualifications. Why not as well say that they can call it butter and sell it for butter? If these dealers will violate the law in selling colored butterine, will they not as readily violate and sell it for butter?

You say the dealers point to the general increase of its use during recent years, in spite of strenuous opposition, as an evidence of its quality. The figures from the revenue collections show that the production of oleomargarine in the country has fallen off from 939,218 tubs for seven months of 1893-4 to 791,722 tubs for seven months of 1894-5, a decline of 138,496 tubs, or about 14 per cent. In twelve districts of the United States there were Feb. 1, 1895, 2,002 retailers in butterine, compared with 2,663 on Feb. 1, 1894, and this shrinkage occurred before the passage of the anti-color laws in Wisconsin, Missouri and Nebraska. You ask can the law be enforced? Why not? Are our citizens a set of outlaws? New York and Pennsylvania are meeting with good success and will soon have all their scalps, while Massachusetts has them under control entirely.

DAIRYMAN.