

alleging that the article was shipped on or about June 14, 1918, by the Sethness Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Mississippi and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Analyses of samples of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained insoluble saccharin and sodium bicarbonate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the libel in that the statement on the label regarding the article, to wit, "Soluble Saccharine," was false and misleading in that the article was not in fact soluble saccharin, but consisted largely of sodium bicarbonate, insoluble saccharin, and other substances. Further misbranding was alleged in that the article was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the name of, another and different drug, to wit, soluble saccharin. Further misbranding was alleged in that the label did not contain a statement showing the quantity or proportion of sodium bicarbonate, insoluble saccharin, and other substances contained in the article.

On July 26, 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.*

8423. Misbranding of Black Caps. U. S. * * * v. 5 Dozen Packages of Black Caps. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10820. I. S. No. 13448-r. S. No. E-1600.)

On July 3, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, 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 5 dozen packages of Black Caps, at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article was shipped on or about April 7, 1919, by the Safety Remedy Co., Canton, Ohio, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Pennsylvania 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 the contents of the capsules consisted essentially of cubeb, copaiba, and saw palmetto.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements appearing in the circular accompanying the article, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for affections of the mucous membranes, leucorrhœa, chronic cystitis, chronic bronchitis, leucorrhœa, cystorrhœa, abscess of the prostate gland, and affections of the neck of the bladder and prostatic portions of the urethra, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On June 25, 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.*

8424. Misbranding of Purola Kidney and Liver Remedy, Purola Diarrhœa Mixture, Purola Female, Purola Syrup Sarsaparilla Compound with Iodide of Potash, and Purola Compound Extract of Buchu. U. S. * * * v. Blumauer-Frank Drug Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$200. (F. & D. No. 11049. I. S. Nos. 16177-p, 16178-p, 16179-p, 16180-p, 2312-r.)

On December 1, 1919, 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 an information against the Blumauer-

Frank Drug Co., a corporation, Portland, Oreg., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, from the State of Oregon into the State of Washington, on or about February 13, 1918, of a quantity of Purola Kidney and Liver Remedy, on or about February 18, 1918, of a quantity of Purola Diarrhoea Mixture, on or about February 20, 1918, of a quantity of Purola Femaline, on or about April 10, 1918, of a quantity of Purola Syrup Sarsaparilla Compound with Iodide of Potash, and on or about June 15, 1918, of a quantity of Purola Compound Extract of Buchu, which were misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results: Purola Kidney and Liver Remedy, a hydroalcoholic solution consisting essentially of vegetable extractives carrying emodin and resin, potassium acetate, sugars, and a faint trace of salicylic acid; Purola Diarrhoea Mixture, a hydroalcoholic solution of opium, camphor, capsicum extractives, rhubarb, oils of peppermint and anise, and indications of a trace of gambir; Purola Femaline, a hydroalcoholic solution consisting essentially of glycyrrhiza extractives, emodin, resin, a trace of alkaloid, sucrose, glycerin, and aromatics; Purola Syrup Sarsaparilla Compound with Iodide of Potash, a hydroalcoholic solution consisting essentially of vegetable extractives carrying emodin, indications of saponin, glycyrrhizin, alkaloids, volatile oils, sugar, glucose, and potassium iodid; Purola Compound Extract of Buchu, a hydroalcoholic solution of buchu extractives, sugar, glycyrrhiza extractives, potassium acetate, and little, if any, emodin.

It was alleged in substance in the information that the Purola Kidney and Liver Remedy was misbranded for the reason that certain statements appearing on the labels of the bottles and cartons falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for diseases of the kidneys and liver, diabetes, Bright's disease, urinary disorders, inflammation of the bladder, pain in back, gravel, catarrh of the bladder, dropsy, leucorrhoea, and all ailments arising from a weakened or diseased condition of the liver and kidneys, irritable bladder, catarrh of the womb, whites, and barrenness resulting from these conditions, jaundice, low spirits resulting from liver affections, dropsy, whether originating from heart, kidney, or liver diseases, or from simple general exhaustion, and Bright's disease and its painful complications, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

It was alleged in substance that the Purola Diarrhoea Mixture was misbranded for the reason that certain statements appearing on the labels of the bottles and cartons falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for cholera, cholera morbus, dysentery, cholera infantum, and bowel complaints generally, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

It was alleged in substance that the Purola Femaline was misbranded for the reason that certain statements appearing on the labels of the bottles and cartons falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for female weakness and maladies, such as prolapsus uteri, or falling of the womb, suppressed menstruation, ulceration or inflammation of the uterus, ovarian pains and leucorrhoea, and effective for all diseases of the female organism, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

It was alleged in substance that the Purola Syrup Sarsaparilla Compound with Iodide of Potash was misbranded for the reason that certain statements appearing on the labels of the bottles and cartons falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a blood purifier, and effective to expel humors from the blood, and to renovate and enrich the blood, and effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for scrofulous affections and cutaneous diseases, boils,

ring worms, unsightly humors of the face, pimples, pustules, tetter or salt rheum, scald head, ulcers, sores, rheumatism, syphilitic and mercurial diseases, and all complaints arising from impurities of the blood, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

It was alleged in substance that the Purolo Compound Extract of Buchu was misbranded for the reason that certain statements appearing on the labels of the bottles and cartons falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment, remedy, and cure for many ailments arising in the urinary organs, bladder, or kidneys, such as nonretention of urine, inflammation of bladder and urethra, catarrh of the bladder, gravel and mucous discharges, diseases of the genital organs, such as Bright's disease, irritation, inflammation or ulceration of bladder or kidneys, chronic catarrh of the bladder and urethra, diseased prostate, gravel and stone in the bladder, mucous and milky discharges, dropsical swellings, and weakness arising from excess or indiscretion and dissipation in either sex, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On April 10, 1920, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200.

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

S425. Misbranding of Dr. Sanger's Capsules. U. S. * * * v. 5 Dozen Boxes of a Product Labeled "Dr. Sanger's Capsules." Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11061. I. S. No. 12915-r. S. No. E-1355.)

On August 11, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 5 dozen boxes of Dr. Sanger's Capsules, at Boston, Mass., consigned April 2, 1919, by Sanger & Co., New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped and transported from the State of New York into the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 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 the contents of the capsules consisted essentially of copaiba, cubebs, gum turpentine, and magnesia. Licorice and santal oil also were indicated.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements appearing in the booklet accompanying the article, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for diseases pertaining to the mucous membranes, cystitis, cystirrhoea or catarrh of the bladder, retention of urine, and leucorrhoea, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On May 10, 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.*

S426. Misbranding of The Texas Wonder. U. S. * * * v. 32 Bottles of The Texas Wonder. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11303. I. S. No. 6796-r. S. No. C-1487.)

On October 2, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi, 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 32 bottles of The Texas Wonder, at Meridian, Miss., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 5, 1919, by E. W.