

set forth above and said statements on the label were false and misleading and constituted a misbranding according to law.

On June 4, 1913, the Dawson Bros. Mfg. Co., Memphis, Tenn., claimant, having admitted the allegations in the libel, it was ordered by the court that upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bond in the sum of \$500 in conformity with section 10 of the act, the product should be delivered to said claimant.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 14, 1914.*

3100. Adulteration and misbranding of spirits of turpentine. U. S. v. Consolidated Oil Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20 and costs. (F. & D. No. 5218. I. S. No. 1666-e.)

On August 1, 1913, the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Consolidated Oil Co., doing business under the name of the Southern States Turpentine Co., Cleveland, Ohio, alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about December 10, 1912, from the State of Ohio into the State of New York, of a quantity of so-called pure spirits turpentine, which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: (On the barrel) "Southern States Turpentine Co., Pure Spirits Turpentine for Technical Purposes Only U. S. A. 206 L. D. H. McIlvain, New York City. 91616-C-12-17-"

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Specific gravity at 20° C	0.8447
Refractive index at 20° C	1.4612
Color: Standard.	
Polymerization residue (per cent by volume).....	21
Refractive index of polymerization residue at 20° C.....	1.4450
Consistency of residue: Limpid.	
Color of residue: Colorless.	
Mineral oil (per cent).....	At least 21

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, but differed from the standard of strength, quality, or purity as determined by the test laid down in the said United States Pharmacopœia, official at the time of the investigation, in that it contained mineral oil and its own standard of strength, quality, or purity was not stated upon the bottle, box, or other container in which it was offered for sale.

Misbranding of the product was alleged for the reason that it was offered for sale under the name of another article, to wit, pure turpentine.

On January 14, 1914, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant concern and the court imposed a fine of \$20 and costs.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 6, 1914.*