merce, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Chloroform * * * For Anaesthesia."

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the chloroform in the consignment of March 7 was turbid, upon evaporation it left a foreign odor, and it contained hydrochloric acid, free chlorin, impurities decomposable by sulphuric acid, and chlorinated decomposition products, and that the chloroform in the consignment of March 10 was turbid, upon evaporation it left a foreign odor, and it contained chlorids and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation.

On July 25, 1922, 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 disposed of according to law.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11175. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 98 Cans of Chloroform. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product disposed of according to law. (F. & D. No. 16598. I. S. No. 14001-t. S. No. W-1148.)

On July 10, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, 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 98 cans of chloroform, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., consigned by the Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Co., New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., on or about May 22, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was turbid and contained chlorids, odorous decomposition products, and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation.

On October 2, 1922, 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 disposed of according to law.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11176. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 4 Cans of Chloroform. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product disposed of according to law. (F. & D. No. 16599. I. S. No. 11123-t. S. No. W-1150.)

On July 7, 1922, the United States attorney for the Southern District of California, 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 4 cans of chloroform, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Los Angeles, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., on or about March 29, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was turbid, upon evaporation it left a foreign odor, and it contained chlorids, impurities decomposable by sulphuric acid, and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation.

On October 2, 1922, 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 disposed of according to law.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*