

and effective as a treatment for delicate women and the diseases peculiar to their sex; and effective to restore strength, renew vitality, and build up the functional structure of delicate women, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On March 5, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6954. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. S. F. Zaloom & Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 9450. I. S. No. 2684-p.)

On July 17, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against S. F. Zaloom & Co., a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about February 20, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "De Angelo Brand Lucca Olive Oil," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Examination of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Average net contents of 10 cans-----	1 pint 14.57 fluid ounces.
Average shortage (fluid ounces)-----	1.43
Average shortage (per cent)-----	4.46
Test for cottonseed oil: Strongly positive.	

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Olio D'Oliva De Angelo Brand," "Lucca Olive Oil Product of Italy," and "1/4 Gall. Net Contents," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the kingdom of Italy, that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not pure olive oil, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and was not a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the kingdom of Italy, but was a domestic product, to wit, a product produced in the United States of America, and each of said cans did not contain $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, but contained a less amount; and for the further reason that it was falsely branded as to the country in which it was manufactured and produced in that it was a product manufactured and produced in whole or in part in the United States of America, and was branded as manufactured and produced in the kingdom of Italy; and for the further reason that it was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil prepared in imitation of olive oil, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, olive oil; and for the further reason that the statements borne on the cans purported that the article was a foreign product, when not so. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason

that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On July 30, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6955. Misbranding of A Texas Wonder Hall's Great Discovery. U. S. * * * v. 75 Bottles of A Texas Wonder Hall's Great Discovery. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9451. I. S. No. 5989-r. S. No. C-1007.)

On November 16, 1918, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Alabama, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 75 bottles of A Texas Wonder Hall's Great Discovery, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Montgomery, Ala., alleging that the product had been shipped on or about September 17, 1918, by E. W. Hall, St. Louis, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Alabama, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (On carton) "A Texas Wonder. Hall's Great Discovery for Kidney and Bladder Troubles, Diabetes, Weak and Lane Backs, Rheumatism. Dissolves Gravel, Regulates Bladder Trouble in Children. One small bottle is two months' treatment." (On circular) "Louis A. Portner * * * testified he began using The Texas Wonder for stone in the kidneys * * * and tuberculosis of the kidneys * * *. He was still using the medicine with wonderful results and his weight had increased."

Examination of a previous sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed it to consist essentially of oleoresin of copaiba, rhubarb, turpentine, guaiac, and alcohol.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance for the reason that the above-quoted statements, borne on the cartons and circulars, were false and fraudulent in that the product contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the therapeutic effects claimed for it on the carton and circular.

On March 26, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6956. Adulteration and misbranding of tomatoes. U. S. * * * v. 704 Cases of Canned Tomatoes. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 9452. I. S. No. 17607-r. S. No. E-1154.)

On November 13, 1918, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 704 cases of canned tomatoes, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Augusta, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 24, 1918, by the Sunbright Canning Co., Dickson, Tenn., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Georgia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Helmet Tomatoes."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that added water had been mixed and packed therewith, so as to reduce, lower,