

4842. Misbranding of Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy. U. S. v. Abbott Bros. Co., a corporation. Tried to the court and a jury. Verdict of guilty. Fine, \$200 and costs. (F. & D. No. 6190. I. S. No. 7945-e.)

On November 4, 1915, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, 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 Abbott Bros. Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about January 31, 1913, from the State of Illinois into the State of Ohio, of a quantity of "Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy," which was misbranded. The article was labeled: (On carton) "New Style Package, Dec. 1912. Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy Contains 24% Pure Grain Alcohol To Preserve Its Vegetable Ingredients. For Rheumatism of every form and stage, including Inflammatory, Muscular, Articular, Sciatica, Gout, Lumbago, Acute, Chronic, etc., Constipation, Inactive or Torpid Liver, Kidney and Bladder Troubles, Backache, Shifting Pains, Sharp-Shooting or Dull Aches and Pains in any part of the body, Swellings, Inflammation, Soreness and Stiffness in the Joints and Muscles, Uric Acid and all deep-seated Blood Disorders Inherited or Contracted, Scrofula, Eczema, and for improving the general health. Price One Dollar Contains no Opiates or Narcotics Guaranteed by Abbott Bros. Co., under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906. Serial No. 441. Manufactured Only by Abbott Bros. Company 711 South Dearborn Street Chicago, Ill., U. S. A." (On back of carton) "Abbott Brothers' Rheumatic Remedy The New One Dollar Size Adopted March 1st, 1902. Established 1888. Put up only by Abbott Bros. Co., Chicago, Ill." (On sides of carton) "Symptoms of Rheumatism. Shifting pains, tenderness, stiffness, soreness and inflammation of the muscles. Pain increased by bringing muscles into action. Inflammation of the fibrous tissues and distress in the region of the heart. Joints swollen, stiff, painful, feverish and sore to the touch. Lacerating sciatic pains in thighs and legs. Intense burning or gnawing pain in joints. Pains and aches in the bones. Soreness and sharp pains in the back, sharp shooting or piercing pains in different parts of the body. Numbness and needle-like pricking sensation. Pains in the kidneys and bladder. Pain and stiffness in neck and shoulders. In acute rheumatism the fever is more pronounced. For all forms of rheumatism and all Uric Acid Diathesis, former sufferers scattered all over the country recommend Abbott Brothers' Rheumatic Remedy. A guarantee. We positively guarantee that Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy Does not contain any Salicylic Acid, Mercury, Morphine, Opium, Heroin, Cocaine, Alpha or Beta Eucaine, Chloroform, Cannabis Indica, Chloral Hydrate or Acetanilide or any derivative or preparation of any such substance contained therein. Abbott Bros. Co. Chicago, Ill. Abbott Brothers' Rheumatic Remedy." (On top flap) "Guaranteed by Abbott Bros. Co., under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906. Serial Number 441 Abbott Bros. Co., Chicago, Ill." (On bottle) "New Label Adopted April 25th, 1911. Abbott Brothers Rheumatic Remedy Contains 24 Per Cent Alcohol To Dissolve and Preserve Ingredients For all Uric Acid Troubles, Eczema, Kidney and Bladder Disorders, Backache, Stiff and Inflamed Joints, Aching Muscles, Bone Pains, Neuralgia, Gout, Sciatica, Lumbago, Inflammatory, Muscular, Articular, Acute, Chronic and all other forms of Rheumatism. Shake Bottle Before Using Dose: For Adults: One small teaspoonful in glass of water either one half hour before meals or three hours after each meal. If it acts too freely on the bowels, reduce dose one-half. Drink at least three glasses of water between meals. For Children: From 5 drops to one-half teaspoonful, according to age. It is very important that bowels move freely three times or at least twice, daily. If a laxative is needed take Smead's Regulator Tablets. For weak stomach, indigestion, etc., take Smead's Dyspepsia Tablets. See page

