

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements appearing in the circular accompanying the article, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for gonorrhoea and gleet in obstinate cases where immediate results are desired, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On December 1, 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 be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**S443. Misbranding of Prescription 1000 Internal and External. U. S. \* \* \* v. 26 Bottles of Drugs Labeled in Part, "Prescription 1000 Internal" and 17 Bottles of Drugs Labeled in Part, "Prescription 1000 External." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10507. I. S. Nos. 2638-r, 2639-r. S. No. W-400.)**

On June 18, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Washington, 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 certain articles, labeled in part "Prescription 1000," at Spokane, Wash., consigned by the Reese Chemical Co., Cleveland, Ohio, alleging that the articles had been shipped on or about April 26, 1919, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Washington, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the Prescription 1000 Internal consisted essentially of an emulsion of copaiba, with methyl salicylate, and that the Prescription 1000 External consisted of a dilute solution of potassium permanganate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements appeared in the circular accompanying, on the cartons enclosing, and on the bottles containing the articles, regarding their curative or therapeutic effects as a remedy for gleet, gonorrhoea, bladder troubles, frequent urination and inflammation, which statements were false and fraudulent in that the drugs did not contain any ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of curing the diseases named.

On September 25, 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 be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**S444. Misbranding of Big G. U. S. \* \* \* v. 101 Bottles of a Drug Labeled in Part, "Big G, a Non-poisonous Tonic Antiseptic Prepared by Evans Chemical Company, Cincinnati, Ohio." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10512. S. No. W-401.)**

On June 18, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Washington, 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 "Big G," at Spokane, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 23, 1918, by the Evans Chemical Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Washington, 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 an aqueous solution of borax and berberine.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel, in that certain statements in the booklets accompanying, on the cartons enclosing, and on the bottles containing the article, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be a non-poisonous tonic, and to be effective as a remedy for unnatural discharges of the urinary organs, catarrh, hay fever, and inflamed, ulcerated, itching conditions of the skin and mucous membrane or linings of the mouth, nose, throat, eye, and ear, gastritis, hemorrhoids, gonorrhoea, gleet, balanitis, bubo, inflammation and swelling of a lymphatic gland of the groin, leucorrhoea, whites, and catarrh of the vagina, whereas it was not effective.

On September 25, 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 be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**8445. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. \* \* \* v. 72 Cans of Olive Oil. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered sold.** (F. & D. No. 10555. I. S. No. 15006-r. S. No. E-1491.)

On June 12, 1919, the United States attorney for the Middle 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 72 cans of olive oil, at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 22, 1919, by the Venice Importing Co., New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Representative samples of the article, consisting of 22 cans, examined by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed a shortage in quantity of the contents of 5.41 per cent.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel in that the statement on the label of the can, regarding its contents, to wit, "One Quart," was false and misleading in that it represented that the contents of the cans were 1 quart, whereas they were less than 1 quart. Further misbranding was alleged in that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents of the said package was not correctly stated on the package.

On January 19, 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 sold by the United States marshal.

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

**8446. Misbranding of Short Stop products. U. S. \* \* \* v. 2 Dozen, More or Less, Bottles of a Drug Labeled "Short Stop Injection, First Stage," 2 Dozen, More or Less, Bottles of a Drug Labeled "Short Stop Injection, Second Stage," and 3 Dozen Bottles, More or Less, of a Drug Labeled "Short Stop Capsules." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction.** (F. & D. No. 10839. I. S. Nos. 7791-r, 7792-r, 7793-r. S. No. C-1367.)

On July 15, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern 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 certain products, labeled "Short Stop," at Cincinnati, Ohio, consigned on or about June 14, 1917, and December 7, 1918, by the Massmann Chemical Co., Covington, Ky., alleging that the article had been