

garding its curative or therapeutic effect with respect to intestinal parasites in poultry, hogs, dogs, rabbits, and cats.

On May 19, 1936, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Indiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Elmer O. Clark, trading as Clark Remedies Co., Kokomo, Ind., charging shipment by said defendant in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended, on or about September 20 and October 4, 1935, from the State of Indiana into the States of Illinois and Iowa, of quantities of E. O. Clark's Famous Liquid Formula No. 6 that was misbranded.

Analyses of the article in each of the two consignments showed that it consisted, in the case of one consignment, of a solid (plant material—kamala indicated), and a liquid containing chiefly mineral oil, turpentine, carbon tetrachloride, sassafras oil, and water; and in the case of the other consignment, of a mixture of two immiscible liquids, and a separated solid (plant material—kamala indicated), the lighter of the two liquids consisting chiefly of mineral oil, turpentine, carbon tetrachloride, and sassafras oil, and the heavier liquid consisting of a solution of nicotine and sodium sulphate in water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the labels bore statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effect of the article, falsely and fraudulently representing it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for roundworms, tapeworms, and gizzard and pin worms in fowls and turkeys, hogs, dogs, rabbits, and cats.

On June 27, 1936, the defendant entered a plea of guilty and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

M. L. WILSON,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

26510. Misbranding of Universal Tonic Ginseng. U. S. v. Jay Leighton Van Cleve (Universal Medicine Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50. (F. & D. no. 36984. Sample no. 87640-B.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of Universal Tonic Ginseng the labels of which bore false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative or therapeutic effects.

On April 7, 1936, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against Jay Leighton Van Cleve, trading as Universal Medicine Co., Portland, Oreg., charging shipment by said defendant in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about June 24, 1935, from the State of Oregon into the State of Washington of a quantity of Universal Tonic Ginseng that was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it consisted essentially of extracts of plant drugs, alcohol (2.7 percent by volume), glycerin, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements regarding its curative and therapeutic effects, appearing on the bottle labels, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for ailments of the stomach, liver, kidneys, and nerves, and effective to make weak men and women strong.

On June 11, 1936, the defendant entered a plea of guilty and the court imposed a fine of \$50.

M. L. WILSON,
Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

26511. Misbranding of Punch Brand Rubbing Alcohol Compound. U. S. v. 136 Dozen Bottles of Punch Brand Rubbing Alcohol Compound. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 37141. Sample no. 80937-B.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of Punch Brand Rubbing Alcohol Compound that contained no ordinary (ethyl) alcohol, but consisted of isopropyl alcohol, acetone, and water.

On February 4, 1936, the United States attorney for the District of Connecticut, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 136 dozen bottles of Punch Brand Rubbing Alcohol Compound at New Haven, Conn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about November 19, 1935, by Wilshire Sales Corporation from New York, N. Y., and that it was misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that the statements on the label, "Rubbing Alcohol Compound" and "Alcohol 70 Proof", were false and