

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label of the article and in the circular entitled "Directions for Feeding," which accompanied the article, were false and misleading since they represented and created the impression that the article would be effective in the prevention and treatment of disease conditions in poultry; that the ingredient, charcoal, would be of therapeutic importance in the prevention and treatment of disease; that the article contained glauber salt, white oak bark, and epsom salt in amounts sufficient to be of therapeutic importance in the treatment and prevention of disease when used as directed. The article would not be efficacious for the purposes represented and would not be of therapeutic importance by reason of the stated ingredients, in that the article contained insignificant proportions of any substance other than charcoal and would furnish no therapeutically active amount of any ingredient.

**DISPOSITION:** June 17, 1947. Pleas of nolo contendere having been entered, the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs against each defendant.

**2190. Misbranding of Far-Vet Merco-Tabs, Far-Vet Gwyo-Dine Tablets, and Far-Vet Gwyo-Spray. U. S. v. Joseph Pogoriler (Farmers Veterinary Supply Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$300. (F. D. C. No. 20104. Sample Nos. 18345-H to 18347-H, incl.)**

**INFORMATION FILED:** July 17, 1946, District of Minnesota, against Joseph Pogoriler, trading as the Farmers Veterinary Supply Co., St. Paul, Minn.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** Between the approximate dates of December 20, 1944, and March 16, 1945, from the State of Minnesota into the State of South Dakota. A number of leaflets entitled "Dealers' Price List 1944," which accompanied the article, were shipped during the fall of 1944 from the State of Minnesota into the State of South Dakota.

**PRODUCT:** Analyses showed that the *Far-Vet Merco-Tabs* contained approximately 8 grains of mercuric chloride per tablet; that the *Far-Vet Gwyo-Dine Tablets* consisted essentially of potassium dichromate, potassium guaiacol sulfonate, sodium chloride, iodine, and creosote; and that the *Far-Vet Gwyo-Spray* was a liquid containing camphoraceous substances, phenol, thymol, iodine and turpentine in an inert oil base.

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** *Far-Vet Merco-Tabs.* Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the statements on the label, "For Drinking Water Medication \* \* \* Dissolve 1 tablet in 1 gallon of drinking water. In aggravated cases, use 2 tablets to 1 gallon of water. Allow no other water. At the first sign of an outbreak— isolate all infected birds in separate pen or house to avoid spreading the disease among the rest of the flock. Begin treatment immediately, continuing for about a week and repeating thereafter as indicated," and the statement in the circular, "For Fowl Cholera, Typhoid and Coccidiosis," were false and misleading. These statements represented, suggested, and implied that the article would be an adequate treatment for cholera, typhoid, and coccidiosis in fowls, whereas it would not be an adequate treatment for those conditions.

*Far-Vet Gwyo-Dine Tablets.* Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the statements on the label, "Poultry Solution Tablets \* \* \* Dissolve 1 tablet in 1 gallon of drinking water. Change water daily," and the statements in the circular, "For Roup, Colds, and all Respiratory ailments," were false and misleading. These statements represented, suggested, and implied that the article when used as directed would be effective in the treatment of roup, colds, and all respiratory ailments of poultry, whereas it would not be effective for those purposes.

*Far-Vet Gwyo-Spray.* Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the statements on the label, "Spray Application For Poultry \* \* \* Fill atomizer or spray gun with undiluted Gwyo-Spray and spray nostrils, around the eyes and down the throat of birds. Birds should then be placed in separate pen or house to avoid contact with healthy birds," and the statement in the circular, "Spray Inhalant For Roup, Colds and Brooder Pneumonia," were false and misleading. These statements represented, suggested, and implied that the article would be effective in the treatment of roup, colds, and brooder pneumonia in poultry, whereas it would not be effective for those purposes.

**DISPOSITION:** November 26, 1946. A plea of guilty having been entered, the defendant was fined \$300.