

Bronchial Tubes, Asthma, etc., use Mistol. * * * Use it continuously in order to prevent and cure diseases * * * of the nose and throat. * * * Persons suffering from chronic nasal catarrhs * * * For children of any age. Mistol possesses great value for treating * * * coughs."

On May 9, 1931, the West India Oil Co., Puerta de Tierra, P. R., having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, 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 execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, conditioned in part that it be relabeled and should not be sold or otherwise disposed of contrary to the provisions of the Federal food and drugs act as amended.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18361. Misbranding of solution citrate of magnesia. U. S. v. 270 Dozen Bottles of Solution Citrate of Magnesia. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 25994. I. S. No. 27108. S. No. 4267.)

Sample bottles of solution of citrate of magnesia from the shipment herein described having been found to contain less than the volume declared on the label, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas.

On April 3, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 270 dozen bottles of solution citrate of magnesia, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Dallas, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the National Magnesia Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., on or about August 2, 1930, and had been transported from the State of New York into the State of Texas, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Blown in bottle) "Solution Citrate Magnesia U. S. P.;" (bottle cap) "Contents Approx. 11½ oz."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement on the bottle cap, "Contents Approx. 11½ oz.," was false and misleading.

On May 15, 1931, 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.*

18362. Adulteration and misbranding of Good Samaritan ointment. U. S. v. 21 Packages of Good Samaritan Ointment. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 26061. I. S. No. 27880. S. No. 4332.)

Examination of a drug product, known as Good Samaritan ointment, from the shipment herein described having shown that it was represented to be antiseptic, whereas it was not, also that the labels bore statements representing that the article possessed curative and therapeutic properties which it did not possess, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the District of Delaware.

On March 24, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 21 packages of Good Samaritan ointment, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Wilmington, Del., consigned about January 20, 1931, alleging that the article had been shipped by the Good Samaritan Ointment Co., from Philadelphia, Pa., and had been transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Delaware, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of lead carbonate, fatty oils, wax, and traces of volatile oils including methyl salicylate. Bacteriological examination showed that the article was not antiseptic.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it fell below the professed standard of strength under which it was sold, namely "Antiseptic."

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the carton and can label and in the circular, "Antiseptic," was false and misleading, when applied to an article which was not antiseptic. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the following statements on the can label and in the accompanying circular, regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of