

lines of prevention: that is Kill The Worm While It Is Small \* \* \* Is intended to keep your animals From Getting Sick. \* \* \* to Destroy The Worm As Soon As It Is Hatched." It was further alleged in substance in the libel that the product was also misbranded in violation of the general paragraph of section 8 of the said act, in that the label stated that sulphate of iron, quassia, American wormseed (*Chenopodium*), and Levant wormseed (*santonica*) were present, whereas the analysis of the product showed them to be absent.

On January 11, 1924, the Union Pacific Railroad Co. having interposed a claim for the property based on a lien by said claimant, decree of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be sold or destroyed by the United States marshal, pursuant to law, and that any funds resulting from the sale be applied, first, to the payment of the costs of the proceedings, second, to the discharge of the claim of the said Union Pacific Railroad Co., and third, that the balance be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12064. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. Joseph Gloster Velvin. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 17808. I. S. No. 5929-v.)**

On December 13, 1923, the United States attorney for the Eastern 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 Joseph Gloster Velvin, Swink, Okla., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about June 25, 1923, from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Texas, of a quantity of shell eggs which were adulterated. The article was labeled in part: "From J. G. Velvin Swink Okla."

Examination by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of the 360 eggs in the consignment showed that 145, or 40 per cent of those examined, were inedible eggs, consisting of black rots, mixed or white rots, spot rots, blood rings, and enlarged embryos.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy and decomposed and putrid animal substance.

On January 19, 1924, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**12065. Adulteration and misbranding of soluble saccharin. U. S. v. 2 Boxes of Alleged Saccharin. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11245. I. S. No. 7106-r. S. No. C-1464.)**

On October 1, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 2 boxes, 5 pounds each, of alleged saccharin, at Dallas, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Sethness Co., from Chicago, Ill., on or about July 30, 1918, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Texas, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Cosco Guaranteed Under The Food And Drugs Act \* \* \* Sethness Company Chicago, U. S. A. Est. 1884 Cosco Brand Soluble Saccharine."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized by the United States Pharmacopœia and National Formulary, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia and Formulary, official at the date of investigation. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the strength and purity of the article fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the label, "Guaranteed Under The Food And Drugs Act. \* \* \* Soluble Saccharine," was false, untrue, and misleading in that the said statement represented that the article was soluble saccharin and was guaranteed under the terms of the Food and Drugs Act, whereas it was not soluble saccharin as defined by the tests laid down in the United States Pharmacopœia and Formulary, and the strength and purity of the said article fell below the professed standard and quality of soluble saccharin. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article