30 of book wrapped around bottle. Guaranteed by Abbott Bros. Co., under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906 Serial No. 441. Price \$1.00 Six Bottles \$5.00 None genuine without this signature Abbott Bros. Prepared Only by Abbott Bros. Company 711 So. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill., U. S. A." (Blown in bottle) "Rheumatic Remedy Abbott Bros. Abbott Bros. Chicago Rheumatic Remedy Est. 1888." The booklet accompanying the article contained, among other things, the following: "Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy Guaranteed to contain no opiates Guaranteed by Abbott Bros. Co. Under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906. Serial Number 441 For Rheumatism, Gout, Neuralgia, Sciatica, Lumbago, Backache, Kidney and Liver Troubles, Shifting Pains and all Manifestations of Uric Acid Diathesis, Eczema, Etc. Designed to give prompt relief and restore health. Abbott Bros. Co. 711 S. Dearborn St. Chicago, Ill." "Cured of Sciatica Six Years Ago. Mr. Herman C. Beckman, who is connected with the DeLaval Separator Company, Canal and Randolph streets, Chicago, residence Berwyn, Ill., writes: 'Having been cured of rheumatism from which I suffered severely I desire to assist as much as possible in the relief of others. I therefore take pleasure in recommending Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy which cured me of Sciatica six years ago.'" "Mr. Arthur Peterson, 1422 Concord St., Keokuk, Ia., writes: 'I have been to Hot Springs twice on account of gonorrhoeal rheumatism. I was helped for a little while when there, but soon after leaving the springs the trouble would come right back on me again. I had the rheumatism four years and had to have a stick to help me along. A friend of mine who had also taken the baths at the Government Bath House told me Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy had cured him in fourteen days. I would not buy it because I had taken so much treatment that I did not think there was anything in this world that could help me. When my friend saw that I would not buy Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy, he bought a bottle for me. I was then laid up in bed, but after I had taken half of the bottle I got out of bed and could walk as well as ever. Hot Springs could not cure me, but Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy did it for me. I am well known here and our people know I could not walk without a stick. After I got cured they all wanted to know what in the world cured me.'" "Death of Child Averted. Mrs. W. S. Edwards, 1122 North Twenty-first St., Birmingham, Ala., writes: 'If my friends could not testify to what I say regarding my child's case, I would not dare say it, because I could not expect anybody to believe it. My daughter Mattie, when a little miss 13 years of age, was down with acute inflammatory rheumatism for four months. I hope I may never again see anyone suffer as she did. You could hear her scream a block. She was in a drawn position and was not able to move or straighten. I dared not raise her head off her pillow on account of heart failure. Her doctor said she was liable to pass away at any moment. She was bedfast four months and I believe she would have died but for Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy. At the time I began this treatment I hesitated, as her heart was so affected I was afraid to take the heart stimulants from her. She was so weak I only gave her four drops to the dose. It acted on her kidneys and liver as nothing had ever done before. In three days she wanted to sit up in bed, began to eat and then improved every day. She had not taken all of two bottles of Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy when she was entirely cured. She is now 18 years of age, weighs 127 pounds, and is in fine health.'" "Mr. Chas. E. Piper, Supreme Scribe of the Royal League, whose offices are in the Masonic Temple, Chicago, residence at Berwyn, Ill., writes: It gives me great pleasure to inform you that your Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy has cured my wife's mother, Mrs. Gregory, of Rheumatoid Arthritis. She had been a great sufferer for many years and her hands seemed hopelessly crippled. Her finger joints were stiff, badly swollen, and her fingers were drawn

