

ing on the label on the bottle containing, and on the shipping case enclosing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for kidney, stomach, and intestinal disorders and that the water was actively diuretic, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective for the purposes claimed. Misbranding of the article was alleged further in that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents of the package was not plainly or conspicuously marked on the outside thereof in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count.

On April 29, 1920, the defendant entered a plea of *nolo contendere* to count 1, count 2 was dismissed on motion of the United States attorney, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

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

**7972. Misbranding of Gold Medal Haarlem Oil Capsules. U. S. \* \* \* v. H. R. Lathrop & Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$300. (F. & D. No. 10898. I. S. Nos. 14954-r, 14971-r, 14972-r.)**

On October 15, 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 H. R. Lathrop & Co., a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging the shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on February 19, 1919, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, of quantities of an article, labeled in part "Gold Medal Haarlem Oil Capsules," which was misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of capsules containing essentially oil of turpentine, a mixture of fixed oils, and combined sulphur.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the information in that certain statements, designs, and devices regarding the therapeutic and curative effects of the article, appearing on the labels of the cartons and in the booklets accompanying the packages, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was effective, among other things, as a treatment, remedy, and cure for kidney, liver, bladder, rheumatic and uric acid troubles, for kidney complaint, highly colored urine, brick-dust therein, uric acid, calculi, gravel, stone in bladder, impure blood, rheumatism, backache, catarrh of the bladder and bowels, ulceration of the bladder, pain in the joints and hips, chronic and other diseases of the kidneys, and any diseases of the kidneys and urinary tracts, loss of flesh, liver complaints, distress after eating, dyspepsia, stomach disorders including weak stomach, constipation, nausea, and vomiting, female disorders, and to control female disorders and avert their consequences, when, in truth and in fact, said article was not effective for the purposes named.

On November 5, 1919, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$300.

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

**7973. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. \* \* \* v. 6 Cases of Shell Eggs. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10899. I. S. No. 8427-r. S. No. C-1386.)**

On July 16, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, 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 6 cases of shell eggs, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about

July 14, 1919, by the Brookland Feed Co., Brookland, Ark., and transported from the State of Arkansas into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel in that the article consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On May 1, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**7974. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. \* \* \* v. 7 Cases of Shell Eggs. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale.** (F. & D. No. 10900. I. S. No. 9448-r. S. No. C-1378.)

On July 11, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, 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 7 cases of shell eggs, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 9, 1919, by Hatchett Bros., Clinton, Ark., and transported from the State of Arkansas into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On May 1, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**7975. Misbranding of Allan's Compound of Sarsaparilla and Yellow Dock. U. S. \* \* \* v. 36 Bottles, More or Less, of Allan's Compound of Sarsaparilla and Yellow Dock. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 10905. I. S. No. 8844-r. S. No. C-1395.)

On August 7, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Illinois, 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 36 bottles, more or less, of Allan's Compound of Sarsaparilla and Yellow Dock, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at East St. Louis, Ill., consigned by the Allan-Pfeiffer Chemical Co., St. Louis, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about May 29, 1919, from St. Louis, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Illinois, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of a solution containing potassium iodid, sugar, plant extractives including those of a laxative plant drug, alcohol, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel in that certain statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, appearing on the labels on the carton enclosing, and on the label of the bottle containing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for scrofulous and cancerous affections, ulcers, cancers, pimples, boils, tetter, blotches, salt rheum, rheumatism, syphilitic mercurial diseases, as a