color, 2 cans of red coal-tar color, and 1 can of purple coal-tar color, in various lots at Ruston, Winnfield, Opelousas, Lake Charles, and Kinder, La., respectively, alleging that the article had been shipped by the W. B. Wood Mfg. Co., St. Louis, Mo., between the dates of May 10, 1920, and March 15, 1921, and had been transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Louisiana, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The labels of the said article bore the statement, "1 Lb. Net * * * W. B. Wood Mfg. Co. * * * St. Louis, Mo.," and the statements, "Red," "Yellow," or "Purple," as the case might be.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that sodium chloride and sodium sulphate had been mixed and packed with and substituted wholly or in part for the article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that the article contained an added poisonous or deleterious ingredient, to wit, arsenic, which might render it injurious to health.

On May 17 and June 1, 1923, respectively, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11753. Misbranding of Giles' germicide. U. S. v. 6 Bottles of Giles' Germicide. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 16126. I. S. No. 19-t. S. No. C-3524.)

On April 25, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Indiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 6 bottles of Giles' germicide, remaining in the original unbroken packages at La Fayette, Ind., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Giles Remedy Co., Chicago, Ill., on or about September 10, 1921, and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Indiana, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Carton) "Registered Giles' Germicide Trade Mark Aether Sulphuricus, 10% Guaranteed by Giles Remedy Co. to contain no poisonous Drugs or deleterious matter A Modern Remedy Recommended For Ailments caused by disease producing germs within and without the body Neutralizes and Expels From The Blood The toxins of germs and other poisons or impurities, Allays internal or external congestion or inflamation. Absolutely Harmless."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of camphor, ether, and linseed oil, and was not an antiseptic or a germicide.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the above-quoted statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the said article were false and fraudulent in that the article did not contain any ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the results claimed.

On October 21, 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 destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11754. Misbranding of white beans. U. S. v. Ady & Crowe Mercantile Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, $50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 16205. I. S. No. 13001-t.)

On June 5, 1922, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Ady & Crowe Mercantile Co., a corporation, Denver, Colo., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about October 18, 1921, from the State of Colorado into the State of Wyoming, of a quantity of white beans in sacks which were misbranded.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On July 6, 1922, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $50 and costs.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*