shapeless. She had great difficulty in using her hands and there seemed no hope of her ever regaining their usefulness. Your Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy had been very highly recommended to me several times and upon my request mother finally decided to try it. A few bottles of it relieved her pain, but she took about six or seven bottles before much improvement was noticeable in her joints. They improved gradually and we were delighted with such favorable results. At the end of four months she had entirely recovered. She rejoices over the regaining the use of her hands and never tires of praising your Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy. The cost of Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy is small and the time required to take it is short. There are many instances in which \$5.00 spent for six bottles was the total cost of lasting relief." "Twelve Years of Suffering Ended. Mr. W. A. Lewis, of the Terre Haute (Ind.) Fire Department, Fourth and Locust Sts., writes: I was as helpless as an infant when my wife got Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy for me. My limbs were frightfully swollen and I was suffering more than tongue can tell with inflammatory rheumatism. I had been on my back almost four months and had been afflicted with the disease twelve years. The doctor couldn't ease the pains for one minute. He kept my limbs wrapped with cotton and soaked it with liniment, but even that didn't do me any good. I don't believe I could have recovered from the attack had it not been for Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy. It eased the pains like magic, cured my rheumatism, and that was the end of it. I have been a well man for the past ten years. This proves that Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy drove the rheumatism out of my system, root and branch. It has also cured a great many others here, including my sister. She had been helpless a long time, and her limbs were drawn out of shape by the terrible disease." "Mr. H. L. Strenning, 5535 Gladys Ave., Chicago, Ill., writes: I was afflicted with rheumatism and a serious kidney trouble. The rheumatism started with occasional pains in my shoulders and back. It gradually spread all over my body, and then my kidneys got in bad shape. I tried many kidney medicines and doctor after doctor, but got worse. I suffered nameless torture for ten years and was told my case was hopelessly incurable. I became almost helpless, and when my doctor said I had Bright's Disease and couldn't be cured, I gave up in despair. Finally a friend told me about Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy and got me to try it. It soon eased the horrible pain and helped my kidneys wonderfully. Now my kidneys are in fine condition and my rheumatism is gone. Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy did the work. I am a living advertisement for this godsend to suffering humanity. I would advise every man, woman and child to take Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy if they want to be cured of rheumatism or kidney misery."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Alcohol (per cent)----- 23.2

Potassium iodid (grains per fluid dram)----- 5.0

Essentially a hydroalcoholic solution of potassium iodid and extracts of drugs such as sarsaparilla and taraxacum.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the following statements regarding the therapeutic or curative effects thereof appearing on the label aforesaid, to wit (on carton), "Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy * * * For Rheumatism of every form and Stage, including Inflammatory, * * * Sciatica * * * Acute, * * * and all Uric Acid Diathesis." (On label) "Abbott Brothers Rheumatic Remedy * * * for all Uric Acid Troubles * * * Eczema, * * * Sciatica, * * * Inflammatory, * * * Acute, * * * and all other forms of Rheumatism,"

and included in the booklet aforesaid, to wit, "Abbott Bros. Rheumatic Remedy * * * For * * * all manifestations of Uric Acid Diathesis * * *. Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy * * * cured me of Sciatica * * * gonorrheal rheumatism * * * Hot Springs could not cure me, but Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy did it for me. * * * Death of Child averted. * * * acute inflammatory rheumatism * * * I believe she would have died but for Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy. * * * she was entirely cured. * * * Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy * * * cured * * * Rheumatoid Arthritis. * * * Inflammatory rheumatism * * * Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy. It eased the pains like magic, cured my rheumatism, and that was the end of it. * * * Doctor said I had Bright's Disease and couldn't be cured, * * * Abbott Bros.' Rheumatic Remedy * * * soon eased the horrible pain and helped my kidneys wonderfully. Now my kidneys are in fine condition * * *," were false and fraudulent in that the same were applied to the article knowingly and in reckless and wanton disregard of their truth or falsity, so as to represent falsely and fraudulently to the purchasers thereof and create in the minds of purchasers thereof the impression and belief that it was, in whole or in part, composed of or contained ingredients or medicinal agents effective, among other things, as a remedy for rheumatism of every form and stage, for inflammatory rheumatism, for sciatica, for acute rheumatism, for all uric-acid diathesis, for all uric-acid troubles, and for eczema, and as a cure for sciatica, gonorrheal rheumatism, acute inflammatory rheumatism, rheumatoid arthritis, inflammatory rheumatism, and Bright's disease, when, in truth and in fact, it was not, in whole or in part, composed of and did not contain such ingredients or medicinal agents.

