

ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed: (Bottle label) "For \* \* \* Coughs, \* \* \* Pneumonia, Bronchitis, Asthma, Consumption and Croup. \* \* \* For adults, teaspoonful as needed; \* \* \* Coughine;" (carton label) "For the relief of \* \* \* Coughs, \* \* \* Pneumonia, Bronchitis, Asthma, Consumption, and Croup. \* \* \* For adults, teaspoonful as needed. \* \* \* Coughine;" (circular) "For relief of \* \* \* Coughs \* \* \* Pneumonia, Bronchitis, Asthma, Consumption and Croup \* \* \* Coughine."

On April 8, 1929, the National Drug Co., of Joplin, Mo., having appeared as claimant for the property and having executed a bond to insure relabeling of the product to conform with the requirements of this department, a decree was entered ordering that the product be released to the said claimant for the purpose of relabeling upon payment of costs.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**17384. Adulteration and misbranding of gum myrrh. U. S. v. 2 Bags, et al., of Gum Myrrh. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 24209. I. S. No. 03071. S. No. 1863.)**

On November 8, 1929, the United States attorney for the Eastern 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 2 bags and 2 partly filled bags of crushed gum myrrh, and 1 barrel and 1 partly filled barrel of powdered gum myrrh, remaining in the original packages at Brooklyn, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by Devkapan-Adenwalla, Aden, Arabia, December 4, 1928, into the port of Boston, Mass., and forwarded from Boston into the State of New York, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it contained an excessive amount of acid-insoluble ash and woody or bark-like material and was deficient in alcohol-soluble material.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopeia and differed in strength, quality, and purity from the pharmacopeia specifications, in that it was deficient in alcohol-soluble material and contained an excessive amount of acid-insoluble ash and woody and bark-like material.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was offered for sale under the name of another article.

On December 13, 1929, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**17385. Adulteration and misbranding of ether. U. S. v. 1 Case of Ether. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 24372. I. S. No. 026901. S. No. 2629.)**

On December 18, 1929, 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 a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 1 case of ether, remaining in the original unbroken package at Palestine, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Ohio Chemical Manufacturing Co., from Cleveland, Ohio, on or about October 12, 1929, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Texas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that the ether contained peroxide.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia, and differed from the standard of purity as determined by tests laid down in said pharmacopoeia, in that it contained peroxide. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article was sold under the following standard of purity, (can label) "The exceptional purity of this ether \* \* \* the exclusion of air by carbon dioxide prevents the oxidation of ether to \* \* \* peroxides by atmospheric oxygen," whereas it fell below such professed standard of purity, in that it contained peroxide.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the above-quoted statements appearing on the can label, were false and misleading when applied to an article containing peroxide.