

The articles were alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements appearing in the labeling, regarding their curative and therapeutic effects, were false and fraudulent: (Terraline Plain) "Terraline Plain is prescribed for * * * autointoxication, with excellent results. Terraline Plain is a desirable vehicle for medicaments in the treatment of bronchial and pulmonary affections"; (Terraline Creosote) "Terraline is an excellent base for the treatment of pulmonary disorders with creosote—bronchial catarrh * * * and coughs—a * * * healing influence on the bronchial mucus membrane"; (Dr. Clark Johnson's Syrup) "A valuable Household Medicine for many troubles arising from a disordered condition of the Stomach, Liver and Bowels." Misbranding of the Terraline Plain and Terraline Creosote was alleged for the further reason that the statement on the label, "Petroleum Purificatum", was false and misleading, since it created the impression that the article was a thoroughly purified liquid petrolatum, whereas it was a comparatively impure petroleum oil.

On July 16, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and it was ordered that the products be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25049. Misbranding of Lygel. U. S. v. 108 Kits of Lygel, et al. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35630. Sample nos. 35655-B, 35656-B.)

This case involved a drug preparation which was misbranded because of unwarranted curative and therapeutic claims in the labeling.

On June 25, 1935, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 108 kits of Lygel and 48 packages of Lygel refills at Denver, Colo., consigned by Lehn & Fink, Inc., Bloomfield, N. J., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce in various shipments between the dates of January 31 and April 2, 1935, from the State of New Jersey into the State of Colorado, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Examination showed that the Lygel kits each contained one tube of jelly and an applicator. Analysis of the jelly showed that it consisted essentially of water and a gum with small amounts of a chloride, a phenolic compound, and perfume material. The Lygel refills each contained a tube of the jelly.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, contained in a circular shipped with the article, were false and fraudulent: "Prescribed by many Specialists for Leucorrhoea, Cervicitis, Vaginitis, Cervical Ulceration, etc."

On August 6, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

W. R. GREGG, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

25050. Misbranding of Malvitose. U. S. v. 30 Cans of Malvitose. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 35681. Sample nos. 31550-B, 37936-B.)

This case involved a product which was misbranded because of false and fraudulent curative and therapeutic claims in the labeling, and because of the false and misleading impression created by the labeling that the article contained appreciable amounts of all vitamins and appreciable amounts of alkaline ingredients.

On June 28, 1935, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 30 cans of Malvitose at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about April 2, 1935, by Malvitose Laboratories, Inc., from San Francisco, Calif., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of sugars (at least 63.5 percent), protein (9.4 percent), fat (7.9 percent), and small proportions of inorganic constituents (ash 2.65 percent). Examination showed that it contained no detectable proportions of vitamin C and that a heaping teaspoonful of the product did not contain one-twentieth as much vitamin A as does 8 cubic centimeters (the average adult dose) of cod-liver oil.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the following statements on the label were false and misleading: "The Alkaline * * * Drink * * * Malvitose the Alkaline * * * Drink Malvitose is strictly alkaline, obtain-