pain and hasten the process of healing: Pyorrhea and Inflamed Gums—Use full strength several times a day, slushing well between the teeth for 3 or 4 minutes. Dilute to a weaker solution as case improves. * * * Vincent's or Trench Mouth—Follow directions as for pyorrhea. Use frequently and continue indefinitely even after case seems apparently cured. Extractions—After removal of teeth * * * keep out infection * * * Sores—Saturate gauze or cotton and bandage on wound."

On November 8, 1932, the Painallay Co., Kansas City, Mo., having appeared as claimant for the property 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 upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of $100, conditioned in part that it be relabeled under the supervision of this Department, and that it should not be sold or offered for sale in violation of any existing law.

R. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

20357. Adulteration of Dr. Cates' Cato tooth paste. U.S. v. Cato Chemical Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, $50. (F. & D. no. 26664. I.S. no. 8139.)

This action was based on the shipment in interstate commerce of a product represented to be an antiseptic and germicide. Bacteriological examination showed that the article was not an antiseptic and germicide when used according to directions.

On February 11, 1932, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an information against the Cato Chemical Co., a corporation, St. Louis, Mo., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about January 13, 1930, from the State of Missouri into the State of Tennessee, of a quantity of Dr. Cates' Cato tooth paste that was adulterated. The article was labeled in part: (Tube) "Dr. Cates' Cato Tooth Paste * * * A harmless antiseptic"; (carton) "Germicide, antiseptic."

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of calcium carbonate, potassium chlorate, a magnesium compound, talc, and water, flavored with peppermint oil. Bacteriological examination showed that the article was not antiseptic.

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in that it was represented to be an antiseptic and germicide, whereas it was not an antiseptic and was not a germicide.

On October 4, 1932, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $50.

R. G. TUGWELL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

20358. Adulteration and misbranding of fluidextract of ergot. U.S. v. Eleven 1-Pint Bottles of Fluidextract Ergot. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 27652. I.S. no. 46167. S. no. 5700.)

This action involved a quantity of a product represented to be fluidextract of ergot of pharmacopoeial standard which, upon examination, was found to possess a potency of not more than one half of that required by the United States Pharmacopoeia.

On January 13, 1932, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of eleven 1-pint bottles of fluidextract of ergot, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Atlanta, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about December 12, 1931, by the Standard Pharmaceutical Corporation from Baltimore, Md., to Atlanta, Ga., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Fluidextract Ergot (Fluidextractum Ergotae) U.S.P."

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 strength as determined by the test laid down in the said pharmacopoeia and its own standard of strength was not stated upon the container. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the strength of the article fell below the professed standard of quality under which it was sold,