

is attacked in a rational way, and beneficial results may be expected in ordinary cases. Frequently chronic cases—those which have been treated with injections or which have not been attended regularly—will yield, with the use of Uriseptic Pills. * * * In many cases in which the patient conducts himself properly, that is, abstaining from alcoholic drinks, violent exercise, and taking Uriseptic Pills as per instructions, the results are beneficial. Uriseptic Pills are likewise used in acute as well as in chronic cases, since they counteract the disease in a purely natural manner. * * * In Cystitis * * * Uriseptic Pills may be used. * * * Uriseptic Pills, * * * represent modern ideas of treatment. Uriseptic Pills exert no prejudicial action on the stomach and do not derange digestion. * * * Uriseptic Pills—a formula which represents efficacious agents to combat this disease—in the hands of the most experienced and conscientious physicians. Uriseptic Pills will be found of value * * *.”

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the pills consisted essentially of cubebs, methylene blue, salol, and kava kava.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libels for the reason that the above-quoted statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof were false and fraudulent, as the article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On March 14, 1921, the Davis & Lawrence Co., New York, N. Y., claimant, having consented to the entry of decrees in the respective cases, and having failed to deny the allegations contained in the libels, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bonds in the aggregate sum of \$200, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

9349. Adulteration and misbranding of vinegar. U. S. * * * v. 57 Barrels of Vinegar * * *. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 14677. I. S. No. 13153-t. S. No. E-3195.)

On March 24, 1921, the United States attorney for the District of Maine, 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 57 barrels of vinegar, consigned by the National Vinegar Inc., per J. C. Voseburgh, Canajoharie, N. Y., remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Portland, Me., alleging that the article had been shipped from Canajoharie, N. Y., on or about October 30, 1920, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Maine, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, “New York State Pure Cider Vinegar reduced to New York State Standard 4 Per Centum.”

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that apple waste vinegar had been mixed and packed with, and substituted wholly or in part for, the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article was mixed in a manner whereby damage or inferiority was concealed.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the statement appearing on the label, to wit, “New York State Pure Cider Vinegar,” was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, for the further reason that the article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article, and for the further reason that the said article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package, since the statement appearing thereon was incorrect and not in the correct form.

On April 22, 1921, 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, and that the barrels in which the product was contained be sold.

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

9350. Adulteration of scallops. U. S. * * * v. James C. Tawes and Isaac H. Tawes (Tawes & Co.). Submission to information. Fine, \$10 and costs. (F. & D. No. 11355. I. S. No. 14959-r.)

On July 10, 1920, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of North Carolina, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against James C. Tawes and Isaac H. Tawes, copartners, trading as Tawes & Co., Morehead City, N. C., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about March 6, 1919, from the State of North Carolina into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of scallops which were adulterated. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "1 Gallon Escallops * * *;" (another tag) "* * * Tawes & Company Branch Office Morehead City, N. C."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained added water.

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

On October 12, 1920, the defendants submitted to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10 and costs.

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