

**8661. Misbranding of Gonosan. U. S. \* \* \* v. 12 Dozen Packages, 134 Packages, and 1½ Dozen Packages of Gonosan. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond.** (F. & D. Nos. 11366, 11367, 11368. I. S. Nos. 17058-r, 17066-r, 17068-r. S. Nos. E-1723, E-1760, E-1761.)

On October 9, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, 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 certain quantities of Gonosan, remaining in the original unbroken packages, alleging that 12 dozen packages, at San Juan, P. R., had been shipped by Riedel & Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., on or about July 10, 1919, and transported from the State of New York into the Island of Porto Rico, and that 134 packages at San Juan and 1½ dozen packages at Ponce had been offered for sale and quantities sold in the Island of Porto Rico on August 28, and September 2, 1919, respectively, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Gonosan \* \* \* Riedel & Co., New York \* \* \*."

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed it to consist essentially of oil of sandalwood.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libels for the reason that certain statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effect thereof, to wit, (circular, Spanish) "Gonosan \* \* \* the best of balsams in gonorrhoeal therapeutics \* \* \* makes the acute, scalding pains and violent erections disappear, \* \* \* likewise those manifestations which are accustomed to show themselves in acute gonorrhoea \* \* \* in those cases in which inflammation of the bladder is added to them, Gonosan rapidly calms the nerves of same and makes dysuria disappear \* \* \* stop the disease from proceeding to the posterior part of the urethra, providing dietetic prescriptions are observed \* \* \*" were false and fraudulent as the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On August 20, 1920, Riedel & Co., New York, N. Y., claimant, having consented to a decree without denying the allegations of the libel, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bonds in the aggregate sum of \$750, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

**8662. Misbranding of dairy feed. U. S. \* \* \* v. Sutherland Flour Mills Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100 and costs.** (F. & D. No. 11427. I. S. Nos. 16306-r, 18052-r.)

At the April, 1920, term of the District Court of the United States within and for the Eastern District of Illinois, the United States attorney for said district, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court aforesaid an information against the Sutherland Flour Mills Co., a corporation, Cairo, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about December 31, 1918, and April 15, 1918, from the State of Illinois into the States of Georgia and Pennsylvania, respectively, of quantities of an article, labeled in part, "Daisy Dairy Feed," which was misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the product contained 8.18 per cent of protein, 0.94 per cent of fat, and 16.51 per cent of crude fiber, and consisted mainly of ground

corn, alfalfa meal, ground screenings, and molasses. It contained no wheat bran or oat feed.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the following statements, to wit, "Made from Ground Corn, Wheat Bran, Wheat Screenings, Alfalfa Meal, Oat Feed and Molasses Guaranteed Analysis Protein 13.25 per cent, Fat 3.50 per cent, Fiber 12.50 per cent," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was compounded from the ingredients named on the tag, and that it contained not less than 13.25 per cent of protein and not less than 3.50 per cent of fat, and not more than 12.50 per cent of fiber, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was compounded from the ingredients named on the tag, and that it contained not less than 13.25 per cent of protein, not less than 3.50 per cent of fat, and not more than 12.50 per cent of fiber, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not compounded from the ingredients named on the label, but was a mixture which contained no wheat bran or oat feed, and contained less than 13.25 per cent of protein and less than 3.50 per cent of fat, and more than 12.50 per cent of fiber.

On October 7, 1920, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100 and costs.

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

**8663. Misbranding of Fisher's Indian Remedy. U. S. \* \* \* v. Anthony Fisher (Anthony Fisher Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 12327. I. S. No. 2535-r.)**

On May 1, 1920, the United States attorney for the District of Utah, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Anthony Fisher, trading as the Anthony Fisher Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about March 18, 1919, from the State of Utah into the State of Colorado, of a quantity of Fisher's Indian Remedy which was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed it to consist of uncoated compressed tablets containing aloes, emodin, strychnine, saponin-like glucoside, reducing sugars, and talcum.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the information for the reason that certain statements regarding the therapeutic and curative effects thereof, appearing on the packages and in the circular contained therein, falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a remedy, treatment, cure, and preventive for indigestion, stomach troubles, sick and nervous headache, neuralgia, kidney and liver complaints, rheumatism, pimples, blotches, boils, syphilitic affections, female weakness, hay fever, asthma, la grippe, catarrh, and all diseases which arise from an impure condition of the blood, eczema, nervousness, paralysis, insanity, diseases of the liver, failing eyesight, pains under the shoulder blades, and in the region of the kidneys, pain in the back, burning pains in the stomach, dizziness, yellow skin, melancholy, blood and liver trouble, jaundice, gall stones, fatty liver, malignant affections, piles, brain disease, malaria, chills and fever, kidney, bladder, and uric acid troubles, kidney disease, stomach ache, spine ache, backache, scalding urine, uterine catarrh, suppressed or painful periods, ovarian dropsy, painful or irregular menstruation, leucorrhoea, and for being unwell most of the time, chronic weak-