

for this condition. Piles For itching piles. * * * apply Helpuall. It * * * relieves the inflammation. For Domestic Animals. Helpuall has been found valuable in treating many ailments in domestic animals, particularly * * * skin diseases. * * * the most wonderful remedy for * * * throat trouble * * * it is fine for * * * sore throat * * * Especially good for * * * hoarseness * * * I find it very beneficial in a baby case of glandular infection and enlarged tonsils;" (display carton) "Helpuall * * * Croup, Tonsillitis, Bronchitis, Sore Throat, Rheumatism, * * * Eczema, Piles, * * * Itching Piles * * * Sore Throat."

On January 4, 1932, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19064. Adulteration and misbranding of Ergotole. U. S. v. Eighty-one 1-Ounce Bottles of Ergotole. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 27252. I. S. No. 38819. S. No. 5436.)

Examination of Ergotole from the shipment herein described having shown that the article was represented to have the same potency as fluidextract of ergot, whereas its potency was only one-half of that required by the United States Pharmacopoeia for fluidextract of ergot, the Secretary of Agriculture reported the matter to the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts.

On November 16, 1931, the United States attorney filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of eighty-one 1-ounce bottles of Ergotole, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by Sharp & Dohme (Inc.), from Philadelphia, Pa., on or about October 15, 1931, and had been transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it fell below the professed standard under which it was sold, namely: (Circular) "Ergotole is biologically assayed by the cock's comb method and standardized to the same potency as the Fluidextract of Ergot."

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the circular, "Ergotole is biologically assayed by the cock's comb method and standardized to the same potency as the Fluidextract of Ergot," was false and misleading.

On December 7, 1931, 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.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

19065. Adulteration and misbranding of Bafaline dental cream. U. S. v. 84 Packages of Bafaline Dental Cream. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 27080. I. S. No. 34600. S. No. 5271.)

Examination of Bafaline dental cream, involved in the shipment herein described, showed that the retail carton and a display carton bore statements representing that the article possessed curative and therapeutic properties which, in fact, it did not possess. The article was also represented to be anti-septic, whereas it was not.

On October 15, 1931, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 84 packages of the said Bafaline dental cream, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Bafaline Laboratories (Inc.), from Manchester, N. H., on or about September 11, 1931, and had been transported from the State of New Hampshire into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted essentially of calcium carbonate, glycerin, magnesium hydroxide, sodium pyroborate, sodium benzoate, soap, and flavoring materials. Bacteriological examination showed that the product was not antiseptic.