Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel in that certain statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, appearing on the label on the package containing, and in the circular and booklet accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective for the relief of vaginitis, vulvitis, gonnorrhœal inflammation, leucorrhœal discharge, leucorrhœa or whites, gonorrhœa, inflammation, congestion and ulceration of the vagina, and similar female complaints, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On January 30, 1920, 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.*

8157. Adulteration and misbranding of tankage. U. S. * * * v. 15 Sacks, More or Less, of Tankage. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11493. I. S. No. 8081–r. S. No. C–1549.)

On or about October 17, 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 condemnation of a certain quantity of an article, labeled in part "Tankage," remaining unsold in the original unbroken package at Cameron, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about August 28, 1919, by the Schalker Packing Co., Leavenworth, Kans., and transported from the State of Kansas into the State of Missouri, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel in that a substance containing approximately only 41 per cent of protein had been substituted wholly or in part for an article containing 60.65 per cent of protein.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in that the statement on the label on the package containing the article, to wit, "Protein 60.65%," was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser.

On March 12, 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.*

8158. Misbranding of Oculum Oil. U. S. * * * v. 2 Dozen Bottles, More or Less, of Oculum Oil. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 12540. I. S. No. 8136–r. S. No. C–1874.)

On April 3, 1920, 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 condemnation of a certain quantity of an article, labeled in part "Oculum Oil," remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Kansas City, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 12, 1918, by the Hancock Inoculatum Co., Inc., Salem, Va., and transported from the State of Virginia into the State of Missouri, 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 oil of turpentine with a small amount of oil of amber and an orange coloring.