On March 1, 1916, the case having come on for trial before the court and a jury, after the submission of evidence and arguments by counsel, the following charge was delivered to the jury on March 4, 1916, by the court (Anderson, D. J.):

Gentlemen of the jury, this is a criminal case, and in this case you are the judges of the evidence, the weight of the evidence, and the credibility of the witnesses. It is your exclusive province to determine what the facts are, but you are bound by the law as it is given to you by the court. During the course of the trial defendants' counsel objected to some statements made by the court in colloquy between court and counsel, or in ruling upon some evidence as to questions of fact. You will understand, gentlemen of the jury, that you are not bound by any statement that the court may make as to the facts in this case, but, as I have stated, you are the exclusive judges of the facts. If in the course of these instructions the court should make any statement of fact, that statement is not made, will not be made for the purpose of binding your judgments, controlling your minds, but only for the purpose of assisting and aiding you in coming to a correct conclusion upon the facts.

Now, Congress has forbidden the transportation of drugs in interstate commerce which are misbranded, and it is defined in the law which prohibits transportation, what that misbranding shall consist in. If a person transports in interstate commerce an article which is misbranded, as I shall define to you, the law says he or, in this case it, the defendant in this case being a corporation, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be fined not to exceed \$200. Now, this statute says that it shall be an offense, a misdemeanor, to ship in interstate commerce any drug which is misbranded, it says for the purpose of this act an article shall be deemed to be misbranded in case of drugs if its package or label shall bear or contain any statement, design, or device regarding the curative or therapeutic effect of such article or any of the ingredients or substances contained therein, which is false and fraudulent. The word "therapeutic" means specifically the same as the word "curative." "Therapeutic" means pertaining to the healing or curative therein. You will understand it best in determining the questions here, the word "therapeutic" practically means the same as "curative." This statement, as you will see in order to subject the defendant to a successful prosecution, should be false and fraudulent. The false statement needs no definition. A false statement is a statement

which is not true. A fraudulent statement is a statement which is not true and which is made for the purpose of misleading some one—made for the purpose of gaining some advantage. Now, in this case the charge is made by an information by the district attorney; it is in one count. It charges that the defendant, a corporation, did on a certain day in November, 1913, I believe—January, 1913—the defendant shipped in interstate commerce 12 dozen, I believe it was, of bottles of a certain article, describing it. It sets forth that on the label and within the package in which this article was packed there were certain statements made with regard to the curative and therapeutic effects of this so-called medicine. It is not necessary for me to read to you this information, as you will be allowed to take it with you to the jury room and can read it there, nor is it necessary for me now to read over to you the statements which are relied upon by the Government to make up this case—they are contained in the information and are upon the cartons and the bottle, which will go out with you if you desire, and you can then see just what they are.

Now, this information proceeds after setting out the fact that this shipment was made and that the carton and bottle, or the package contained in it, and the bottle contained on it certain labels, certain statements in the label and in the package avers that these statements were false and misleading, in this false and fraudulent in this that the same were applied to said article knowingly and in reckless and in wanton disregard of truth or falsity so as to represent falsely and fraudulently to the purchasers thereof and create in the minds of purchasers thereof an impression and belief that it was in whole or in part composed of or contained ingredients or medicinal agents effective among other things as a remedy for rheumatism of every form and stage, and effective as a remedy for inflammatory rheumatism and effective as a remedy for sciatica, and effective as a remedy for acute rheumatism, and effective as a remedy for all uric-acid diathesis, and effective as a remedy for all uric-acid troubles, and effective as a remedy for eczema, when, in truth and in fact, said article was not, in whole or in part, composed of, and did not contain, ingredients or medicinal agents effective, among other things, as a remedy for rheumatism of every form or stage; or effective as a remedy for inflammatory rheumatism; or effective as a remedy for sciatica; or effective as a remedy for acute rheumatism; or effective as a remedy for all uric-acid diathesis; or effective as a remedy for all uric-acid troubles; or effective as a remedy for eczema.

