use of the product would be effective in restoring good health. The article would not be effective for such purposes.

On April 13, 1945, the Bay State Drug Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

1534. Misbranding of V. M. Tablets. U. S. v. 107 Bottles of V. M. Tablets and 3,900 Circulars. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 15127. Sample Nos. 4201–H, 4202–H.)

On January 30, 1945, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 107 bottles of V. M. Tablets and 3,900 circulars at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the tablets had been shipped on or about December 6 and 29, 1944, by V. M. Products, from Chicago, Ill., and that the circulars accompanied the article when introduced into and while it was in interstate commerce.

The article was labeled in part: "V. M. A Vegetable Mucinoid Also known as Vegemucene Okra Concentrated by dehydration." The circulars were entitled "Stomach Sufferers."

Examination of samples of the article showed that it consisted essentially of mucilaginous plant material, such as okra.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article was effective in the treatment of gastric or peptic ulcers, duodenal ulcers, colitis, gastric hemorrhage, recurring pains, pain in the epigastrium, vomiting, loss of weight, gastritis, and cramp-like pains; that it was effective to protect the linings of the stomach and intestines from thte irritant action of excess acids and food roughage; and that it would cause the user to gain weight. The article would not be effective for such purposes.

On February 20, 1945, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1535. Misbranding of Parry's Compound. U. S. v. 16⅙ Dozen Bottles of Parry's Compound. Consent decree of condemnation. Product ordered released under bond. (F. D. C. No. 15295. Sample No. 10004–H.)

On February 20, 1945, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania filed a libel against 16⅙ dozen bottles of Parry's Compound and 100 circulars at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the circulars and the drug had been shipped by the Parry Vegetable Compound Co., Inc., from Mansfield, Ohio, on or about November 1, 1944, and January 3, 1945, respectively. The circulars were entitled "Parry's Compound 'Dad' Parry's Famous Medicine 35 Years in Service."

Examination of a sample disclosed that the article consisted essentially of olive oil, water, and alcohol, colored with FD&C Red No. 2.

It was alleged to be misbranded because of false and misleading statements in the circulars which represented and suggested that the article would be effective in restoring health and in the treatment of gallstones, gallstone colic, stomach trouble, intestinal disorders, and ulcers. The article would not be effective for those purposes.

On March 20, 1945, the Parry Vegetable Compound Co., Inc., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered released under bond for relabeling under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration.

1536. Misbranding of Vitalex Perdiz Tonic. U. S. v. 105 Bottles of Vitalex Perdiz Tonic. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 15376. Sample No. 96819–F.)

On February 13, 1945,, the United States attorney for the Western District of Texas filed a libel against 105 bottles of Vitalex Perdiz Tonic at San Antonio, Tex., alleging that the article, which had been consigned by the Vitatlex Laboratories, had been shipped on or about September 27, 1944, from Buffalo, N. Y.

Analysis showed that the article was a pink, sugar- and calcium carbonate-coated tablet containing nux vomica and zinc phosphide, with compounds of sodium, calcium, and iron, including phosphates. Each tablet contained iron compounds equivalent to not more than 7.1 milligrams of iron.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the label statements in the English and Spanish languages, "nutritional anemia, and in convalescence from