

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,