

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of santal oil.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that the statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effect of the article, appearing on the carton enclosing, in the circular accompanying, and on the label on the bottle containing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective in the treatment of gonorrhoea and inflammation of mucous membranes, especially of the urinary tract, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On May 25, 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.*

8048. Adulteration of raisins. U. S. * * * v. 1,128 Boxes, More or Less, of Raisins. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond. (F. & D. No. 11512. I. S. No. 8389-r. S. No. C-1591.)

On or about November 12, 1919, 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 a libel for the seizure and condemnation of a certain quantity of a certain article, labeled in part "Raisins," alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 15, 1919, by the California Raisin Co., Parlier, Calif., and transported from the State of California into the State of Ohio, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel in that sand had been mixed and packed with the article so as to lower, reduce, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and in that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On December 15, 1919, the Youngstown Macaroni Co., claimant, having consented to the entry of the decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be delivered to the claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceeding and the filing of a bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

8049. Misbranding of G. S. Remedy. U. S. * * * v. 27 Bottles, More or Less, of an Article of Drugs Labeled in Part "G. S. Remedy." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11547. I. S. No. 9077-r. S. No. C-1614.)

On or about January 2, 1920, 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 27 bottles of a certain article, labeled in part "G. S. Remedy," at Cairo, Ill., consigned by L. M. Gross, Little Rock, Ark., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 2, 1919, and transported from the State of Arkansas 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 of a solution containing unidentified vegetable extractives and small amounts of potassium iodid and alcohol.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, appearing

on the cartons enclosing, in the circular accompanying, and on the labels on the bottles containing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy in case of pellagra, rheumatism, lumbago, sciatica, neuralgia, scrofula, eczema, indigestion, dyspepsia, biliousness, constipation, malaria, chills and fever, nervousness, stomach, liver, kidney, and bladder diseases, syphilis, and all diseases arising from impure blood or diseases of the liver or kidneys, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On January 21, 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.*

**8050. Adulteration and misbranding of so-called sugar corn. U. S. * * *
v. 400 Cases and 715 Cases of So-Called Sugar Corn. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered sold.
(F. & D. Nos. 10423, 10424. I. S. Nos. 7657-r, 7658-r. S. No. C-1238.)**

On May 24, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 400 cases and 715 cases of so-called sugar corn, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Parsons, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 5, 1918, by W. E. Robinson & Co., Clarksville, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Kansas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled in part, "Purest Brand Extra Fine Sugar Corn Packed by A. A. Linton, Clarksville, Ohio," or "Good Health Brand Sugar Corn Packed by A. A. Linton, Clarksville, Ohio."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that field corn had been substituted in whole or in part for sugar corn, which product it purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements on the labels of the article were false and misleading, and were calculated to deceive and mislead the purchaser into believing that the product was pure sugar corn, when, in truth and in fact, it was field corn.

On November 10, 1919, the cases having come on for disposition, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be sold by the United States marshal, and that the purchaser execute good and sufficient bonds in the aggregate sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that the product should not be disposed of in violation of law, State or Federal.

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