

Analysis by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department of samples of the article showed that one lot of the ether contained aldehyde and the other two lots contained peroxide.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under a name recognized in the U. S. Pharmacopoeia, and differed from the standard of quality and purity as prescribed in and determined by the tests laid down in said pharmacopoeia, and in that its purity fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statements borne on the labels of the cans containing the article, "Ether for Anesthesia It Is superior in vital respects to the ether of the U. S. P.," were false and misleading.

On August 6, 1926, E. R. Squibb & Sons, New York, N. Y., having appeared as claimant for the property, and having confessed the allegations of the libels, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of bonds in the aggregate sum of \$1,100, conditioned in part that it not be sold again for anesthetic purposes and that it be relabeled under the supervision of this department.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14558. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 5 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21206. I. S. No. 6299-x. S. No. E-5816.)

On July 15, 1926, the United States attorney for the Eastern 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 praying seizure and condemnation of 5 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Zanesville Creamery Co., Zanesville, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped from Zanesville, Ohio, on or about July 12, 1926, and transported from the State of Ohio into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance containing less than 80 per cent of butterfat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been wholly or in part abstracted.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the article was an imitation of and offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On August 2, 1926, C. M. Drake & Co., Philadelphia, Pa., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the 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 \$150, conditioned in part that it be reconditioned under the supervision of this department.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14559. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 5 Tubs of Butter. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21193. I. S. No. 6354-x. S. No. E-5807.)

On July 7, 1926, the United States attorney for the Eastern 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 praying seizure and condemnation of 5 tubs of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Sherburn Farm Creamery Co., Sherburn, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped from Sherburn, Minn., on or about June 23, 1926, and transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that a substance containing less than 80 per cent of butterfat had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce, lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article. Adulteration was alleged for the further reason that a valuable constituent of the article, butterfat, had been wholly or in part abstracted.