

Co., Matawan, N. J., and transported from the State of New Jersey into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel in that the article consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid tomato product.

On January 19, 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.*

S441. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. * * * v. R. M. Hughes & Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 9602. I. S. No. 11909-p, 12122-p.)

On April 28, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Kentucky, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against R. M. Hughes & Co., a corporation, Louisville, Ky., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about January 10, 1918, and October 23, 1917, from the State of Kentucky into the State of Missouri, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Distilled * * * Vinegar 80 grain," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was of less than 80 grain acid strength.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, a vinegar of less than 80 grain strength, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for vinegar 80 grain, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Vinegar 80 grain," borne on the barrels containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that said article was vinegar 80 grain, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was vinegar 80 grain, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article was not vinegar 80 grain, but was vinegar of less than 80 grain.

On October 14, 1919, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant corporation, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

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

S442. Misbranding of Prescription 1000 Injection. U. S. * * * v. 3 Dozen Bottles, More or Less, of Prescription 1000 Injection. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10501. I. S. No. 15004-r. S. No. E-1494.)

On June 12, 1919, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, 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 3 dozen bottles of Prescription 1000 Injection, at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about April 2, 1919, by the Reese Chemical Co., Cleveland, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Pennsylvania, 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 a dilute solution of potassium permanganate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements appearing in the circular accompanying the article, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for gonorrhoea and gleet in obstinate cases where immediate results are desired, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On December 1, 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.*

S443. Misbranding of Prescription 1000 Internal and External. U. S. * * * v. 26 Bottles of Drugs Labeled in Part, "Prescription 1000 Internal" and 17 Bottles of Drugs Labeled in Part, "Prescription 1000 External." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10507. I. S. Nos. 2638-r, 2639-r. S. No. W-400.)

On June 18, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Washington, 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 certain articles, labeled in part "Prescription 1000," at Spokane, Wash., consigned by the Reese Chemical Co., Cleveland, Ohio, alleging that the articles had been shipped on or about April 26, 1919, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Washington, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the Prescription 1000 Internal consisted essentially of an emulsion of copaiba, with methyl salicylate, and that the Prescription 1000 External consisted of a dilute solution of potassium permanganate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements appeared in the circular accompanying, on the cartons enclosing, and on the bottles containing the articles, regarding their curative or therapeutic effects as a remedy for gleet, gonorrhoea, bladder troubles, frequent urination and inflammation, which statements were false and fraudulent in that the drugs did not contain any ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of curing the diseases named.

On September 25, 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.*

S444. Misbranding of Big G. U. S. * * * v. 101 Bottles of a Drug Labeled in Part, "Big G, a Non-poisonous Tonic Antiseptic Prepared by Evans Chemical Company, Cincinnati, Ohio." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10512. S. No. W-401.)

On June 18, 1919, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Washington, 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 "Big G," at Spokane, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 23, 1918, by the Evans Chemical Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Washington, 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 of an aqueous solution of borax and berberine.