having been found to contain not more than 70.54 and 72.88 cc, respectively, of ammonia water per 1,000 cc, whereas the pharmacopoeia provides that 1,000 cc of aromatic spirits of ammonia shall contain not less than 90 cc of ammonia water; the alleged heavy mineral oil had a kinetic viscosity of not more than 0.171 at 27.8° C., whereas the pharmacopoeia provides that heavy mineral oil shall have a kinetic viscosity of not less than 0.381 at 37.8°; and the standard of strength, quality, and purity of the articles was not declared on the containers thereof. Adulteration was alleged with respect to all products for the reason that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold in that the tincture of aconite and aromatic spirits ammonia were represented to conform to the standard laid down in the pharmacopoeia; whereas they did not conform to the standard laid down in that authority; the mineral oil was represented to be heavy Russian mineral oil, whereas it was not heavy Russian mineral oil, and the cinchophen tablets were represented to contain 7½ grains of cinchophen per tablet, whereas they contained not more than 6.27 grains of cinchophen per tablet.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements, "Tincture of Aconite U. S. P.", "Cinchophen * * * Tablets—7½ gr.", "Aromatic Spirits Ammonia U. S. P.", "Russian Mineral Oil, Heavy * * * Honor Research Laboratories, New York, Chicago", in the labeling were false and misleading, since the said statements represented that the tincture of aconite and aromatic spirits of ammonia conformed to the standard laid down in the United States Pharmacopoeia, that the cinchophen tablets contained 7½ grains of cinchophen each, and that the mineral oil was heavy Russian mineral oil manufactured by the Honor Research Laboratories; whereas the tincture of aconite and aromatic spirits ammonia did not conform to the standard laid down in the pharmacopoeia, the cinchophen tablets contained less than 7½ grains of cinchophen, and the mineral oil was not Russian Mineral Oil Heavy, and was not manufactured by the Honor Research Laboratories, New York and Chicago. Misbranding of the mineral oil was alleged for the further reason that it was falsely branded as to the country in which it was manufactured and produced in that it was represented to have been manufactured and produced by the Honor Research Laboratories, New York and Chicago, whereas it was manufactured and produced by the Gibson-Howell Sales Co., Jersey City, N. J.

On June 28, 1934, a plea of guilty was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of $600.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22954. Misbranding of Bromo Paper. U. S. v. 14 Cases of Bromo Paper. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 31189. Sample nos. 23458–A, 45001–A, 45002–A, 45003–A.)

This case involved a shipment of Bromo paper that was labeled with unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims.

On October 2, 1933, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 14 cases, 50 boxes each of Bromo Paper, at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce in various shipments on or about February 28, April 22, and August 1, 1933, by the Diamond Mills Paper Co., from Saugerties, N. Y., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted of tissue paper impregnated with a small amount of mineral oil and a small amount of carbolic acid.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement on the label and in the circular, "A positive preventative of that most distressing and almost universal complaint the Piles", was false and fraudulent.

On September 27, 1934, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and destruction of the product was ordered.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22955. Misbranding of Sanmetto. U. S. v. 36 Bottles of Sanmetto. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 31190. Sample no. 49715–A.)

This case involved a drug preparation labeled with unwarranted therapeutic claims.

On October 11, 1933, the United States attorney for the Western District of Arkansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the