

4992. Misbranding of "Jacobs' Liver Salt." U. S. * * * v. Jacobs' Pharmacy Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 6204. I. S. No. 9330-e.)

On September 21, 1915, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Georgia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Jacobs' Pharmacy Co., a corporation, Atlanta, Ga., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about February 18, 1913, from the State of Georgia into the State of Colorado, of a quantity of an article labeled, in part, "Jacobs' Liver Salt," which was misbranded.

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

Loss on ignition (per cent)-----	30.64
Phosphates as Na ₂ HPO ₄ (per cent)-----	26.51
Chlorids as NaCl (per cent)-----	6.63
Sulphates as Na ₂ SO ₄ (per cent)-----	27.84

Test for carbonate: Positive.

Denige's test for citric acid: Positive.

Spectroscopic test: Lithium; Very faint.

The preparation consists largely of sodium phosphate, sulphate, and chlorid, incorporated with a desiccated mixture of sodium carbonate and citric acid; contains a trace only of lithium salt.

It was charged in substance in the information that the article was misbranded for the reason that the statements on the label falsely and fraudulently represented it as a remedy for headache, rheumatism, gout, gastritis, deranged digestion, and sore throat, when, in truth and in fact, it was not. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the statement, to wit, "Formula Jacobs' Liver Salt is composed of Lithium Phosphate, Sodium Phosphate, and Sodium Sulphate in the correct proportions as determined by expert chemists," borne on the label and the statement, to wit, "Containing Lithium Phosphate," borne on the carton, were false and misleading in that they purported and represented that said article contained an appreciable quantity of lithium phosphate, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article contained little, if any, lithium phosphate.

On October 3, 1916, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

CARL VROOMAN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*