

packaged medicine is protected twice by the Federal Food and Drugs Act—once against impure or substandard ingredients, and secondly against unwarranted claims for their therapeutic effectiveness. * * * Have used Creomulsion and find it relieves my bronchial troubles best of anything I ever tried. I find it especially helped during the Hay-fever period in August and September. * * * Creomulsion has helped wonderfully—not only me but members of my family * * * shall have a bottle on hand as a first aid treatment for a persistent and nerve racking cough. * * * I had a cold and cough. The bottle of Creomulsion I bought fixed me up all right and I haven't had a cold since. * * * Utah.—I have found Creomulsion to be very good for coughs and colds and can recommend it highly. * * * Creomulsion is the best medicine I ever took. I had a bad cough all winter. The doctor said it was bronchitis. * * * He says it is the best cough medicine he ever saw. * * * I want to thank you for Creomulsion. It is the best cough medicine my husband and I have ever used. * * * Both my little son and I were troubled with a stubborn cough last winter and spring. * * * Then we tried Creomulsion and it not only gave us relief but stopped the cough entirely and we felt like ourselves again. * * * My uncle, who is well up in years, a few weeks ago was in bed with a severe cough. We did not see how he could possibly escape pneumonia. He had no rest day or night from the severe coughing spells. After a few days' trial of Creomulsion he was slowly improving and in ten days he was around tending to his daily chores. Now his cough has greatly improved and he also has a wonderful appetite. * * * I had a cold that had been hanging on for almost four years, off and on. Have used almost one bottle of Creomulsion, and it has helped me considerably. * * * I had an awful cough * * *. It is the greatest cough syrup I ever took. * * * My brother had a bad cough and coughed all the time but when he took Creomulsion it stopped his cough right away. My father says it is the best medicine he ever took for indigestion. I give Creomulsion credit for pulling me through a severe case of flu I had recently. * * * I have been a sufferer for years with spasmodic asthma accompanied with a bad cough. I have taken doses of Creomulsion every 3 hours for several days and it has relieved me entirely of all bronchial trouble. * * * About eighteen months ago I had the flu and began taking a terrible cough and after a few days' treatment of Creomulsion my cough was relieved * * * at the beginning of colds and coughs I begin this remedy. * * * I want to let you know that Creomulsion meant new life to me. I was in bed nearly three months with an awful cough. Ran a high fever and could not talk above a whisper. My husband finally bought some Creomulsion for me which gave me immediate relief. I gained eight pounds in eleven days, and do not cough at all now. * * * How to Prevent Pneumonia See page 3;" (blown in bottle) "Coughs and Colds;" (shipping cases) "Creomulsion for Chronic Coughs and Persistent Colds."

On June 1, June 5, June 18, and June 20, 1928, respectively, the Creomulsion Co., Inc., Atlanta, Ga., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of bonds, totaling \$31,800, conditioned that it should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to law.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15986. Adulteration of apple chops. U. S. v. 586 Sacks of Apple Chops. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21973. I. S. No. 16660-x. S. No. 7.)

On July 11, 1927, 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 seizure and condemnation of 586 sacks of apple chops at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped by Evaporated Fruits, Inc., from Seattle, Wash., on or about November 13, 1926, and transported from the State of Washington into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it contained an added poisonous or other added deleterious ingredient, arsenic, which might have rendered it injurious to health.

On February 29, 1928, the Evaporated Fruits, Inc., Seattle, Wash., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to the entry

of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant to be reconditioned, upon the execution of a bond in the sum of \$5,000, conditioned in part that the product be reconditioned, and that the claimant pay the costs of the proceedings.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15987. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 5 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 22880. I. S. No. 21785-x. S. No. 904.)

On June 26, 1928, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 5 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., consigned about June 4, 1928, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Sugar Creek Creamery Co., Danville, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance containing less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted in whole or in part for butter, which the said article purported to be, the act of Congress approved March 4, 1923, providing that butter should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat.

On September 10, 1928, the Sugar Creek Creamery Co., Danville, Ill., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and the deposit of \$100 in lieu of bond, conditioned that it be reworked under the supervision of this department so that it contain at least 80 per cent of butterfat.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15988. Adulteration of butter. U. S. v. 21 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 22912. I. S. No. 20998-x. S. No. 949.)

On July 6, 1928, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 21 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., consigned about June 14, 1928, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Mandan Creamery & Produce Co., Mandan, N. Dak., and transported from the State of North Dakota into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance containing less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat had been substituted in whole or in part for butter, which the article purported to be, the act of Congress approved March 4, 1923, providing that butter should contain not less than 80 per cent by weight of milk fat.

On July 24, 1928, the Mandan Creamery and Produce Co., Mandan, N. Dak., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and the deposit of \$500 in lieu of bond, conditioned in part that it be reworked, under the supervision of this department, so that it contain at least 80 per cent of butterfat.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15989. Adulteration of canned sardines. U. S. v. 29 Cases of Sardines. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction (F. & D. No. 23041. I. S. No. 02499. S. No. 1125.)

On August 31, 1928, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 29 cases of sardines at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by A. H. Mayo, from Brooklin, Me., on or about August 13, 1928, and transported from the State of Maine into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Concordia Brand Sardines. Weight 3¼ Ounces."