

**SS71. Misbranding of Brou's Injection. U. S. \* \* \* v. 6½ Dozen Bottles of Brou's Injection. Default decree entered ordering destruction of product.** (F. & D. No. 10616. I. S. No. 16510-r. S. No. E-1544.)

On or about June 19, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Florida, 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 6½ dozen bottles of Brou's Injection, at Jacksonville, Fla., consigned by E. Fougera & Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 5, 1917, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Florida, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Brou's Injection E. Fougera & Co., New York."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of acetates and sulphates of zinc and lead, small amounts of opium and alcohol, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the label upon the bottles and in the booklet accompanying the bottles contained the following statements, regarding the curative and therapeutic effect thereof, to wit, "Hygienic and Preservative Brou's Injection \* \* \* (French) Against runnings or discharges 'Les Ecoulemens' recent or chronic and against 'White Flowers' Leucorrhœa, Blennorrhagia \* \* \* Blennorrhœa \* \* \* White Losses \* \* \* strictures, injections prevent them by curing their usual causes that is to say prolonged inflammation of the mucous membranes and its extension to underlying tissues \* \* \* Brou's Injection is not solely tonic and astringent but also isolating which explains its success in the treatment of blennorrhœa \* \* \* Brou's Injection, Hygienic and Preservative For the cure of all recent and chronic discharges of the urinary organs (Gonorrhœa, Leucorrhœa and Gleet) \* \* \* used as a preservative After intercourse with a suspected person use the injection \* \* \*," which were false, fraudulent, and misleading in that the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effect claimed.

On January 6, 1921, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment was entered by the court ordering that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

**SS72. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed cake. U. S. \* \* \* v. Lee County Cotton Oil Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs.** (F. & D. No. 10881. I. S. Nos. 5927-r, 10865-r.)

On January 27, 1920, the United States attorney for the Western District of Texas, 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 Lee County Cotton Oil Co., a corporation, Giddings, Tex., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Texas into the State of Kansas, on or about October 29, 1918, of a quantity of cottonseed cake which was misbranded, and on or about November 16, 1918, of a quantity of cottonseed cake which was adulterated and misbranded. The consignment of October 29, 1918, was labeled in part, "Protein not less than 41 per cent." The consignment of November 16, 1918, was invoiced as "41 per cent Cotton Seed Cake."

Analysis of a sample taken from each shipment of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained 37 per cent and 39.15 per cent, respectively, of protein.