Now, to these things there has been entered a plea of not guilty, and that makes the issue which you are to try; and upon that issue before the Government can ask a verdict at your hands it must establish all the material averments of the information beyond all reasonable doubt. There has been filed in this case a stipulation which relieves you of determining some of the facts put in issue by this plea. It has been admitted here before you that the shipment was made as averred of the articles as averred in interstate commerce at the time and in the place averred in the information so that with that stipulation in the record it leaves for you to determine simply these two questions:

1. Was there any statement within this package, or upon the label attached to this article, which was false; and

2. Was that statement, was such statement, if false, fraudulent?

If you find that the statement was false and fraudulent both, then your verdict should, of course, be guilty. If you should find that the statement was not false, then you need go no further, because it must be false and fraudulent. If you determine that the statement or any statement within this package or on this label is false, then you will proceed to consider whether or not it was fraudulent.

Now, you will notice that the statute does not require or provide that in order to make a defendant amenable to its provisions that every statement made in the label or in its packing, that its package or on the label shall be false or fraudulent, if its package or label shall bear or contain any statement regarding the curative or therapeutic effect of such article or any of the ingredients or substances contained therein, which is false and fraudulent, it shall be misbranded within the meaning of this act.

So you will proceed to determine, gentlemen of the jury, first, whether or not the statements which are on the label and contained in the packages which were shipped, as the stipulation shows, were false, and if you determine that they were false, then you will proceed to determine whether they were fraudulently named; that is, made for the purpose of gaining some advantage, monetary or otherwise—in this case, of course, money.

In a criminal case a defendant is presumed to be innocent until he is proven guilty beyond all reasonable doubt, and this presumption of innocence remains with him throughout the trial; with it throughout the trial in this case, and before the Government can ask the jury to return a verdict of guilty, it must remove that reasonable doubt and overcome that presumption of innocence by proof beyond a reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt, gentlemen of the jury, is what the term implies. It means a doubt for which a reason can be given. It is not a speculative or captious doubt, it is not a doubt conjured up by your own ingenuity or by the ingenuity of counsel, but it is a reasonable, substantial misgiving generated by the evidence or the want of it. As I have said, you are the judges of the evidence, the weight of the evidence, and the credibility of the witnesses. In determining what weight you shall give to the testimony of any witness you should take into consideration his manner, bearing upon the witness stand, his knowledge or want of knowledge of the things about which he testifies, his intelligence or his want of intelligence, and his interest or his want of interest in the result of the suit. Many of the witnesses who have testified here are what are known in law as expert witnesses—because all men can not know about all things, and because some men by studied examination learn about things which the average man does not know, it is permissible for persons who are schooled in certain matters and branches of learning to state their conclusions and express their opinions for the guidance and assistance of juries in investigations of fact. Expert evidence is often spoken of as opinion evidence, and it is opinion evidence. When a man has devoted years of study to a science or a branch of learning, and has become proficient in that branch, it is of assistance to juries and to average men to have their opinions upon certain questions of fact about which the witness is informed and about which the jurors ordinarily are not informed. Now, when you come to determine what weight you will give to the testimony of an expert witness, you will apply the same rules that you will apply to any other witness so far as they are applicable. In other words, you will inquire what interest, if any, the witness has in testifying in the case, what his knowledge or opportunities are for knowing the things about which he testifies, what his opportunities and qualifications are for expressing the things which he is allowed to express upon the witness stand, and when you come to consider the testimony of what are not properly considered expert witnesses, but non-expert witnesses and average men. The man who follows his trade of blacksmith, barber, or farmer, or lawyer, for that matter, when it comes to medicine and he states upon the witness stand that he had a certain disease and that he took a certain remedy, and that it cured him, in determining what weight you will give to his testimony you will consider what knowledge he has upon the subject, what he knows, what particular investigation or experience—investigation he has made or experience he has had which will enable him to say to you that he had a particular disease or what he knows about medicine or the curative effects of medicine whereby he can state to you that a certain thing that he took effected a certain remedy; and when you are to determine whether or not this medicine will or will not do things which are claimed for it, and you are weighing the testimony on the one side of experienced and learned men who have given their lives to the study of this question, giving consideration to their testimony in determining what weight you will give to it when you come to considering it to the testimony of witnesses who have never studied such subjects and have had no opportunity to become acquainted with such subjects, you will then decide what weight you will give to the opinions which they express as to what afflictions they were suffering from and as to what effect, if any, the medicine which they took had upon those afflictions.

