27898. Misbranding of Anbesol. U. S. v. 54 Bottles of Anbesol. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 40120. Sample No. 38099–C.)

The label of this product bore false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative or therapeutic effects. The label also bore representations which were false and misleading in view of the composition of the product.

On August 17, 1937, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 54 bottles of Anbesol at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about July 31, 1937, by the Anbesol Co. from Newark, N. J., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The articles was labeled in part: "Anbesol * * * An Effective Antiseptic—Anesthetic."

Analysis showed that it consisted essentially of alcohol, glycerin, water, benzocaine, menthol, camphor, and small quantities of a phenolic substance and free and combined iodine.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements on the label were false and misleading in that they were untrue: (Carton and bottle label) "Non-Toxic * * * Non-Irritant"; (circular) "* * * harmless * * * freedom from toxicity * * * non-toxic, non-irritating, * * * Unlike other antiseptics, Anbesol retains its antiseptic-anesthetic activities indefinitely."

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the following statements appearing in the circular contained in the package, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, were false and fraudulent: (Circular) "* * * induces immediate local anesthesia * * * effecting instant and prolonged pain relief * * * 1. Induces immediate and prolonged anesthesia * * * causing prompt relief from pain. * * * Unlike other antiseptics, Anbesol retains its antiseptic-anesthetic activities indefinitely, * * * kills quickly the most resistant pyogenic germs. * * * gives immediate relief from pain to the injured area * * * It is recommended for the relief of such conditions as: abscesses, inflammation. * * * pruritis ani et vulvae, cracked nipples, fever sores, * * * For stomatitis * * * For Teething Babies."

On September 3, 1937, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

27899. Misbranding of Burton's Relief. U. S. v. 146 Bottles of Burton's Relief. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 40157. Sample No. 43735–C.)

The labeling of this product contained false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative or therapeutic effects.

On or about August 26, 1937, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of South Carolina, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 146 bottles of Burton's Relief at Sumter, S. C., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce or or about October 11, 1930, by the Carolina Medicine Co. from Littleton, N. C., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of water, extracts of plant drugs including colocynth, and a red coloring material.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the bottle label, the carton, and the circular shipped with it bore false and fraudulent representations regarding its effectiveness in the treatment of rheumatism, high blood pressure, pellagra, and eczema; its effectiveness as a blood purifier; and its effectiveness to cleanse the whole system.

On September 25, 1937, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

27900. Misbranding of Grange Poke Root Compound. U. S. v. Nine Packages of Grange Poke Root Compound. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. No. 40227. Sample No. 21247–C.)

The labeling of this product bore false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative and therapeutic effects. Its name also was misleading since it contained other physiologically active ingredients in addition to poke root.

On August 31, 1937, the United States attorney for the District of Maine, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of nine packages of Grange Poke