Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article, appearing in the circular accompanying, on the carton enclosing, and on the label on the bottles containing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be a prophylactic, and to be a remedy for gonorrhœa, blennorrhœa, catarrhal affections of the eye, nose, throat, and genito-urinary organs, inflammation, hemorrhoids, ulcers, eyes, and throat, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On December 9, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

8042. Misbranding of Gon-nor. U. S. * * * v. 120 Bottles Containing a Product Called Gon-nor. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released on bond. (F. & D. No. 11168. I. S. No. 17028-r. S. No. E-1688.)

On September 16, 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 a libel for the seizure and condemnation of a certain quantity of a certain article, labeled in part "Gon-nor," at San Juan, P. R., alleging that the article had been shipped on November 12, 1918, by the Occidental Medicine Co., Arecibo, P. R., and offered for sale and sold in Porto Rico, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of an aqueous solution containing acetates and sulphates of zinc and lead and extractives of catechu and wild-cherry bark.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel in that certain statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article, appearing on the carton enclosing, in the circular accompanying, and on the label on the bottle containing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as an astringent on the mucous membranes of the urethra in acute gonorrhœa, chronic gonorrhœa, urethritis, fluxes, and catarrhs of the urethral tract, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On May 26, 1920, J. M. Blanco & Co., Inc., claimant, having consented to the entry of the decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be delivered to the claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the filing of a bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

8043. Misbranding of Gon-nor. U. S. * * * v. 60 Bottles Containing a Product Called Gon-nor. (F. & D. No. 11169. I. S. No. 17029-r. S. No. E-1689.)

On September 16, 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 a libel for the seizure and condemnation of a certain quantity of a certain article, labeled in part "Gon-nor," at San Juan, P. R., alleging that the article had been shipped some time between November 13, 1918, and September 16, 1919, by the Occidental Medicine Co., Arecibo, P. R., and offered for sale and sold in Porto Rico, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of an aqueous solution containing acetates and sulphates of zinc and lead and extractives of catechu and wild-cherry bark.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in that certain statements appearing in the circular accompanying, on the carton enclosing, and on the label on the bottle containing the article, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as an astringent on the mucous membranes of the urethra in acute gonorrhœa, chronic gonorrhœa, urethritis, fluxes, and catarrhs of the urethral tract, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On May 26, 1920, the Porto Rico Drug Co., claimant, having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be delivered to the claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the filing of a bond, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

8044. Misbranding of Milks Emulsion. U. S. * * * v. 6 Dozen Bottles, Small Size, of a Drug Labeled in Part "Milks Emulsion." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11374. I. S. No. 16431–r. S. No. E–1777.)

On October 2, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Georgia, 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 a certain quantity of a certain article, labeled in part "Milks Emulsion," at Macon, Ga., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 19, 1919, by the Milks Emulsion Co., Terre Haute, Ind., and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Georgia, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of petrolatum with small amounts of sugar, glycerin, and essential oils.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel in that certain statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article, appearing on the label on the bottle containing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article as a valuable remedy for dyspepsia, indigestion, catarrh of the stomach and bowels, bronchial asthma, catarrhal croup, and bronchitis, and especially beneficial in incipient consumption, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective. Further misbranding was alleged in that the statement in the booklet accompanying the article, to wit, "Milks Emulsion contains a great amount of fat," was false and misleading, since it contained no fat.

On May 3, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

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

8045. Misbranding of Gono-Cide Injection. U. S. * * * v. 42 Bottles, More or Less, of Gono-Cide Injection. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11423. I. S. No. 8703–r. S. No. C–1510.)

On October 9, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, 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