

part, "Brou's Injection * * * E. Fougera & Co., Inc. Importers N. Y.," alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., December 5, 1918, and transported from the State of New York into the State of California, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "Hygienic and Preservative Brou's Injection," (French) "Against Runnings or discharges (Les Ecoulemens) recent or chronic and Against White Flowers, Leucorrhoea;" (booklet, French) "Blenorrhagia * * * Blenorrhoea * * * Leucorrhoea or white Flowers White losses Their Treatment * * * Blenorrhagia urethral, or gonorrhoea * * * The beginning of Blenorrhagia * * * It is at this moment that one should have recourse to the use of Brou's Injection * * * It is of immense importance to the patient to rid himself as quickly as possible of his discharge * * * If one has waited too long before having recourse to Brou's Injection * * * In cases where one has left the inflammation to show itself it is necessary to wait till it has stopped * * * when the discharge has changed color and becomes yellow it is necessary to begin the treatment by the injection. * * * Thus employed Brou's Injection will always give good results. The treatment by injection constitutes the treatment par excellence of blenorrhoea * * * Far from producing strictures injections prevent them by curing their usual causes that is to say prolonged inflammation of the mucous membranes and its extention to underlying tissues * * * These injections act on the mucous membrane * * * and facilitates its return to a state of health. Brou's Injection is not solely tonic and astringent but also isolating, which explains its success in the treatment of blenorrhoea. It coats the canal with a medicament which keeps the walls isolated. Leucorrhoea, white flowers, white Losses * * * The treatment consists of Injection Brou * * * This treatment * * * will not be long in bringing a complete cure * * * Injection Brou is hygienic and preservative * * * It is preservative (preventive) because by taking an injection after an impure contact * * *," (English, French, Italian, German, Spanish, Portuguese, and other languages) "Brou's Injection Hygienic and Preservative For the cure all recent and chronic discharges of the urinary organs. (Gonorrhoea, Leucorrhoea, and Glett.) Brou's Injection will always be more successful, if it be used immediately after the first appearance of the disease. * * * Brou's Injection used as preservative * * * use the injection."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of sulphates and acetates of lead and zinc, opium alkaloids, alcohol, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that certain statements appearing on the bottles and in the booklets, as aforesaid, and in an accompanying circular, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, were false and fraudulent in that the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the effects claimed.

On October 11, 1919, E. Fougera & Co., New York, N. Y., claimant, having consented to a decree, an order was entered by the court adjudging the product to be misbranded, and it was further ordered that the said product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$300, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

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

11041. Misbranding of Dr. Burkhardt's vegetable compound. U. S. v. 6 Dozen, et al., Packages of Dr. Burkhardt's [Burkhardt's] Vegetable Compound. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 13046, 13047. I. S. Nos. 10352-t, 10353-t. S. Nos. W-625, W-626.)

On July 14, 1920, the United States attorney for the Northern District of California, 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 6 dozen packages, 25-cent size, 6½ dozen packages, 50-cent size, and 32 packages, \$1 size, of Dr. Burkhardt's [Burkhardt's] Vegetable Compound, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Francisco, Calif., alleging that the article had been shipped by W. S. Burkhardt [Burkhardt], Cincinnati, Ohio, in various consignments on April 14, May 1, and May 12, 1920, respectively, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of California, 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 pills consisted essentially of aloes, capsicum, and podophyllum.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it was labeled in part on the cartons as follows, (25-cent and 50-cent sizes) “* * * Recommended for Kidney and Liver Disease, Fever and Ague, Rheumatism, Sick and Nervous Headache, Erysipelas, Scrofula, Female Complaints, Catarrh, Indigestion, Neuralgia, Nervous Affection, Dyspepsia, * * * and all Syphilitic Diseases * * *,” (\$1 size) “* * * Recommended for Blood Diseases, such as Rheumatism, Kidney and Liver Diseases, Fever and Ague, Sick and Nervous Headache, Erysipelas, Scrofula, Female Complaints, Catarrh, * * * Indigestion, Neuralgia, Nervous Affection, Dyspepsia * * *,” which said statements were false and fraudulent, since the said article contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing the curative and therapeutic effects claimed.

On May 9, 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. F. MARVIN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11042. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. Joe Milton Arnold and Richard Wesley Newman (Arnold & Newman). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 15593. I. S. No. 3358-t.)

On April 3, 1922, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Joe Milton Arnold and Richard Wesley Newman, co-partners, trading under the firm name of Arnold & Newman, Baldwyn, Miss., alleging shipment by said defendants in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about September 27, 1921, from the State of Mississippi into the State of Alabama, of a quantity of shell eggs which were adulterated.

Examination, by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department, of 30 eggs from the consignment showed that 23, or 6.4 per cent of those examined, were inedible eggs, consisting of black rots, mixed or white rots, spot rots, and heavy blood rings.

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

On October 2, 1922, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

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

11043. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. v. John Roper and Jesse W. Jones (Roper & Jones). Pleas of guilty. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 15594. I. S. No. 1496-t.)

On April 3, 1922, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against John Roper and Jesse W. Jones, trading as Roper & Jones, Saltillo, Miss., alleging shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about September 20, 1921, from the State of Mississippi into the State of Alabama, of a quantity of shell eggs which were adulterated. The article was labeled in part: “* * * Roper & Jones, General Merchandise, Saltillo, Mississippi.”

Examination by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of 540 eggs from the consignment showed the presence of 53 inedible eggs, or 9.8 per cent of those examined, which consisted of black rots, mixed or white rots, spot rots, and heavy blood rings.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal substance.

On October 2, 1922, the defendants entered pleas of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs.

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

11044. Misbranding of olive oil. U. S. v. 42 Cans, et al., of Olive Oil. Consent decrees of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. Nos. 16367, 16368. I. S. Nos. 15610-t, 15611-t, 15612-t, 15619-t, 15620-t. S. Nos. E-3810, E-3818.)

On May 5 and 10, 1922, respectively, the United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels for the seizure and condemnation of 42 7½-pound cans, 22 3¼-pound cans, 144 ¼-gallon cans, 15 gallon cans, and 20 ½-gallon cans of olive oil, in part at Newark and in part at