

sleep, as a treatment of value in cases of teething, and as a treatment, remedy, and cure for summer complaint, when, in truth and in fact, it was not. It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the further reason that certain statements, included in the circulars accompanying the said article, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a preventive against serious sickness, and as a treatment, remedy, and cure for stomach trouble, female weakness, ulceration of the bowels, St. Vitus' dance, suppressed menstruation, irritation and inflammation of the bladder, urethra or prostate gland, catarrh, chicken pox, cholera morbus, diarrhœa, dysentery, epilepsy, erysipelas, flux, gonorrhœa, grippe, severe colds that threaten pneumonia, hives, nervous and sick headache, humors in the blood, insomnia, leucorrhœa, measles, painful, suppressed, profuse, or scanty menstruation, mumps, nervous troubles, neuralgia, roseola, sore eyes, granulated lids, womb troubles, inflammation, ulceration, and falling of the womb, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

Analysis of a sample of the Royaline Oil by said bureau showed that it consisted essentially of camphor, sassafras, menthol, capsicum, cloves, boric acid, morphine, probably derived from tincture of opium, chloroform, alcohol, and water.

It was alleged in substance in the information that this article was misbranded for the reason that certain statements, appearing on the labels of the bottles and cartons, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for burns, sore throat, sore eyes, and colic, when, in truth and in fact, it was not. It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the further reason that certain statements, appearing in the circulars accompanying the said article, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for scalds, sore mouth, internal and external inflammation, earache, flux or dysentery, diphtheria, piles, rheumatism, colic and thumps and foot evil in stock, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On November 19, 1919, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

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

7922. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Emilio Di Bianco. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. No. 9723. I. S. Nos. 2954-p, 12577-r.)

On July 18, 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 Emilio Di Bianco, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on June 1, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of so-called olive oil which was adulterated and misbranded, and on June 3, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, of a quantity of olive oil which was misbranded. The oil shipped to Pennsylvania was labeled in part, "1 Gall. Net," and was invoiced by the shipper as olive oil. The oil shipped to Massachusetts was labeled in part, "1 Gal."

Analysis of a sample of the oil shipped to Pennsylvania by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted almost entirely of cottonseed oil, and that the contents of the cans were short in volume, the average shortage on 12 cans being 5.07 per cent. Examination of the oil shipped to Massachusetts showed an average shortage on 10 cans of 5.88 per cent.

Adulteration of the oil shipped to Pennsylvania 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 this article was alleged for the reason that it was a product 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. Misbranding of this oil and of the oil shipped to Massachusetts was alleged for the further reason that the statements, to wit, "1 Gall. Net" and "1 Gal.," as the case might be, borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it, were false and misleading in that they represented that each of the cans contained 1 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 each of said cans contained 1 gallon net of the article, when, in truth and in fact, each of said cans did not contain 1 gallon net of the article, but did contain a less amount; and for the further reason that the article 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 entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

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

7923. Misbranding of Salvitae. U. S. * * * v. The American Apothecaries Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. No. 9788. I. S. No. 17002-r.)

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 The American Apothecaries Co., a corporation, Astoria, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on May 25, 1918, from the State of New York into the Island of Porto Rico, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Salvitae," which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of citric and tartaric acids with sulphates, carbonates or bicarbonates, and phosphates of magnesium, sodium, potassium, and lithium, and a trace of hexamethylenetetramine.

It was alleged in substance in the information that the article was misbranded for the reason that certain statements, appearing on the labels of the bottles containing the article and on the wrapper around said bottles, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for gout, rheumatism, Bright's disease, Riggs' disease, stomatitis, recession of the gums, urethritis, cystitis, gravel, inflammatory affections of the urinary passages and diseases that are produced by uric acid, inactivity of the kidneys, renal or hepatic calculi or incontinence and gingivitis, as a uric acid solvent, urinary antiseptic and diuretic and intestinal antiseptic, to fortify the system against the millions of dangerous microbes, and to restore lost health and preserve one from disease, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On November 12, 1919, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

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