You will also understand, gentlemen of the jury, in our system of jurisprudence the unsworn testimony—statement of a third party—is no evidence, and you will not give weight to the statements made by many witnesses upon the stand, that Dr. So-and-so said he had rheumatism. Dr. So-and-so is not here upon the witness stand, and that is the unsworn statement of a third party and is hearsay evidence and is not regarded as of weight in a court like this.

Now, you will take this case, gentlemen of the jury, weigh the evidence in the light of the instructions which I have given to you. If you after having considered this evidence, weighed and compared it in the light of the instructions which I have given to you, have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of this defendant, it is your duty to return a verdict of not guilty. But, if upon full consideration you determine that the Government has established

the averments of the information beyond a reasonable doubt as defined to you, it is your duty to return a verdict of guilty. A good deal of evidence has been allowed to go before you upon the question of good faith—ordinarily what somebody said to the defendant or what the defendant said to somebody else is not evidence, but where there comes a question in the case as to whether or not a defendant, and in this case the defendant's officers have acted in good faith, then the information that has come to him, whether it be reliable or not and which he claims to have acted upon becomes pertinent for the jury to consider. Now, the president of this defendant has taken the witness stand and testified as to the various persons who have told him that they have taken his medicines and of the curative effects it has had, and that evidence has been allowed to go to you, that bearing upon the question whether he honestly believed that this medicine could do the things which are claimed for it. In determining, gentlemen of the jury, the question of the good faith of the defendants you will take into consideration the fact that the president of this organization, the only officer who has appeared here and testified here for it, who himself says he originated the manufacture of this thing and has superintended it throughout the course of this business—he himself says that he is neither a physician nor a chemist, that he has never studied medicine nor the practice of it, that he has never studied chemistry nor the science of chemistry, and when you are asked to find that he acted in good faith in selling to persons who supposed themselves to be afflicted with certain diseases, this so-called remedy, you will take into consideration the fact that he himself admits that he is neither a physician nor a chemist, and bear those things in mind, as well as the other circumstances in the case, determine whether or not if you find that these statements were not true they were made either knowing them to be untrue or with such a reckless disregard of the truth as to amount to fraud. You will have nothing to do with the punishment in this case if you find the defendant guilty. If you find the defendant guilty the duty of inflicting the punishment which can not be anything but a fine not to exceed \$200, is imposed upon the court. You have nothing to do except to determine the simple question whether or not the defendant is or is not guilty. Forms of verdict will be provided to you. If you find that the defendant is guilty the form of your verdict will be: We, the jury, find the defendant guilty as charged. If you find the defendant not guilty the form of your verdict will be: We, the jury, find the defendant not guilty as charged in the information. The verdict is signed by all the jurors.

THE COURT. Any suggestion?

Mr. ANDERSON. If your honor please, I do not think the fact as to what constitutes fraud was brought out sufficiently. The court instructed the jury as I understood it, that fraud is where the proposition was false and was put out to mislead the public.

The COURT. Knowingly; I intended to use that word.

Mr. ANDERSON. And, further, the proposition as the charge now stands, I believe that the jury are instructed to disregarded all statements as to what physicians may have told the witnesses, although they told that to Mr. Abbott, I think.

THE COURT. Except as bearing upon the question of good faith.

Mr. DICKINSON. Your honor, in stating the charge made no reference to statement in the pamphlet.

THE COURT. I said statement on the label; the charge is specific. It is so understood, gentlemen of the jury, the statement in the package or on the label are to be considered by you statements in the package as well as on the label.

You have no exceptions?

Mr. ANDERSON. None further than I have stated and which you corrected.

The jury thereupon retired, and, after due deliberation, returned into court with a verdict of guilty, and the court imposed a fine of \$200 and costs.

CARL VROOMAN,

Acting Secretary of Agriculture.