

used in connection with Hokara, as a relief for severe cases of skin disease, and effective, when used in connection with Hokara and Antiseptic Compound, as a treatment, remedy, and cure for acne, scrofula, rheumatic eczema, and erysipelas, when, in truth and in fact, it was not. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that the statement, to wit, "Hokara Blood Tablets are a combination of vegetable remedies," borne in the booklet accompanying the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the article was composed exclusively of vegetable ingredients, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not composed exclusively of vegetable ingredients, but was composed in part of mineral ingredients, to wit, potassium nitrate and calcium carbonate.

On April 25, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6808. Adulteration and misbranding of oil sweet birch. U. S. * * * v. 2 Cans of Oil Sweet Birch. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 9211. I. S. No. 13607-r. S. No. E-1081.)

On August 8, 1918, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, 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 two cans of oil sweet birch at Linden, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 24, 1918, by J. B. Johnson, Hickory, N. C., and transported from the State of North Carolina into the State of New Jersey, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted in whole or in large part of synthetic methyl salicylate.

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 Pharmacopoeia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopoeia, official at the time of the investigation of the article, and that the strength and purity of the article fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold. Adulteration of the article was alleged for the further reason that a substance, to wit, synthetic methyl salicylate, had been mixed and packed therewith, thereby reducing, lowering, and injuriously affecting the quality and strength of the article, and had been substituted in part for oil sweet birch, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the name of, another article, to wit, oil sweet birch. Misbranding of the article was alleged for the further reason that the statement on the invoice, "Oil Sweet Birch," was false and misleading in that it represented that the article invoiced thereon was oil sweet birch; and for the further reason that the statement on the invoice as aforesaid deceived and misled the purchaser into the belief that it was oil sweet birch, whereas, in fact and in truth, it was not, but was a product other than oil sweet birch, to wit, a product to which had been added, and with which had been mixed and packed, a substance, to wit, synthetic methyl salicylate.

On March 11, 1919, the said J. B. Johnson, claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be released to said claimant upon

the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$600, in conformity with section 10 of the act, conditioned in part that the product should be relabeled under the supervision of a representative of this department as imitation oil of birch.

C. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

6809. Adulteration and misbranding of olive oil. U. S. * * * v. Christ Paraskevopolus (National Importing Co.). Tried to the court and a jury. Verdict of guilty. Fine, \$603. (F. & D. No. 9235. I. S. Nos. 3861-3862-p.)

On March 5, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Christ Paraskevopolus, trading as the National Importing Co., New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on January 31, 1918, and February 1, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, of quantities of an article, labeled in part, respectively, "Finest Quality Olive Oil $\frac{1}{4}$ Gallon Net," and "Olive Oil Speciality Lucca 1 Gallon Net," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed it to consist almost wholly of cottonseed oil and to be short volume.

Adulteration of the article in each shipment was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, cottonseed oil, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to lower and reduce and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted in part for pure olive oil, which the article purported to be.

Misbranding of the article in the shipment on January 31, 1918, was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Finest Quality Olive Oil, Extra Pure, Termini Imerese, Sicilia-Italia, $\frac{1}{4}$ Gallon Net, Guaranteed Absolutely Pure," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Sicily, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained not less than $\frac{3}{4}$ gallon net of the article, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it was pure olive oil, that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Sicily, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not pure olive oil, and was not a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Sicily, in the kingdom of Italy, and each of said cans did not contain $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article, but was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil, and was a domestic product, to wit, a product manufactured in the United States of America, and each of said cans contained less than $\frac{1}{4}$ gallon net of the article; and for the further reason that it was a mixture composed in part of cottonseed oil prepared in imitation of pure olive oil, and was offered for sale and sold under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, pure olive oil.

Misbranding of the article in the shipment on February 1, 1918, was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, "Olive Oil, Lucca, 1 Gallon Net," borne on the cans containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, were false and misleading in that they represented that the article was olive oil and that it was a foreign product, to wit, an olive oil produced in Lucca, in the kingdom of Italy, and that each of said cans contained one gallon net of the article, and for the further reason that it