

a few drops around the inside and outside of the ear; \* \* \* Sore or swelling tonsils or sore throat, apply oil over swelling or sore part \* \* \* Where joints are swollen or are inflamed, don't rub the oil, just pat it on \* \* \* It Penetrates to the seat of your aches and pains and dissolves them."

On December 8, 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.*

**19160. Misbranding of Renolin. U. S. v. 34 Bottles of Renolin. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 27213. I. S. No. 38817. S. No. 5354.)**

Examination of a drug product, known as Renolin, from the shipment herein described showed that the label represented that the article contained no injurious drugs, whereas it contained drugs that might be injurious. The labeling also bore statements representing that the article possessed curative and therapeutic properties which it did not possess.

On November 5, 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 34 bottles of Renolin, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Renolin Co., from Bradford, N. H., on or about September 5, 1931, and had been transported from the State of New Hampshire into the State of Massachusetts, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended.

Examination of a sample of the article by this department showed that it consisted of tablets containing 0.52 gram of cinchophen each.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement, "Renolin \* \* \* Contains no injurious \* \* \* drugs," was false and misleading. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the following statements appearing in the labeling, 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: (Bottle label) "A Relief for Rheumatism;" (carton) "A Relief for Rheumatism;" (circular) "A Relief for Rheumatism \* \* \* a relief for Rheumatism, Arthritis, Neuritis, Sciatica, \* \* \* Lumbago \* \* \* In acute and stubborn cases \* \* \* Rheumatic Relief."

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.*

**19161. Adulteration and misbranding of Dunlop pyorrhea paste. U. S. v. 43 Tubes of Dunlop Pyorrhea Paste. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 27218. I. S. No. 44029. S. No. 5384.)**

Examination of samples of Dunlop pyorrhea paste from the shipment herein described showed that the labeling bore statements representing that the article possessed curative and therapeutic properties which it did not possess. The article was also represented to be antiseptic, whereas it was not. Furthermore, the label failed to bear the statement of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained in the article.

On November 10, 1931, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, 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 43 tubes of Dunlop pyorrhea paste at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Dunlop Pyorrhea Machine Manufacturing Co., from St. Paul, Minn., on or about September 18, 1931, and had been transported from the State of Minnesota into the State of Illinois, 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 boric acid, glycerin, peppermint oil, and alcohol (3.4 per cent by weight). Bacteriological examination of the article showed that it was not antiseptic.