

eggs in cooking and baking only," "Saves about one-third the shortening," "Use one-third less shortening than usual," "How to cook and bake entirely without expensive eggs," "Sa-Van- which may be used in place of eggs," "Sa-Van- will make without a single egg the most delicious cakes and other foods," "For each whole egg called for, a level teaspoonful of Sa-Van- may be used with no eggs whatsoever," "It matters not how many eggs are called for, you can use Sa-Van-," and "Sa-Van- gives practically the same result as expensive eggs," were false and misleading in that they represented to the purchasers of said article that the same was an egg substitute and could be used as a substitute for eggs in cooking, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchasers thereof into the belief that the same was an egg substitute and could be used as a substitute for eggs in cooking, whereas, in fact and in truth, it was not an egg substitute, nor could the same be used in place of eggs in cooking.

On March 23, 1920, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8038. Misbranding of A Texas Wonder. U. S. * * * v. 70 Bottles, More or Less, of A Texas Wonder. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11470 I. S. No. 8710-r. S. No. C-1522.)

On October 11, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma, 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 a certain quantity of a drug, labeled in part "A Texas Wonder," remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Oklahoma City, Okla., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 11, 1919, by E. W. Hall, St. Louis, Mo., and transported from the State of Missouri into the State of Oklahoma, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of copaiba, rhubarb, turpentine, guaiac, and alcohol.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in that certain statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, appearing on the label on the carton containing, and in the circular accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for stone in the kidneys, inflammation of the bladder, and tuberculosis of the kidneys, for kidney and bladder troubles, diabetes, weak and lame backs, rheumatism and gravel, and for regulating bladder trouble in children, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective for the purposes named.

On January 30, 1920, 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.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8039. Adulteration of sardines. U. S. * * * v. 13 Cases of Sardines. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 12439. I. S. Nos. 13495-r, 13496-r. S. No. E-2094.)

On or about May 6, 1920, the United States attorney for the Western 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 a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 13 cases of sardines, remaining unsold in the original unbroken

packages at Buffalo, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on or after February 10, 1920, from New Orleans, La., and transported from the State of Louisiana into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Sardines in Salt Packed by Sherwood Sea Food Company, San Pedro, Calif."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the label in that it consisted wholly or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance, and was unfit for food.

On May 29, 1920, 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.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8040. Misbranding of Knoxit. U. S. * * * v. 4 Boxes, More or Less, of Knoxit. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9839. I. S. No. 6870-r. S. No. C-1091.)

On March 8, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel, and on June 2, 1919, an amended libel, for the seizure and condemnation of 4 boxes of Knoxit at St. Joseph, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about October 22, 1918, by the Beggs Mfg. Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Missouri, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of a dilute aqueous solution containing glycerin, zinc acetate, and hydrastis, perfumed with oil of rose.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, appearing on the carton inclosing, in the circular accompanying, and on the label on the bottle containing the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be a prophylactic, and to be effective as a remedy for gonorrhœa, leucorrhœa, catarrhal affections of the eye, nose, throat, and genito-urinary organs, inflammation, hemorrhoids, ulcers, eyes, and throat, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On December 19, 1919, 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.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8041. Misbranding of Knoxit. U. S. * * * v. 5 Dozen Bottles, More or Less, of Knoxit. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9927. I. S. No. 6881-r. S. No. C-1114.)

On March 21, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Missouri, 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 a certain quantity of a certain article, labeled in part "Knoxit," at St. Joseph, Mo., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about November 5, 1918, by the Beggs Mfg. Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Missouri, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of a dilute aqueous solution containing glycerin, zinc acetate, and hydrastis, perfumed with oil of rose.