

"* * * Aphrodisiac * * * For General Weakness * * * Nervous Debility." The Vitalo was labeled in part: (Bottle and carton, large and small sizes) "Aphrodisiac;" (carton, small size) "* * * An Aid In Relieving General Weakness." The Vitalo nerve and muscle tonic was labeled in part: (Carton) "For General Weakness * * * Nervous Debility * * * for the Brain and Muscles." The Parrott sexual pills were labeled in part: (Box and circular) "Sexual Pills * * * Recommended For Hysteria, Dizziness, Nervous Prostration, Nervous Debility and General Weakness."

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that Allan's and Bayne's compound extracts of damiana consisted of extracts of plant drugs, including nux vomica, sugar, alcohol, and water; that the Parrott sexual pills contained strychnine and a compound of iron and phosphorus, coated with calcium carbonate; and that Vitalo and the Vitalo nerve and muscle tonic consisted of extracts of plant drugs, including damiana and nux vomica, sugar, alcohol, and water.

Misbranding was alleged in substance in the libels with respect to the articles involved in all of the consignments for the reason that the above-quoted statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof were false and fraudulent since the said articles contained no ingredients or combinations of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed. Misbranding was alleged with respect to the so-called Vitalo, Vitalo nerve and muscle tonic, and a portion of the Allan's compound extract of damiana for the further reason that the labels of the said articles failed to bear statements of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained therein.

On March 31, May 20, and October 20, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the products be destroyed by the United States marshal.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11173. Adulteration of egg noodles. U. S. v. John J. Meier (John J. Meier & Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 16027. I. S. No. 175-t.)

On June 16, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against John J. Meier, trading as John J. Meier & Co., St. Louis, Mo., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about April 12, 1921, from the State of Missouri into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of egg noodles which were adulterated. The article was labeled in part: "White Cross Brand Egg Nudels * * * Spaghetti and Macaroni John J. Meier & Co. St. Louis, Mo."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was artificially colored and contained little or no egg solids.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a mixture containing little or no egg had been substituted for egg noodles which the said article purported to be, and for the further reason that it was a product inferior to egg noodles, to wit, a mixture which contained little or no egg, and was artificially colored with certain coal-tar dyes, to wit, tartrazine and orange I, so as to simulate the appearance of egg noodles, and in a manner whereby its inferiority to said egg noodles was concealed.

On October 23, 1922, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11174. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 800 and 1,500 Tins of Chloroform. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered disposed of according to law. (F. & D. No. 16469. I. S. Nos. 13973-t, 13974-t. S. Nos. W-1108, W-1121.)

On June 26, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, 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 2,300 tins of chloroform, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., consigned from New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in part on or about March 7, 1922, and in part on or about March 10, 1922, and transported in interstate com-

merce, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Chloroform * * * For Anaesthesia."

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the chloroform in the consignment of March 7 was turbid, upon evaporation it left a foreign odor, and it contained hydrochloric acid, free chlorin, impurities decomposable by sulphuric acid, and chlorinated decomposition products, and that the chloroform in the consignment of March 10 was turbid, upon evaporation it left a foreign odor, and it contained chlorids and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation.

On July 25, 1922, 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 disposed of according to law.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11175. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 98 Cans of Chloroform. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product disposed of according to law. (F. & D. No. 16598. I. S. No. 14001-t. S. No. W-1148.)

On July 10, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, 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 98 cans of chloroform, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., consigned by the Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Co., New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., on or about May 22, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging adulteration 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 was turbid and contained chlorids, odorous decomposition products, and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation.

On October 2, 1922, 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 disposed of according to law.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11176. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 4 Cans of Chloroform. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product disposed of according to law. (F. & D. No. 16599. I. S. No. 11123-t. S. No. W-1150.)

On July 7, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, 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 4 cans of chloroform, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., on or about March 29, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging adulteration 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 was turbid, upon evaporation it left a foreign odor, and it contained chlorids, impurities decomposable by sulphuric acid, and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation.

On October 2, 1922, 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 disposed of according to law.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*