

distemper and other contagious diseases which take a heavy toll from wormy dogs. * * * Directions for Worming with 'Tet.' * * * The use of Tetrachlorethylene as a wormer for dogs was the discovery of Dr. M. C. Hall of the U. S. Bureau of Animal Industry, * * * Besides the tests of Dr. Hall which showed this drug more effective for roundworms * * * Authoritative experiments have been made showing it safe for three weeks old pups in doses 25 times that necessary to remove * * * roundworms. Safe worming before weaning removes the most serious trouble of all dog breeders. * * * I have found your 'Tet' to * * * have stopped every case of 'Running-Barking Fits' I have had. I give it to all my dogs every 28 days and I have not had a case of fits since I have used it in this way. * * * I have tried everything and find your 'Tet' the best for worms and 'Running Fits.' * * * 'Tet' will remove * * * roundworms * * * Through the removal of worms the regular use of 'Tet' is a valuable preventive treatment for 'Running-Barking Fits,' and Sore Mouth and is insurance against heavy losses from Distemper."

On June 26, 1931, the Chloride "C. P." Co., McNeill, Miss., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel 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 the execution of a bond in the sum of \$50, conditioned in part that it should not be sold or disposed of in violation of the Federal food and drugs act, and it was further ordered that claimant pay costs of the proceedings.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

18486. Misbranding of Rice's G. G. Liniment. U. S. v. 5¼ Dozen Bottles of Rice's G. G. Liniment. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 26032. I. S. No. 16203. S. No. 4265.)

Examination of a drug product, known as Rice's G. G. liniment, from the shipment herein described having shown that the bottle label 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 Eastern District of Virginia.

On March 17, 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 5¼ dozen bottles of Rice's G. G. liniment, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Richmond, Va., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Rice Chemical Co., from Greensboro, N. C., on or about June 27, 1930, and had been transported from the State of North Carolina into the State of Virginia, and charging 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 turpentine oil, ammonia, an emulsifying agent, and water.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the following statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the said article, appearing on the bottle label, were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed: "Used for rheumatism, neuralgia, sciatica, back-ache * * * old sores, coughs, * * * lagrippe, croup, scratches, sweeny, spavin, stiffe joint, lameness, etc."

On April 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.*

18487. Misbranding of Hill's rheumatic and gout remedy. U. S. v. 32 Bottles of Hill's Rheumatic and Gout Remedy. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 26778. I. S. No. 17513. S. No. 4531.)

Examination of a drug product, known as Hill's rheumatic and gout remedy, showed that the carton and bottle labels bore statements representing that the article possessed curative and therapeutic properties which, in fact, it did not possess. The article was in further violation of the law, since it was represented to be guaranteed under the Federal food and drugs act, whereas it did not comply with the said act.

On or about July 10, 1931, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed