

ordinary Coughs and Colds;" (circular) "Fine for La Grippe, Spanish Influenza, Asthma, and Hay Fever."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of a mixture of white mineral oil, turpentine, and creosote, with an aqueous solution containing gum acacia, sugar, and a small amount of hypophosphites and alcohol.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that the statements regarding the therapeutic and curative effects thereof, appearing on the labels of the bottles and cartons, and in the circulars, as aforesaid, were false and fraudulent in that they were applied to said article knowingly and in reckless and wanton disregard of their truth or falsity, so as to represent falsely and fraudulently to the purchaser and create in the mind of the purchaser the impression and belief that the product was in whole or in part a compound containing ingredients or medicinal agents effective and capable of producing the therapeutic effects claimed for it on the labels of the bottles and carton and in the circulars, when, in truth and in fact, said article contained no ingredients or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effect so claimed.

On September 22, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, a default decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

8092. Misbranding of Hinkle Capsules. U. S. * * * v. 30 Packages of So-Called Hinkle Capsules. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10017. I. S. No. 6883-r. S. No. C-1145.)

On April 12, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 30 packages of so-called Hinkle Capsules, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Atchison, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 26, 1918, by the Hinkle Capsule Co., Mayfield, Ky., and transported from the State of Kentucky into the State of Kansas, and charging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Hinkle Capsules."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of powdered cubebs, copaiba, small amounts of cannabis indica, pepsin, and probably santal oil.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, appearing on the labels and in the circulars accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article as effective for the treatment of gonorrhœa, gleet, leucorrhœa, and kidney and bladder affections, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On October 13, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, a default decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

8093. Misbranding of cracked cottonseed feed. U. S. * * * v. Jacksonville Cotton Oil Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 10050. I. S. No. 19135-p.)

On July 24, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, 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 Jacksonville Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Jacksonville, Tex., alleging shipment by said defendant company, on or about January 3, 1918, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, from the State of Texas into the State of Nevada, of a quantity of cracked cottonseed feed which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part, "100 Lbs. Net Cracked Cotton Seed Feed No. 4 Contains not more than 10 per cent Hulls Manufactured by Jacksonville Cotton Oil Company Jacksonville, Texas. Guaranteed Analysis Protein Not Less Than 41.20 per cent."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the percentage of protein was 38.31.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement "Protein Not Less Than 41.20 per cent," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, was false and misleading and the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, in that it was represented that said article contained 41.20 per cent of protein, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article did not contain 41.20 per cent of protein, but did contain a less amount.

On April 26, 1920, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

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

S094. Misbranding of Prescription 1000 Internal and Prescription 1000 External. U. S. * * * v. 33 Bottles of Prescription 1000 Internal and 9 Bottles of Prescription 1000 External. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10082. I. S. Nos. 5537-r, 5538-r. S. No. C-1167.)

On May 27, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 33 bottles of Prescription 1000 Internal and 9 bottles Prescription 1000 External, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Superior, Wis., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 25, 1919, by the Reese Chemical Co., Cleveland, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Wisconsin, and charging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Prescription 1000 Internal" and "Prescription 1000 External."

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the Prescription 1000 Internal consisted essentially of an emulsion of balsam of copaiba and methyl salicylate, and that the Prescription 1000 External consisted of a dilute aqueous solution of potassium permanganate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, appearing on the labels and cartons accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was effective as a treatment for gleet, gonorrhoea, bladder troubles, frequent urination, inflammation, and acid urine, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On October 16, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, a default decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

S095. Misbranding of certified color grape shade. U. S. * * * v. Sethness Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 10142. I. S. No. 10982-r.)

On September 23, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District