

Is your tongue coated? Does your breath smell so that people turn away from you in disgust? Is your hair falling? Are you weak? Are you out of breath when you run a short distance or climb a few steps? Are you nervous? Is it hard for you to fall asleep? Do you get swellings? Do you catch cold easily? Are you bashful? \* \* \* Have you sores on your body? Any pimples on the face and back? \* \* \* do something before it is too late \* \* \* Zendejas Treatment \* \* \*

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of potassium iodid, extracts of plant drugs, including sarsaparilla and a laxative drug, a trace of formaldehyde, flavoring material, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the above-quoted statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the said article were false and fraudulent, since it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On November 14, 1921, 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.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**10721. Adulteration of prunes. U. S. v. 175 Boxes of Prunes. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 15527. I. S. No. 6434-t. S. No. E-3630.)**

On November 5, 1921, 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 175 boxes of prunes, remaining unsold at Trenton, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped by Louis Marks & Son, New York, N. Y., on or about October 18, 1921, and transported from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "California Prune Sunsweet Natural Flavor California Prune and Apricot Growers Inc., San Jose, Cal. \* \* \*."

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On June 23, 1922, 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.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**10722. Misbranding of cottonseed meal. U. S. v. Tecumseh Oil & Cotton Co., a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 15567. I. S. No. 11657-t.)**

On January 13, 1922, 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 an information against the Tecumseh Oil & Cotton Co., a corporation, trading at Tecumseh, Okla., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about December 15, 1920, from the State of Oklahoma into the State of Kansas, of a quantity of cottonseed meal which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "\* \* \* Choctaw Quality Cottonseed Cake and Meal \* \* \*"

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained 41.10 per cent of protein.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Guaranteed Analysis Protein, not less than 43%," borne on the tags attached to the sacks containing the article, regarding the article and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that the article contained not less than 43 per cent of protein, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it contained not less than 43 per cent of protein, whereas, in fact and in truth, the said article did contain less than 43 per cent of protein, to wit, approximately 41.10 per cent.

On January 17, 1922, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

C. W. PUGSLEY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*