

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the tablets consisted of salicylic acid, milk sugar, starch and talc, and that they contained no acetylsalicylic acid or aspirin.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel in that the product fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in that the statement on the label on the package containing the article, to wit, "Acetylsalicylic Acid Tablets," was false and misleading.

On May 20, 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.*

**S062. Adulteration and misbranding of aspirin. U. S. \* \* \* v. 9 Packages, Each Containing 1,000 5-Grain So-Called Acetylsalicylic Acid Tablets. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9615. I. S. No. 13337-r. S. No. E-1206.)**

On January 17, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, 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 "Acetylsalicylic Acid Tablets 'Aspirin,'" remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Blairsville, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about December 7, 1918, by the Verandah Chemical Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the tablets contained no acetylsalicylic acid, but consisted essentially of salicylic acid, starch, sugar, and talc.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in that the statement on the label on the package containing the article, regarding the article, to wit, "Acetylsalicylic Acid Tablets," was false and misleading in that the tablets contained no acetylsalicylic acid, but consisted essentially of salicylic acid, talc, sugar, and starch. Further misbranding was alleged in that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the name of another article, to wit, acetylsalicylic acid.

On June 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.*

**S063. Adulteration and misbranding of tankage. U. S. \* \* \* v. Pittsburgh Provision & Packing Co., a Corporation. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. No. 9653. I. S. No. 15610-p.)**

On January 28, 1920, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, 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 Pittsburgh Provision & Packing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on April 4, 1918, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Ohio, of a quantity of tankage which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part, "100 Lbs. Digestible Tankage Meat & Bone Analysis Protein 32.25% \* \* \* Pittsburgh Provision and Packing Co. Pittsburgh, Pa."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was low in protein and that it contained a large amount of salt and glass.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information in that a substance, to wit, salt, had been mixed and packed with the article so as to lower, reduce, and injuriously affect its quality and strength. Further adulteration was alleged in that a substance, to wit, salt, had been substituted in part for digestible tankage, meat, and bone, which the article purported to be. Further adulteration was alleged in that the article contained an added deleterious ingredient, to wit, glass, which might render the article injurious to health.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in that the statements on the label of each sack containing the article, regarding the article, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article consisted wholly of tankage, meat, and bone, and contained not less than 32.25 per cent of protein, whereas, in truth and in fact, the article did not consist wholly of tankage, meat, and bone, but was a mixture which consisted in large part of salt, and did contain less than 32.25 per cent protein, to wit, approximately 24.3 per cent of protein. Further misbranding was alleged in that the article was so labeled as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the article consisted wholly of tankage, meat, and bone, and contained not less than 32.25 per cent of protein, whereas, in truth and in fact, the article did not consist wholly of tankage, meat, and bone, but contained a large part of salt, and contained less than 32.25 per cent of protein, to wit, approximately 24.3 per cent of protein.

On February 26, 1920, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

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

**8064. Misbranding of cottonseed product. U. S. \* \* \* v. Mangum Cotton Oil Mill Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 9659. I. S. No. 20331-m.)**

On July 3, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma, 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 Mangum Cotton Oil Mill Co., Mangum, Okla., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about February 2, 1917, from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Kansas, of a certain quantity of an article labeled in part "Cottonseed Cake or Meal \* \* \* 100 Pounds Gross or 99 Pounds Net," which was misbranded.

Examination of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the average gross weight of 43 sacks was 94.5 pounds.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information in that the statement on the tag on the sacks containing the article, regarding the article, to wit, "100 Pounds Gross or 99 Pounds Net," was false and misleading in that it represented that each sack contained 99 pounds of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, each sack did not contain 99 pounds of the article, but a less amount. Misbranding was alleged further in that the article was so labeled as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that the sacks contained 99 pounds net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, they contained less. Further misbranding was alleged in 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 August 4, 1919, the defendant pleaded guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100 and costs.

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