

from the State of Arkansas into the State of Alabama, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "G. S. Remedy," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the article was a solution containing alcohol, small quantities of potassium iodid, and vegetable extractives, among which were those of podophyllum, prickly ash, and saponin-bearing drugs.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information in that certain statements appearing on the carton enclosing, and on the label on the bottle containing the article, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for pellagra, rheumatism, lumbago, sciatica, neuralgia, syphilis, scrofula, eczema, indigestion, dyspepsia, biliousness, constipation, malaria, chills and fever, nervousness, and stomach, liver, kidney, and bladder disease, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On May 3, 1920, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

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

8421. Misbranding of salad oil. U. S. * * * v. 23 1-Gallon Cans of Salad Oil. Default decree of condemnation. Product ordered sold. (F. & D. No. 10153. I. S. No. 13581-r. S. No. E-1344.)

On April 26, 1919, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, 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 23 1-gallon cans of salad oil, at Hudson, Pa., alleging that the article was shipped on or about April 23, 1919, by Roberto Emilio, New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of soya-bean oil.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel in that certain statements and designs, to wit, "One Gallon Net Qualita Superiore Olio Puro Tripolitania Garantito Sotto Qualsiasi Analisi Chimica," and the picture of a woman holding the Italian flag, and also a map of Italy and Tripoli, on the label on the can containing the article, regarding the article, deceived and misled the purchaser in that they purported the article to be a foreign product and of foreign origin, whereas it was not a foreign product and not of foreign origin, and that it was olive oil, whereas the article consisted in whole or in part of an oil extracted from soya beans. Further misbranding was alleged in that soya-bean oil had been substituted in whole or in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

On January 19, 1920, 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 sold by the United States marshal.

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

8422. Misbranding of soluble saccharin. U. S. * * * v. 2 Cans of Soluble Saccharin Crystal and 1 Package of Soluble Saccharin. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 10272, 10273. I. S. Nos. 6143-r, 6144-r. S. No. C-1211.)

On May 14, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi, 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 condemnation and forfeiture of a certain quantity of soluble saccharin, at Vicksburg, Miss.,

alleging that the article was shipped on or about June 14, 1918, by the Sethness Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Mississippi and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained insoluble saccharin and sodium bicarbonate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel in that the statement on the label regarding the article, to wit, "Soluble Saccharine," was false and misleading in that the article was not in fact soluble saccharin, but consisted largely of sodium bicarbonate, insoluble saccharin, and other substances. Further misbranding was alleged in that the article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the name of, another and different drug, to wit, soluble saccharin. Further misbranding was alleged in that the label did not contain a statement showing the quantity or proportion of sodium bicarbonate, insoluble saccharin, and other substances contained in the article.

On July 26, 1919, 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.

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

8423. Misbranding of Black Caps. U. S. * * * v. 5 Dozen Packages of Black Caps. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10820. I. S. No. 13448-r. S. No. E-1600.)

On July 3, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, 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 5 dozen packages of Black Caps, at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article was shipped on or about April 7, 1919, by the Safety Remedy Co., Canton, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Pennsylvania and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the contents of the capsules consisted essentially of cubebs, copaiba, and saw palmetto.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements appearing in the circular accompanying the article, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for affections of the mucous membranes, leucorrhea, chronic cystitis, chronic bronchitis, leucorrhea, cystorrhea, abscess of the prostate gland, and affections of the neck of the bladder and prostatic portions of the urethra, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On June 25, 1920, 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.

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

8424. Misbranding of Purola Kidney and Liver Remedy, Purola Diarrhoea Mixture, Purola Female, Purola Syrup Sarsaparilla Compound with Iodide of Potash, and Purola Compound Extract of Buchu. U. S. * * * v. Blumauer-Frank Drug Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. No. 11049. I. S. Nos. 16177-p, 16178-p, 16179-p, 16180-p, 2312-r.)

On December 1, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, 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 Blumauer-