Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that the tablets contained 4.8 grains of acetylsalicylic acid each.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement appearing on the label, "Will not depress the heart", was false and misleading, since aspirin does depress the heart. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the following statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article were false and fraudulent: "Use for * * * Toothache, Sore Throat * * * etc. As an aid in the relief of * * * Rheumatism * * * Toothache, Earache."

On April 16, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22190. Misbranding of Fowlerine. U. S. v. 72 Bottles of Fowlerine. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 30783. Sample no. 41602–A.)

Examination of a sample of Fowlerine showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling.

On or about August 2, 1933, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 72 bottles of Fowlerine at Little Rock, Ark., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about June 29, 1933, by the Fowler Medicine Co., from Memphis, Tenn., 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 of a mixture of turpentine oil and sulphureted fatty oil, flavored with methyl salicylate.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that it was falsely and fraudulently labeled with respect to its effects in curing or preventing various disease conditions, including disorders of the kidneys, bladder, liver, stomach and generative organs, rheumatism, nervousness, indigestion, cramp, colic, Bright's disease, diabetes, dropsy, heart failure, swelling of the feet or ankles, puffiness under the eyes, dull aching around the back, weak and tired back, lumbago, pleurisy, gastritis, dyspepsia, diseases of the appendix, and malaria.

On April 16, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22191. Misbranding of Anti-Cholelith. U. S. v. 29 Bottles of Anti-Cholelith. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 30818. Sample no. 42780–A.)

Examination of a sample of Anti-Cholelith showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling.

On August 7, 1933, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 29 bottles of Anti-Cholelith at Atchison, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about June 8, 1933, by the Leon Chemical Co., from Springfield, Mo., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of extracts of plant drugs including hydrastis, a small proportion of acetic acid, glycerin, and water.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that certain statements appearing on the bottle label, and in a circular shipped with the article, regarding its effectiveness in the treatment of gallstones and renal calculi, kidney stones, indigestion, constipation, and auto-intoxication were false and fraudulent.

Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the statement on the bottle label, "Guaranteed by The Leon Chemical Company under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906", was misleading since it created the impression that the article had been examined and approved by the Government, and