Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of citric acid and sodium, potassium, calcium, and magnesium salts, including bicarbonate and phosphate, flavored with lemon oil.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the following statements, borne in the labeling, "A systemic alkalinizer * * * highly efficient in the treatment of acidosis * * * vomiting of pregnancy, nephritis, rheumatism, diabetes, fevers, and other toxemias * * * assists materially to neutralize uric acid, diacetic acid, indican, acetone, and betaoxybutyric acid," were false and misleading in that the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing said effects.

On August 23, 1928, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of the court was entered finding the product misbranded and ordering that it be destroyed by the United States marshal.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15957. Misbranding of cottonseed screenings. U. S. v. 600 Sacks of Cottonseed Screenings. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 22817. I. S. No. 18931–x. S. No. 844.)

On May 4, 1928, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by an official of the State of Kansas, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 600 sacks of cottonseed screenings, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Miller, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Anadarko Cotton Oil Co., from Anadarko, Okla., on or about April 26, 1928, and had been transported from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Kansas, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that it was invoiced and sold as prime quality cottonseed screenings, whereas it was off quality cottonseed screenings. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the statement, "43% protein," borne on the label, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser to believe that the said product contained not less than 43 per cent of protein, when in fact it contained less than 43 per cent of protein.

On May 4, 1928, the Anadarko Cotton Oil Co., Anadarko, Okla., having appeared as claimant for the property and having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of $500, conditioned in part that it be relabeled to show the true contents.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

15958. Adulteration and misbranding of powdered milk. U. S. v. 1½ Barrels of Powdered Milk. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 22684. I. S. No. 17431–x. S. No. 722.)

On April 2, 1928, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 1½ barrels of powdered milk, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Portland, Ore., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Coast Butcher (Supply) Company, from San Francisco, Calif., on or about February 21, 1928, and transported from the State of California into the State of Oregon, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Powd. Milk."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that skim milk powder had been mixed and packed with and substituted in part for normal powdered milk of good commercial quality, and in that a valuable constituent, butterfat, had been in part abstracted.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the designation "Powd. Milk" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, and for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On July 7, 1928, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*