

various lots at Altoona, Albion, Jeannette, Bedford, Blairsville, and Ridgway, Pa., respectively, alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., between the dates of March 23 and May 26, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Chloroform for Anesthesia."

Analyses of samples 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 chlorid, impurities decomposable by sulphuric acid, and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels 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 April 24, 1923, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11535. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 18 Cans and 16 Cans of Chloroform. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 16634, 16635. S. Nos. E-4057, E-4062.)

On or about July 21 and August 3, 1922, respectively, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of South Carolina, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 34 cans of chloroform, remaining in the original unbroken packages, in part at St. George and in part at Darlington, S. C., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., in part on March 15 and in part on March 20, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of South Carolina, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Chloroform for Anesthesia."

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 hydrochloric acid, impurities decomposable by sulphuric acid, and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels 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.

On December 15, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11536. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 183 Tins of Chloroform. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 16642. S. No. E-4066.)

On July 20, 1922, 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 praying the seizure and condemnation of 183 tins of chloroform, at Erie, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., on or about April 17, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Chloroform for Anesthesia."

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 hydrochloric acid, 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.